

**The Culture and Political World of the Fourth Century AD:
Julian, *paideia* and Education**

Victoria Elizabeth Hughes

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

School of History, Classics and Archaeology

April 2018

Abstract

This thesis examines the role of education and *paideia* in the political and cultural landscape of the mid-fourth century, focusing on the Greek East and the reign of Julian, particularly his educational measures. Julian's edict and rescript on education are often understood (not least in light of the invectives of Gregory of Nazianzus) as marking an attempt on his part to ban Christians from teaching and, by extension, from engaging in elite public life. They have been used by some scholars as evidence to support the hypothesis that Julian, a committed pagan, implemented an anti-Christian persecution. This thesis reconsiders that hypothesis: it re-evaluates the reign of Julian and his educational measures, and considers the political role of *paideia* as the culmination and public expression of rhetorical education.

Chapter one introduces the topic and provides a brief 'literature review' of the key items for a study of Julian and education in the fourth century. Chapter two addresses rhetorical education in the fourth century: it offers a survey of its methods and content, and explores the idea of a 'typical' student in contrast with 'culture heroes'. Chapter three investigates the long-standing Christian debate on the compatibility of a traditional Greek education with Christian belief, and considers the role of Julian in this connection. Chapter four discusses the enhanced status of Latin and of law studies in light of the enlarged imperial administration in the fourth century, and considers the extent to which this development worked to the detriment of rhetorical studies. On the basis of the preceding chapters' discussions, chapters five and six closely discuss two key topics. Chapter five closely examines Julian's edict and rescript: their details and specific contexts; the relationship between them and the broader debate on morality in education; how they relate to Julian's religious ideology and Hellenism. Chapter six offers a discussion of *paideia*, considering its potential range of lexical and cultural meanings, and assessing its influence on Julian's thought and action. The chapter argues for the importance of *paideia* in political relationships in the fourth century and re-evaluates the invectives of Gregory in this context. A brief concluding chapter closes the thesis.

Acknowledgements

Of all the people who have helped me throughout the course of this PhD, I'd firstly like to thank Dr Rowland Smith for his stimulating discussion, thoughtful comments and guidance throughout. Thank you also to Dr Federico Santangelo, whose thorough feedback, advice and assistance I benefited enormously from. Thank you to the late Prof John Moles for his help with this project in its early stages. Grateful thanks are owed to Drs Susanna Phillippo, Janet Watson and David Creese for their patient Greek tuition. Thank you to the AHRC for their belief in the project and financial support. It's much appreciated. I'd also like to take the opportunity to thank Mr Lombard, of St Stephen's Primary School, who fed an interest in ancient history at age eight.

Thank you to my family and friends for their much-needed support, humour and distraction: these past four years would've been much more lonely and boring without them. I owe you all drinks. Finally, I'd like to thank my Dad, for his unfailing and untiring encouragement, patience and help. Without him, none of this would've been possible, truly.

Table of Contents

Chapter one: Introduction	1
1.1 The life of Julian and the fourth century context.....	1
1.2 An overview of this thesis	7
1.3 Literature review	8
Chapter two: Education in the fourth century AD	20
2.1 Introduction	20
2.2 The classroom.....	21
2.2.1 Corporal punishment	23
2.2.2 Pedagogues	26
2.3 Memorisation in the classroom	28
2.3.1 <i>Progymnasmata</i>	29
2.3.2 <i>Florilegia</i>	31
2.4 The curriculum before the fourth century.....	33
2.4.1 The curriculum in the fourth century.....	38
2.5 The education of ‘culture heroes’	50
2.5.1 Julian’s education	54
2.5.2 A ‘typical’ education	59
2.6 The costs of education	63
2.7 Educational centres and their specialisations	65
2.8 Conclusion.....	70
Chapter three: The Christian debate on pagan literature	72
3.1 Introduction	72
3.2 The debate in the second and third centuries: Tertullian.....	74
3.2.1 After Tertullian.....	77
3.3 The fourth century: Basil’s advice	80
3.3.1 Gregory of Nazianzus.....	83
3.3.2 Jerome’s dream.....	86
3.4 After the fourth century: Augustine	89
3.5 East and West	92
3.6 Julian and the debate	93
3.7 Conclusion.....	97
Chapter four: The challenge to rhetoric	98
4.1 Introduction	98
4.2 The ‘decline’ of rhetorical studies.....	99

4.2.1 Latin in the Greek East.....	104
4.2.2 Law studies in the Greek East.....	107
4.3 Bureaucratic developments	113
4.3.1 Opportunities for advancement.....	115
4.4 Decurions and the city councils	118
4.4.1 Attempts to revive the councils.....	120
4.4.2 The undesirability of the councils.....	124
4.5 Conclusion	127
Chapter five: Julian and education	128
5.1 Introduction.....	128
5.1.1 Imperial precedents.....	129
5.2 The edict and the rescript.....	131
5.2.1 The relationship between the edict and rescript; the nature of the rescript.....	137
5.2.2 The audience(s): the target readership and those affected	143
5.3 Morality and education in the thought of Julian	149
5.4 Religion and education: Julian and the Christians	153
5.4.1 The religious element of education.....	159
5.5 Hellenism: “The Hellenic religion...”	161
5.6 Conclusion	168
Chapter six: <i>Paideia</i>	170
6.1 Introduction.....	170
6.2 Towards a definition	172
6.2.1 <i>Paideia</i> as capital	178
6.3 <i>Paideia</i> in action	181
6.3.1 The ideals of <i>paideia</i>	181
6.3.2 Letters, friendship and <i>paideia</i>	186
6.3.3 Anger and <i>paideia</i>	193
6.3.4 The <i>paideia</i> of emperors, ideals and practice.....	198
6.4 Julian and <i>paideia</i>	202
6.5 <i>Paideia</i> in Gregory’s invectives against Julian.....	215
6.6 Conclusion	221
Chapter seven: Conclusion.....	224
Bibliography	231

Chapter one: Introduction

“Whose property are the words of the Greek language?”- Gregory of Nazianzus¹

1.1 The life of Julian and the fourth century context

Julian ‘the Apostate’ was emperor for only a short period of time. However, those nineteen months between AD 361 and 363 were remarkable and, at times, dramatic.² Julian is famous for being the last pagan emperor, who attempted to reverse the inroads made by Christianity under his uncle, Constantine the Great (r. 306-337), and cousin, Constantius II (r. 337-361). He spent his youth away from court, having been sent first by Constantius to Nicomedia and then, in 342, to Macellum in Cappadocia, following the execution of almost all his adult male relatives, including his father, victims of imperial politics.³ Julian remained in Macellum for six years before finally returning to Constantinople. Encouraged by his beloved pedagogue Mardonius, and aided by the extensive library of Bishop George, Julian dedicated himself to a life of learning, eventually studying in Constantinople, Athens and various cities in Asia Minor.⁴ His studies were curtailed, however, after the downfall and execution of his half-brother Gallus, and he was recalled to court in Milan and made Caesar by Constantius on 6 November 355.⁵ After five successful years as commander in Gaul, his troops proclaimed him emperor (with, perhaps, some encouragement by his advisors, if not Julian himself) and he marched east to confront Constantius: civil war seemed imminent.⁶ However, Constantius died before any armed confrontation could take place and Julian was confirmed as sole emperor, arriving in Constantinople on 11 December 361.⁷

¹ τίνας γὰρ τοῦ Ἑλληνίζειν εἰσὶν οἱ λόγοι, GNaz, *Or.* 4.103.

² All dates are AD unless otherwise stated.

³ *Jul. Ep. ad SPQ Ath.* 270c-271d; *Amm.* 21.16.8.

⁴ A significant period for Julian: he studied with Nicocles and Hecebolius in Constantinople, and had access to the lectures of Libanius in Nicomedia (*Lib. Or.* 18.13-15; *Amm.* 15.2.7). He was later granted permission to study in Athens, thanks mainly to the intervention of the empress Eusebia (*Jul. Ep. Ad SPQ Ath.* 274a; *Or.* 3.118b-c).

⁵ *Jul. Or.* 3.121a-c; *Amm.* 15.8.3.

⁶ Julian describes his time in Gaul in the *Letter to the Athenians*, the first frustrating years (277d-278b), and his eventual military successes (279b-c; 280c-d). In early 360, Constantius requested a significant portion of Julian’s army be sent to the East (*Amm.* 20.4.1-2). Ammianus writes that an ‘anonymous’ pamphlet was sent round the camp of the Petulantes, informing them of Constantius’s decision to recall certain troops (20.4.10). This was the impetus for the acclamation of Julian. Julian himself mentioned the role of the letter: *Ep. Ad Ath.* 283b-c. Eunapius suggested that Julian engineered this along with Oribasius and Euhemerus of Libya, *VS.* 476.

⁷ Constantius declared Julian is successor in his will: *Amm.* 21.15.5.

Since the reign of Constantine, the imperial family had been Christian and had promoted Christian interests. This changed with Julian. Though raised as a Christian (apparently he was even a reader in the Church while at Macellum),⁸ Julian had secretly ‘apostatized’ as a young man.⁹ The seriousness of Julian’s Christianity has been questioned (and thus, whether we can genuinely talk about a ‘conversion’),¹⁰ but it is significant that upon becoming emperor, he openly professed his paganism and set about restoring it to its former glory.¹¹ His death whilst on campaign against the Persians on 26 June 363 and the subsequent elevation of the Christian Jovian as emperor ended any hopes of a pagan revival.¹² However, Julian and his actions were not forgotten: few figures in antiquity have been so well documented.¹³ Both Christian and pagan writings, have contributed to the ‘legend’ surrounding Julian, and have helped create opposing images, from apostate actively determined to rid the world of Christianity to simple champion of paganism.¹⁴ Of these, Gregory of Nazianzus’s invectives have presented some of the most extreme opinions and made a significant contribution to the picture of Julian as crusading apostate.¹⁵ Indeed, in many ways, Gregory created ‘Julian the Apostate’.¹⁶

Gregory of Nazianzus (329/330-390), future bishop of Constantinople, and one of the ‘Cappadocian Fathers’, wrote two invectives against Julian soon after his death.¹⁷ These invectives are particularly hostile. Gregory was angry that Julian had never afforded the Christians the honour of martyrdom, as a proper tyrant would have,¹⁸ and did

⁸ GNaz. *Or.* 4.97. Gregory also relates a story of Julian and Gallus building a monument on the tomb of St. Mamas to further highlight the sincerity of Julian’s Christianity and thus contrast his apostasy (*Or.* 4.24-6).

⁹ Jul. *Ep.* 47.434d mentions that he was Christian for twenty years, which he wished to forget (*Or.* 4.131a). This suggests a conversion when Julian met Maximus of Ephesus (Eunap. *VS.* 475).

¹⁰ Athanassiadi 1992, 24-27 suggests we be careful of falling into the ‘romantic’ image of Julian’s conversion and argues that Julian did not undergo a religious conversion like Justin Martyr. Bidez 1930, 57-62 on Julian’s early attraction to the gods and budding ‘fanaticism’. See also Nock 1933 and 1972, and Athanassiadi 2015 on conversion.

¹¹ Lib. *Or.* 18.157; 1.118-119.

¹² The contemporary accounts of Julian’s death differ: Amm. 25.3.6-23; GNaz. *Or.* 5.13-14; Lib. *Or.* 18.268-273.

¹³ Bowersock 1978, 1.

¹⁴ Braun and Richer’s 1978 volume on the history and legend of Julian examines contemporary and near-contemporary accounts of Julian, as well as his image from the sixth to the seventeenth century. See also Bidez 1930, 332-347 on the posthumous image construction of Julian.

¹⁵ Bowersock 1978, 2.

¹⁶ Elm 2010, 2, 337.

¹⁷ Bernardi suggested that they were composed during winter 363/364 (1978, 91). Elm favours a date of late 364 or early 365 and proposes that about a year passed before the composition of *Or.* 5 in late 365 or early 366 (2012, 341-343).

¹⁸ GNaz. *Or.* 4.60-61.

not openly persecute Christians, arguing Julian attacked ‘our religion in a very rascally and ungenerous way, and introduce[d] into his persecution the traps and snares concealed in arguments.’¹⁹ He was particularly furious with Julian’s attempt, as Gregory saw it, to control words. Words – *logoi* - are what he returns to throughout the invectives. Indeed, Gregory’s anger seems to primarily stem from devotion to Greek learning rather than his devotion to Christianity.²⁰ He accused Julian of depriving Christians of all freedom of speech, of attempting to debar them from speaking Greek, of banishing them from their own country and excluding them from all meetings, markets, assemblies and law courts.²¹ Though explicit reference is never made, we can infer that Gregory is referring to Julian’s school edict and subsequent rescript.

The school edict, issued just over a year before Julian’s death, on 17 June 362, decreed that teachers must excel first in morals then in eloquence, and furthermore must be approved to teach by a municipal council before confirmation by Julian himself.²² There is nothing inherently anti-Christian in this, and we might even call it innocuous. Julian’s subsequent rescript, however, goes further, arguing that those who do not believe what they teach should not teach it – they ‘ought not to harbour in their souls opinions irreconcilable with what they publicly profess’.²³ They were given the choice,²⁴

either not to teach what they do not think admirable, or, if they wish to teach, let them first really persuade their pupils that neither Homer nor Hesiod nor any of these writers whom they expound and have declared to be guilty of impiety, folly and error in regard to the gods, is such as they declare.

Christians were instead advised to be pious to the gods or ‘betake themselves to the churches of the Galileans to expound Matthew and Luke’.²⁵ Julian clarifies that it is aimed at those who teach one thing but believe another. The basis of education, and in many ways elite identity, were the classical works which made reference to the pagan gods; if they could not teach these works, they could not teach the curriculum which was

¹⁹ δουλοπρεπῶς δὲ λίαν καὶ ἀγεννῶς κακουργεῖ τὴν εὐσέβειαν, καὶ τὰς περὶ τοὺς λογισμοὺς πλοκάς καὶ διπλόας τῶ καθ’ ἡμῶν διωγμῶ φέρων ἐπεισήγαγε, GNaz. Or. 4.61.

²⁰ Limberis 2000, 391.

²¹ GNaz. Or. 4.96.

²² CTh. 13.3.5.

²³ μὴ μαχόμενα οἷς δημοσίᾳ μεταχειρίζονται τὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ φέρειν δοξάσματα, Jul. Ep. 36.422c.

²⁴ δίδωμι δὲ αἴρεσιν μὴ διδάσκειν ἅ μὴ ἠομίζουσι σπουδαῖα, βουλομένους δὲ διδάσκειν ἔργω πρῶτον πείθειν τοὺς μαθητὰς ὡς οὔτε Ὅμηρος οὔτε Ἡσίοδος οὔτε τούτων τις, οὐς ἐξηγοῦνται καὶ ὧν κατεγνωκότερος εἰσὶν ἀσέβειαν ἀνοιάν τε καὶ πλάνην εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς, τοιοῦτός ἐστιν, Jul. Ep. 36.423b.

²⁵ βαδιζόντων εἰς τὰς τῶν Γαλιλαίων ἐκκλησίας ἐξηγησόμενοι Ματθαῖον καὶ Λουκᾶν, Jul. Ep. 36.423d.

traditional and widespread in the East. It could be argued that education was being used as a tool to keep Christians on the periphery of elite culture, reversing the gains they had made under Julian's predecessors, Constantine and Constantius II.

It is unclear how effective Julian's law was, how widely it was promulgated or enforced, or even whether it was enforced and instead acted more as performative edict of chastisement. However, it was certainly provocative. Even Ammianus, a supporter of Julian whose *Res Gestae* is centred around him as a heroic emperor, was critical, remarking that the 'harsh act' should be 'buried in lasting oblivion'.²⁶ Gregory's invectives, however, present the most hostile and pervasive opinions. Gregory saw Julian as attempting to create a pagan monopoly on learning by banning Christians from teaching pagan works, and by extension controlling the transmission of a heritage and cultural identity. For Gregory, Julian's educational measures could have potentially made Christians socially, culturally and politically insignificant through their impact on *paideia*, a very significant, if complex, concept for the elite of the empire.

Paideia, παιδεία, is usually translated as 'education' but can be understood, in line with Marrou and Brown, rather as the results of this education, a common culture and code of conduct subscribed to by the elites, which operated as the entrée into the Graeco-Roman cultural and political world.²⁷ Bouffartigue, too, equates culture with *paideia*.²⁸ Education, largely the preserve of elite males, was virtually a mandatory and integral part of elite, aristocratic life.²⁹ Birth and class determined who would attend; ability rarely, if ever, came into consideration.³⁰ Education was both expensive and time consuming. Studies usually started at the age of seven, under a grammarian, while rhetorical studies with a sophist or rhetor started, on average, at age fourteen and lasted between two and five years.³¹ Education, particularly rhetorical, became a badge of superiority and helped to preserve the traditional linguistic, geographic and social boundaries of the elite.³² Indeed, preservation of tradition was fundamental to ancient education. A sense of continuity was important and celebrated: that education in the fourth century AD was

²⁶ *Illud autem erat inclemens, obruendum perenni silentio, quod arcebat docere magistros rhetoricos et grammaticos ritus christiani cultores*, Amm. 22.10.7; *Inter quae erat illud inclemens quod docere vetuit magistros rhetoricos et grammaticos Christianos, ni transissent ad numinum cultum*, Amm. 25.4.20.

²⁷ Marrou 1956, 196; Brown 1992, 34; Limberis 2000, 385.

²⁸ Bouffartigue 1992, 10.

²⁹ Marrou, 1956, 95; Cribiore 2007b, 42.

³⁰ Too 2001, 13.

³¹ Cribiore 2001b, 56. A student could then pursue the study of philosophy or Roman law as optional extras.

³² Kaster 1988, x.

remarkably similar to education in the third century BC was a central premise to the elite. Nowhere was this sense of continuity and consistency felt more than in the curriculum. Though never under state control, the literature which formed the curriculum remained consistent, largely through the appeal of tradition and a privileging of the past.³³ Schools in fourth century AD Antioch tended to study the same texts as schools in second century BC Athens. Homer, particularly the *Iliad*, was the main text and the central pivot around which the whole of Greek education was organized.³⁴

Education was, therefore, designed as the transmission of a specific culture based on a specific period of the Greek past and the curriculum reflected this principle. It was a way of preserving and expressing status. Education also provided opportunities in the central administration, law or provincial government.³⁵ In essence, it was pragmatic preparation for life among the elite, which reinforced their positions of privilege and power and maintained elite identity. Grammarians and sophists were custodians of the cultural heritage that notables and their sons would inherit through the study of specific literature and culture. Their identity was preserved and transmitted through this schooling in the same way that knowledge of the classical authors was preserved and transmitted.³⁶

In the background, there was a debate in Christian circles about the compatibility of pagan learning with Christianity, which may also have contributed to Gregory's anger with Julian. This debate was already ongoing in the third century and continued well into the fourth and after. In the fourth century, Basil of Caesarea engaged with this debate, following on from key figures such as Tertullian, Arnobius and Lactantius; in a piece ostensibly written for his nephews, he recommended sifting through the pagan works to accept only those passages praising virtue.³⁷ Later, Augustine would advise Christians to focus on the scriptures and to venture only with due care into classical works.³⁸ Gregory argued that Julian was attempting to exclude Christians from traditional Greek culture, which was such an important factor in defining both one's place in elite society and one's identity. Gregory clearly felt himself, and indeed Christians, to have inherited the wealth of this culture, a culture that formed an integral part of his character and status. The

³³ Cribiore 2001b, 4.

³⁴ Marrou 1956, xiv.

³⁵ Marrou 1956, 311.

³⁶ Cribiore 2007b, 127.

³⁷ Basil. *Ad Adol.* 1; 3; 4.

³⁸ August. *De Doct. Christ.* 2.139; 2.151.

debate centred around the Christian relationship and engagement with pagan literature and may have influenced Gregory's position in the invectives against Julian.

To better understand the background to Julian's edict and rescript, and the reactions to these measures, we must explore education in the fourth century, its disposition and its influence on the elite of the Greek East. We will also reconsider the Christian debate on rhetorical education, questioning whether Julian's educational measures could be viewed as operating within this framework, and examine the shifting trends of fourth century education in the East, with a discussion of Latin and law studies as potential rivals to traditional studies. There will be a reassessment of Julian's reign, and his edict and rescript, and a discussion of the role of morality in education, the place of religion and the contested understanding of Hellenism in this period. We will also consider the concept of *paideia*, its political influence and impact on Julian's ruling style and the expectations the empire had of the emperor. The strong reaction of Gregory to the character of Julian and in particular his educational measures will be explored in greater detail in light of discussions on the influence of education and *paideia* on politics and culture in the fourth century.

The focus will be the fourth century, especially the short reign of Julian, 361 to 363, though reference will be made both to earlier periods and late antiquity in general in order to understand trends and long-standing debates. This is particularly crucial for chapters on the Christian debate and education in the fourth century, which necessarily consider writers outside this timeframe. For example, the evidence of Quintilian is important for understanding the contents of the curriculum, while writers of the Second Sophistic, such as Lucian and Plutarch, also provide invaluable viewpoints; this is particularly relevant as a connection between the Second Sophistic and the fourth century can be seen – indeed, the term 'Third Sophistic' has recently proposed for the fourth century.³⁹ Any discussion of Julian must consider the fifth century Greek Church historians, Socrates Scholasticus and Sozomen, as well as the Latin sources Augustine and Jerome: all are valuable in any discussion of Julian and education in late antiquity.

³⁹ The term 'Third Sophistic' was first used by Laurent Pernot in reference to late antiquity, and has been discussed most fully by Quiroga 2007 and van Hoof 2010. Kaldellis, meanwhile, has also suggested the term be applied to Komnenian Byzantium, that is, the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries (2007, 40). I remain unconvinced by its usage.

Geographically, the main focus will be the Greek East, where Julian spent most of his time, though some reference will be made to the western part of the empire.

1.2 An overview of this thesis

The second chapter surveys education in the fourth century, and explores its methods, including the role of corporal punishment (2.2.1), pedagogues (2.2.2) and *proygnasmata* (2.3.1). A discussion of content follows, considering the central authors and texts both before (2.4) and during the fourth century, using the work of Libanius (2.4.1.1), Julian (2.4.1.2), the Apollinarii (2.4.1.3), Basil (2.4.1.4) and Gregory (2.4.1.5) to build a picture of a curriculum. This chapter also discusses the educational experiences of key fourth century figures, and compares them with the education of Julian (2.5.1) and the experience of a more 'typical' student (2.5.2). The centres of education, such Athens, Antioch and Constantinople, are also explored (2.6).

Chapter three investigates the long-standing Christian debate concerning the appropriateness of Christians studying traditional, pagan literature as part of their grammatical and rhetorical education. This chapter considers the debate in the second and third centuries, using the work of Tertullian, particularly (3.2), but also Clement, Origen and Lactantius (3.2.1) to explore the arguments and positions central to the debate. The debate in the fourth century is then examined: the shifting positions of Basil (3.3), Gregory of Nazianzus (3.3.1) and Jerome (3.3.2), followed by Augustine (3.4). The influence of geography in this debate is also explored (3.5), before an assessment of Julian's place in this debate, looking particularly at his education edict and rescript as possible contributions to this ongoing discussion (3.6).

The fourth chapter explores the developments in the fourth century in light of the bureaucratic changes begun by Diocletian and continued by Constantine. There is a reconsideration of the strong statements made by Libanius on the 'decline' of rhetorical education (4.2), and the increasing influence of Latin (4.2.1) and law studies in the Greek East (4.2.2). Linked to this, there follows a discussion of the declining city councils and the attempts by various emperors, especially Julian, to revive them as traditional local forces (4.4.1).

Following this is an examination of Julian's edict and rescript in detail, discussing the nature of the rescript and its relationship to the edict (5.2.1) and the intended audience for both documents (5.2.2). This chapter then reconsiders how the edict and rescript interact with the broader debates on morality and education (5.3), religion (5.4) and Hellenism in the fourth century (5.5). This includes discussion of Julian's other works which relate to education, such as his *Letter to a Priest*, and his relationship with the Christian community, whether there is a reasonable argument to be made for an emperor engaged in a persecution (5.4.1).

Finally, chapter six is a discussion of *paideia*. This explores and defines the concept of *paideia*, using both primary and secondary literature (6.2), as well as Bourdieu's capital theory to further facilitate a working definition (6.2.1). The ideals of *paideia*, as presented in literary sources, are considered (6.3.1), together with the various ways of expressing *paideia*, successfully or not: the use of letters and friendship as an expression of one's culture (6.3.2); anger and the failure of decorum, particularly the use of violence by imperial representatives (6.3.3); and, the importance of *paideia* for the emperor (6.3.4). Julian's use of *paideia* is then assessed, gauging the extent to which he complied with its ideals during his reign, and examining what it meant for him (6.4). This is contrasted with the understanding of *paideia* in Gregory's invectives (6.5); Gregory's reaction to Julian's actions is shown to stem from the significance of *paideia* as a cultural code of conduct and identity marker for the educated elite of the fourth century.

1.3 Literature review

The literature on Julian is vast: both ancient and modern writers have found the emperor an irresistible subject. Primary sources will form the basis of this study. There are many Julianic sources, both contemporary and near-contemporary, pagan and Christian. Of these, perhaps the most important are those by Julian himself. We have more works written by Julian than any other emperor, including Marcus Aurelius. As was recently remarked, he should be remembered not just as the last pagan emperor, but as 'an emperor who was an author'.⁴⁰ Julian's surviving works, written mainly during his time as emperor, cover three Loeb volumes and a number of genres: panegyric, polemic, satire, theological and philosophical prose hymns, anti-Christian treatises, letters and edicts.

⁴⁰ Baker-Brian and Tougher 2012, xiii.

They offer the historian an almost unparalleled opportunity to ‘catch the cultural milieu of an individual Emperor, the texture of his personal attitudes, and their impact on central aspects of his public action.’⁴¹ Indeed, Julian’s many writings ‘provide an insight into character and disposition such as can be had for no other classical figure apart from Cicero.’⁴² Of these works, Julian’s edict and rescript will be discussed most fully. However, other works, such as the *Misopogon*, the letter to the Athenians, the letters to the Alexandrians and to a priest, are also vital in understanding not only Julian and his reign but also the role and influence of education and *paideia* in the mid-fourth century.

In addition to Julian’s writings, there are many contemporary and near-contemporary accounts of Julian, which give us access to a full range of opinions about an emperor who provoked an extreme response even from those writing two generations after his death. These sources each have their own biases, in some way affected by their religious outlook, a particularly dominant issue in the fourth and fifth centuries. Each is coloured in some way by Julian’s apostasy from Christianity and his status as a pagan emperor. Two contemporary sources, Gregory of Nazianzus and Libanius, exemplify these two attitudes, and highlight the extreme opinions Julian inspired, from demonization to hero-worship.

Gregory of Nazianzus, Christian contemporary of Julian, is one of the central sources for this study. He was a fellow student in Athens in 355, which gave him an opportunity to observe the young Julian, though he did not have any later contact with him.⁴³ His observations feature in his two invectives against Julian, written almost immediately after Julian’s death. The purpose of these orations was to collect the weightiest charges against Julian,⁴⁴ though they refer to him only once by name and contain dubious facts. They are, of course, hostile and represent the heightened feelings towards Julian and his edict, which would continue well into the fifth century, and mark the start of Christian demonising of Julian. As Fowden noted, three quarters of a century after Julian’s death, Cyril of Alexandria set about refuting Julian’s *Against the Galileans* ‘with such massive energy.’⁴⁵ The invectives of Gregory are the best examples of his

⁴¹ Smith 1995, xii.

⁴² Bowersock 1978, 4.

⁴³ Smith 2011b, 74.

⁴⁴ GNaz. *Or.* 4.20.

⁴⁵ Fowden 1982, 46.

dislike of the pagan emperor, but Gregory continued to explore these feelings in further works: his funeral orations for his brother and father continue to demonise Julian, while the funeral oration for his compatriot and friend Basil also contains criticisms. The funeral oration for Basil (c.330-379), as well as letters and other speeches, also give a Christian perspective on education and *paideia* in the fourth century; Gregory describes his education and impresses on us both its significance for him but also own conflicted views on the role of rhetorical education for Christians. Basil's *Address to Young Men* is a significant source for this continuing debate surrounding Christianity and classical culture, and reveals not only some of the main arguments in this debate but also gives hints as to the most important pagan literature and the curriculum in the mid- to late-fourth century.

Libanius of Antioch (314-393), sophist and teacher of rhetoric, was a friend of Julian's. We have a number of letters exchanged between Libanius and Julian, as well as orations Libanius addressed to Julian while he was staying in largely Christian Antioch, a volatile period of Julian's reign.⁴⁶ As someone steeped in Greek literature and thought (we might call him a Hellene, a loaded term which is discussed in chapter 5.5), Libanius was particularly fond of Julian and largely supported his reign and attempted restoration of paganism, though he is curiously silent on Julian's school edict.⁴⁷ His vast corpus of letters and speeches, most notably his *Autobiography*, the *Monody* composed following Julian's death, and the funeral oration for the emperor, provide a counterpoint to Gregory's hostility.⁴⁸ As Criore has illustrated well, his status as a sophist in an educational centre makes Libanius an excellent source for the state of education in the fourth century. His letters to the parents of his students and letters of recommendation for ex-students provide valuable insight into the social element of education, while his *progymnasmata* and speeches show us the methods and contents of education at this time.⁴⁹ Libanius himself studied at Athens in the early fourth century and also taught in

⁴⁶ Drinkwater 1983, 353.

⁴⁷ Swain 2004, 394-400 discusses Libanius's close relationship with Julian, and his presentation of the emperor.

⁴⁸ There survive 1544 letters and 64 orations of Libanius. Van Hoof 2014 offers a good overview of Libanius's life, and discusses the *Autobiography* as a literary, narrative text. On the rise of biographical texts and self-examination in the Roman Empire, see Swain 1997, especially 35 on the monumental tone of late pagan biographies.

⁴⁹ A number of important items in the corpus of Libanius's writings have been recently published in English translation; in some cases, more than one English version now exists. References to translations by Norman 1992 are marked by the abbreviation N; Bradbury 2004 by a B; Criore 2007b by a C. References are

Constantinople and Nicomedia before returning to his hometown of Antioch, so his many letters and speeches provide valuable insight into the changing face of education at this time. As a supporter of traditional education, he also provides insight into the perceived benefits of this education, while his extensive network of contacts and relationship with figures from the imperial court allow us to view the political nature of education and the significance of *paideia*.

A number of other primary sources are crucial to an investigation of Julian and education. The Latin narrative of Ammianus (330-c.391), written in Rome at the end of the fourth century, is a vital source for the study of Julian, as well as late antiquity in general. His aim was to continue the work of Tacitus and write a history from the accession of Nerva in 96 to his own day. Only eighteen books are extant, 14-31, covering the years 353-378. Ten are concerned with the career of Julian, evidently the centrepiece of his work. Julian is largely shown to behave in an exemplary fashion throughout, and serves as a model to judge other rulers, though Ammianus betrays some disapproval and criticises Julian's edict and rescript: it was a harsh act, which should be buried in lasting oblivion.⁵⁰ As a member of Julian's armies in both Gaul and Persia, he provides invaluable insight into the early military career of Julian and an account of some of the most tumultuous and significant periods of Julian's reign.

Another supporter of Julian is Eunapius of Sardis (347-c. 414). His *Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists*, published in the last decade of the fourth century, is a significant source for Neoplatonism at this time, Julian's 'conversion' and relationship with philosophers such as Maximus and Aedesius, and the wider academic world of the Greek East, particularly Athens: Eunapius was a student of Prohaeresius, a famous sophist in Athens and was affected by Julian's educational measures. Eunapius knew a number of key figures in this academic network, one of whom was the sophist Himerius (310-390), who studied and later taught in Athens. His surviving works, like that of Libanius, provides insight into the workings of a fourth century school. Unlike these men, however, Themistius (317-c. 390) did not enjoy a friendly relationship with Julian, though he had taught him in Constantinople.⁵¹ Indeed, Themistius, a prominent figure

given according to the numbering in these collections. Letters without an abbreviation refer to Foerster's numbering.

⁵⁰ Amm. 22.10.7; 25.4.20. Smith 1999, 89; Kelly 2009, 301, 316.

⁵¹ Jul. *Ep ad Them.* 257d; Watts 2015, 116-119. See, however, Brauch 1993, who argues that Themistius held office under Julian and there was no breach.

under Constantius, was side-lined during the reign of Julian, despite his pagan status; his reputation again surged after the death of Julian and he enjoyed the favour of a number of later emperors, such as Theodosius I. Themistius, as a politically engaged rhetor in Constantinople, is an excellent source for education, but especially the role and influence of *parrhêsia* and *paideia* in the social and political world of the fourth century.

The fifth century Church historians Socrates Scholasticus (380-post-440) and Sozomen (c.400-c.450) demonstrate the Christian reception of Julian and the influence of Gregory's invectives. Socrates' narrative covers the period from 305 to 439 and shows a greater concern for accuracy than the slightly later Sozomen work, dedicated to Theodosius II, which covers the years 323 to 425. As continuations of Eusebius's *Church History*, both conform to the tradition of Christian historiography, which emphasise the struggle against persecutors and heretics.⁵² The apostate emperor provided a good subject in the context of ecclesiastical histories, and both accounts demonstrate the Christian reception of Julian's education edict and rescript.

Moving on to secondary sources, there are a number of key modern histories which focus on Julian's personality and take psychological approaches when evaluating his policies. Bidez's 1930 biography, *La Vie de l'Empereur Julien*, remains an excellent overview of the emperor's life, and has proved influential: his opinion that Julian acted as an anti-Christian persecutor has been followed by Downey and Bowersock particularly.⁵³ Between 1975 and 1981, three biographies were published in English: Browning's *The Emperor Julian*, Bowersock's *Julian the Apostate* and Athanassiadi's *Julian and Hellenism* (renamed *Julian, An Intellectual Biography* in a new 1992 edition). They all are important studies but also highlight the dangers of Julianic biography. It is very easy to read too much into Julian's personality and blame public policies on private tastes due to the number of surviving works. As Bouffartigue noted, in Julian's writings we can see both a tragic hero, a statesman, a champion of paganism, or a dogmatic Neoplatonist.⁵⁴ These different facets can be seen in both ancient and modern sources. For example, Browning described Julian as 'very much a man of his time' but also a 'tragic hero, a man of infinite promise, cut off before his prime', and saw some value in a comparison with

⁵² Momigliano 1963, 91.

⁵³ Bidez 1930, 263 is followed by Downey 1957a, 98.

⁵⁴ Bouffartigue 1992, 7.

John F. Kennedy; his account is coloured as such.⁵⁵ Bowersock, meanwhile, saw Julian as ‘fanatic’, an ‘ascetic revolutionary’ in the model of Lenin and Mao-Tse-Tung, doomed to fail due to his myopic and puritanical brand of paganism.⁵⁶ Bowersock memorably stated that ‘all Christians and many pagans’ received the news of Julian’s death ‘with relief’.⁵⁷ Athanassiadi has noted the revulsion Julian seemingly inspired in Bowersock.⁵⁸ In turn, Bowersock has noted that Athanassiadi’s book ‘would certainly be the envy of Libanius’, that her ‘admiring and fervent’ treatment of Julian lent the book an ‘air of hagiography’.⁵⁹

Biographical approaches to Julian remain valuable: Tougher’s 2007 book on Julian undertook to present the various interpretations of Julian and the debates surrounding his reign, along with key primary source material, without the obvious agenda that some of the other biographies reflect.⁶⁰ Teitler’s 2017 biography of Julian also diverges from previous treatments in that it focuses more on ‘the war against Christianity’, a sub-title which alludes to Bidez.⁶¹ Teitler utilises Christian sources to investigate Julian’s apparent anti-Christian attitude, particularly Socrates Scholasticus and the ‘passions épiques’, and engages fully with the Christian reception of Julian, examining the (false) stories of ‘martyrs’ which were later claimed as evidence of persecution.⁶²

There are a number of thematic approaches to the study of Julian. Smith’s 1995 book balances a tendency to emphasise Julian’s Mithraism and, while not dismissing this, he explored Julian’s religion, his Neoplatonism and the role of the gods in Julian’s reign.⁶³ Smith also discusses the education edict and rescript, Julian’s Hellenism, and the rather Christian idea that Julian wished to create a pagan church, though for Smith the inspiration for this is to be found in the previous work of Maximinus Daia rather than Neoplatonism, as Athanassiadi argued.⁶⁴ More recently, an edited volume addressed

⁵⁵ Browning 1975, xi, xii.

⁵⁶ Bowersock 1978, 119, 20, 79.

⁵⁷ Bowersock 1978, 1n.1.

⁵⁸ Athanassiadi 1992, x.

⁵⁹ Bowersock 1983a, 83; Bowersock 1983b, 90.

⁶⁰ Tougher 2007, ix, 72.

⁶¹ Teitler, like Browning and Bowersock, makes a modern parallel in the course of his biography, comparing Julian’s school edict and rescript to the university purges in Nazi Germany (2017, 67).

⁶² Teitler 2017, x.

⁶³ Bidez 1930, 346; Athanassiadi 1992, 38, 88. Athanassiadi admitted in the 1992 reprint that she had overemphasized Julian’s Mithraism, distorting somewhat the balance of his religious belief (1992, xiv).

⁶⁴ Athanassiadi 1992, 181; Smith 1995, 113.

Julian as both an emperor and an author, and attempted to challenge the image of ‘Julian the Apostate’, the last pagan emperor who railed against Christians.⁶⁵

Elm’s insightful 2012 book, which explored Julian in literary conversation with Gregory of Nazianzus, is particularly significant for the study of these men, but also of the religion, culture and philosophy of the fourth century.⁶⁶ Elm takes seriously the invectives of Gregory and emphasises the intellectual similarity between the two men: they are both ‘sons of Hellenism’.⁶⁷ Indeed, Hellenism in the works of Julian and Gregory is something which Elm explores fully, both in this book and a number of articles.⁶⁸ She demonstrates, through a close reading of the works of Gregory and Julian, how each man understood and approached this concept. Elm’s study presents the two men not so much in opposition but as contemporaries who were influenced by *paideia*, to varying results.⁶⁹

Of all the works on ancient education, Marrou’s *A History of Education in Antiquity* remains the starting point. As Too pointed out, it is still *the* authoritative history of education in this period, the accepted narrative of teaching and learning in Greco-Roman society.⁷⁰ Marrou’s 1948 work is a general treatment of the whole subject of ancient education, covering the years from 1000 BC to AD 500 and based on a wide range of sources, mainly literary.⁷¹ Throughout, he insists upon the continuity of education, arguing that once its definitive character was achieved in the Hellenistic period, its structure and methods lasted for centuries without any significant changes, before splitting into two and continuing along parallel lines in the Byzantine East and the Latin West.⁷² He also emphasises the importance of Homer in education throughout antiquity, arguing that the history of Greek education, like the history of classical culture, can only start with Homer, from whom the Greek cultural tradition rises ‘in an unbroken line’.⁷³ As such, he provides valuable background information and a narrative of the

⁶⁵ Baker-Brian and Tougher 2012, xiii.

⁶⁶ Elm observed ‘literary duels’ between the two men (2010, 2).

⁶⁷ Elm 2012, 10-11.

⁶⁸ Elm 2001; 2003; 2010.

⁶⁹ Elm wrote that she hoped to remove Julian, Gregory and other fourth century figures from their historiographic ‘corsets’, and present them as men ‘entirely of their own time’ (2012, 14).

⁷⁰ Too 2001, 1.

⁷¹ Marrou 1956, xi, xii.

⁷² Marrou 1956, xiii.

⁷³ Marrou 1956, xvii, 3.

development of education, the ‘progressive transition from a “noble warrior” culture to a “scribe” culture’ and shows how, by the Hellenistic age, it was fully formed.⁷⁴

Recent works have concentrated on establishing the range of material taught in antiquity. Both Morgan’s *Literate Education in Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* and Cribiore’s *Gymnastics of the Mind* use similar methods to achieve different results. Both use school papyri, which reveal the *realia*, the actual practice of ancient education, and compare them to literary texts, such as Libanius and Quintilian. They both attempt to establish how far the papyri are representative of common educational practice. In line with Marrou, they stress the centrality of Homer, showing that school papyri and literary evidence testify to his importance, through many references and allusions and, in the case of papyri, copied extracts of Homer.⁷⁵

Morgan uses the schooltext papyri to argue that students rarely read entire books, only learning through selected extracts.⁷⁶ She argues that learning in antiquity was thus fragmented, based on lists of names, the beginnings of texts and a few well-known phrases.⁷⁷ Cribiore, though, argued that students read more than just excerpts, and that the schooltext papyri on which Morgan bases her argument were penmanship exercises, analyses of similes and descriptions; the few extant textbooks we do have show a wider breadth of reading than Morgan allows.⁷⁸ It seems that, while more of a text was absorbed by students than Morgan allows, only the very educated would have complete knowledge of a text.⁷⁹

Bouffartigue’s *L’Empereur Julien et la culture de son temps* provides us with an inventory of quotations, citations, allusions, and paraphrases found in Julian’s surviving work, as well as an insight into Julian’s attitudes towards the authors he referenced.⁸⁰ Through a close reading, he separates these between the ‘bibliothèque réelle’ and the ‘bibliothèque idéale’. The ‘real library’ constitutes all the texts quoted, cited or alluded to, equating to all the texts Julian had consulted, while the ‘ideal library’, easier to see than

⁷⁴ Marrou 1956, xiv.

⁷⁵ Morgan 1998, 105; Cribiore 2001b, 140.

⁷⁶ Morgan 1998, 105.

⁷⁷ Morgan 1998, 118. This view is also held by Kaster (1988, 12-13) and Bouffartigue (1992, 327, 137, 140).

⁷⁸ Cribiore 1999. Cribiore bases some of her argument on Plutarch and Libanius, who could be viewed as special cases, part of the very educated set and not necessarily representative of all students (2001b, 204-5).

⁷⁹ Lambertson 2004, 109 n.3.

⁸⁰ Bouffartigue 1992, 9.

the real library, is made up of those authors named by Julian.⁸¹ Julian's 'ideal library' demonstrates the importance of Greek literature and Julian's lack of interest in Latin authors.⁸² Bouffartigue argues that this preference, combined with the fact that the five writers mentioned most frequently by Julian – namely Plato, Homer, Diogenes, Socrates, and Aristotle – would be recognisable to modern students of ancient literature, proof that the programme of Greek literature lasted long after Julian and was very clear.⁸³ Bouffartigue also deals with the absence of certain writers, notably Aeschylus, in the library of Julian, particularly conspicuous as Julian cited so many of the accepted classics.⁸⁴ Bouffartigue, though, is careful to note throughout that silence tells us nothing in itself. He argues that by citing a verse of Euripides, Julian simply proves that he knows it. However, when Julian does not cite Aeschylus, he is not proving that he did not know it; he simply leaves observers in the dark.⁸⁵ For Bouffartigue, silence does not necessarily indicate ignorance.

There has been a recent upsurge of Libanian studies: van Hoof's 2014 edited volume, which considers the vast output of Libanius, including his *progymnasmata*, and his social and political position in Antioch is particularly relevant and comprehensive. Significantly, it considers Libanius's conception of 'Hellenism' and his network of political contacts, formed through his school and a shared literary culture.⁸⁶ More specific to education in late antiquity is Cribiore's *The School of Libanius*, which used the works of Libanius concerned with education, mainly his letters, to trace the story of his school in Antioch and the fluctuating state of rhetoric in the fourth century. Cribiore also touches on the influence of a rhetorical education in gaining a good position and enhancing a career. She concludes that while such training was valuable, other factors were needed, namely status and background, and that a 'vener of cultural refinement' was desirable, rather than the depth of knowledge Libanius recommended and which came from studying rhetoric for a long time.⁸⁷ She also notes that the verse epigrams celebrating the achievements of governors almost never refer directly to *paideia*, praising justice or building programmes instead, citing this as evidence that a high level of education was

⁸¹ Bouffartigue 1992, 52.

⁸² Bouffartigue 1992, 412.

⁸³ Bouffartigue 1992, 138.

⁸⁴ Bouffartigue 1992, 138.

⁸⁵ Bouffartigue 1992, 9.

⁸⁶ Stenger 2014; Bradbury 2014.

⁸⁷ Cribiore 2007b, 225-226; Cribiore 2009, 245.

not a strict requirement for office, nor a proud attainment of those who held it, seemingly not taking into consideration that *paideia* is implicit in the fact that the inscriptions are written as verse epigrams.⁸⁸ While this book is less interested in Julian's educational measures (although Cribiore does mention the silence, and possible disapproval, of Libanius on this),⁸⁹ her 2013 book studies Libanius as a sophist, as a politically engaged orator of a major Christian city. As part of this, Cribiore reassesses the relationship between pagans and Christians, and reconsiders Julian's edict and rescript, and the silence of Libanius.⁹⁰

Kaster, on the other hand, has focused on the social and political role of the *grammaticus* in late antiquity, and examined the content, methods and costs of grammatical studies. He demonstrates the significance of grammarians and grammatical studies for the elite bound for further studies with a rhetor. Kaster also provides a valuable treatment on the Christian debate in the fourth century, including a discussion of eastern and western attitudes to classical culture and how they differed.⁹¹ Watts's treatment of Athens and Alexandria in the fourth and fifth centuries is particularly relevant to this study and our discussion of both educational centres and prominent figures of the fourth century. Watts explores the relationship between the teachers of rhetoric and philosophy with the political and religious powers, and the effects of the differing religious climates. He also discusses the importance of *paideia* in forming and maintaining relationships. Many of the key figures for our study are also discussed by Watts, including Libanius, Gregory, Basil and Julian. Notably, the position of Prohaeresius as a prominent teacher of rhetoric and a Christian in Athens is discussed, as is his contrasting relationship with Constantius and Julian.⁹²

There have been a number of valuable works on *paideia*. While the chronological span of Jaeger's three volume analysis of *paideia* makes it less directly relevant to our study, his discussion still warrants consideration. More relevant to late antiquity, and thus our present discussion, is van Hoof and van Nuffelen's recent edited volume on the performance of *paideia* in the fourth century. They emphasise the continuity and

⁸⁸ Cribiore 2009, 245; Cribiore 2007b, 227. Brown and Roueché disagree: Brown 1992, 36; Roueché 1989, xxi.

⁸⁹ Cribiore 2007b, 90-91.

⁹⁰ Cribiore 2013, 230-237.

⁹¹ Kaster 1988, 71-81.

⁹² Watts 2006, 48-78.

similarities between the Second Sophistic and the fourth century, persuasively arguing that literature in the fourth century retained its vibrancy and urgency in its interaction with society: it was not an age of decline or stagnation.⁹³ Two recent articles also merit mention here: Elsner's discussion of the definition of *paideia* and the influence of contemporary politics on the histories of Jaeger and Marrou is notable, while van Hoof's exploration of *paideia* as seen in the careers and texts of Themistius, Julian and Libanius is both deft and rich.⁹⁴

Peter Brown's *Power and Persuasion* is one of the most significant works for this thesis. Brown offers a less discouraging view of life after higher education than Cribiore, and places more value on rhetoric and *paideia*, arguing *paideia* was an active and still relevant political force in the fourth and fifth centuries, at least for the local elites in the Greek East. He also demonstrates how the emperor collaborated with local elites to maintain social order, and needed their support in day-to-day administration.⁹⁵ He argues that these local elites operated according to *paideia*, which gave them influence and authority, and put them in positions where they could express this influence and power, for example in the collection of taxes. He also shows how the local elites were held responsible for the good behaviour of the populace by imperial representatives and by virtue of their own station; they were meant to instil feelings of deference and respect for the law.⁹⁶ Brown attempts to take the concept of *paideia* seriously and to give it weight, treating it as something which carried a 'moral and quasi-legal weight of its own', rather than simply a badge of status.⁹⁷ Thus, he shows that persuasion, and *paideia*, still had a role to play in the political world of late antiquity, that education and the results of this education still had some importance and influence in society and politics, that appeals to ideals of behaviour, to *paideia*, were a relevant and significant aspect of late Roman political practice. It also ensured the support of other leading families in the area who similarly were bound by *paideia*, and maintained their status as the educated elite with the political power that went along with it. Brown also shows how the role of rhetoric and *paideia* changed with Christianization and the increased influence of bishops as a local power, representatives of the Christian population, which he styles as a struggle for urban

⁹³ Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2015, 1-3.

⁹⁴ Elsner 2013; van Hoof 2013.

⁹⁵ Brown 1992, 72.

⁹⁶ Brown 1992, 79.

⁹⁷ Brown 1997, 26.

leadership rather than a clash of religions.⁹⁸ He shows how bishops, such as Ambrose, took over the traditional role of philosophers, that of *parrhesia*, speaking openly, and combined classical culture along with their Christianity to claim positions of power and influence.⁹⁹

By the end of the fourth century, Christianity was the clear winner and the official religion of the Roman Empire. However, under Julian, this was still undetermined. His reign stands at the centre of debates about the relationship between culture, religion and politics. This research will explore the relationship between emperor and elites, while also examining that between Christians and pagans. We will examine the ongoing Christian debate on the role of pagan literature, and Julian's place in that debate; the significance of rhetorical education in the fourth century and the way in which Julian's educational measures touched on broader issues of morality in education, the role of religion and the concept of Hellenism, and, the cultural and political influence rhetorical education had on the elite of the Greek East – the vitality of *paideia* in a time of change when the financial, military and political reality could be particularly violent and uncertain.

⁹⁸ Brown 1992, 76.

⁹⁹ Brown 1992, 75, 61.

Chapter two: Education in the fourth century AD

“For eloquence will never attain to its full development or robust health, unless it acquires strength by frequent practice in writing, while such practice without the models supplied by reading will be like a ship drifting aimlessly without a steersman.” – Quintilian¹

“Moreover, in my opinion, there is in such books a means of liberal education for the character, supposing that one understands how, like a craftsman, setting before himself as patterns the noblest men and words and deeds, to mould his own character to match them, and make his words resemble theirs.” – Julian²

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will be a detailed discussion of education in the fourth century, examining its content, with a focus on the Greek East, though reference will be made to the West for comparison. It will discuss the experience of education for both students and teachers, considering the classroom (2.2), corporal punishment (2.2.1) and the place of pedagogues (2.2.2). We will also examine common methods of education, looking at the importance of memorisation (2.3), and the use of *progymnasmata* (2.3.1) and *florilegia* (2.3.2), determining whether there was a more pronounced use of these pedagogical aids in the fourth century than in the earlier Imperial period, and if so, why. An examination of the curriculum, as far as we can determine it, will follow: this will not only help to understand what was being taught, but also give insights into why certain subjects were popular with grammarians, rhetoricians and sophists. This section will explore the curriculum before the fourth century, using the work of Quintilian and Lucian (2.4), before discussing the fourth century curriculum (2.4.1).

Use will be made of the writings of Libanius, Eunapius, Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil of Caesarea, Themistius and Himerius, those men we might refer to as ‘culture heroes’ due to their commitment to education and literary culture, as well as their continuing prominent status (2.5).³ A comparison between these sources and the school

¹ *Nam neque solida atque robusta fuerit umquam eloquentia nisi multo stilo vires acceperit, et citra lectionis exemplum labor ille carens rectore fluitabit*, Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.2.

² ἔστι δὲ οἴμαι τις ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ παιδαγωγία πρὸς ἦθος γενναῖον, εἴ τις ἐπίσταιτο τοὺς ἀρίστους ἄνδρας καὶ λόγους καὶ πράξεις, οἷον ἀρχέτυπα προτιθέμενος δημιουργός, πλάττειν ἤδη πρὸς ταῦτα τὴν αὐτοῦ δίνουσαν καὶ ἀφομοιοῦν τοὺς λόγους, Jul. *Or.* 3.124c-d.

³ Cribiore referred to men such as Libanius and Basil as ‘culture heroes’ (2007b, 175), while Morgan referred to them as ‘litterati’ (1998, 109-110). We might also use the terms ‘professional *pepaideumenoi*’

letters of Libanius will help to ascertain what a more ‘typical’ education was and whether the experiences recorded by Gregory and Basil, for example, are in any way comparable to the other, often anonymous students of the fourth century (2.5.1). This will include a discussion of the length of attendance and the number of rhetorical schools attended by both the ‘culture heroes’ and the more typical students. Julian’s own education is then discussed and compared to these (2.5.2).

We will also consider the costs associated with education (2.6) and the major fourth century centres of education in the Greek East, namely Athens, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Berytus, with reference for comparison to Rome, Autun, Bordeaux, and Carthage (2.7). We will discuss the changing reputations and fortunes of these educational centres, who they attracted and why. Some were traditional centres of education, such as Athens, and continued to have great influence and prestige in our period, while others, such as Constantinople, were up-and-coming. Berytus, meanwhile, emerged as an area of specialisation and became the centre of law studies in the East. It will be relevant to examine these institutions, noting how many of our culture heroes studied in each, and get a sense of how common it was for a student to undertake a tour of these institutions, and also to see how the rise of the new centres affected education.

2.2 The classroom

The writings of Libanius give us valuable insights into the particulars of Greek rhetorical education, both his description of his time as a student in Antioch and Athens and his recounting of his long career as a teacher in Constantinople, Nicaea, Nicomedia and Antioch. Similarly, the speeches of Himerius, though fewer in number and often fragmentary, provide insight into an Athenian rhetorical school in the mid-fourth century.⁴ In terms of practicalities, classes started at dawn and ended at midday, although particularly dedicated students practised their declamations well into the night, to the

(Preston 2001, 89n.25) or ‘cultural figures’ (Van Hoof 2013, 389). As a term, ‘culture heroes’ is a modern formula; *pepaideumenoι*, meaning educated or cultured people, is the closest historical parallel. Libanius, Basil and Gregory would not have referred to themselves as ‘culture heroes’. Rather, they might have described or understood themselves as educated or successful. By using the term ‘culture hero’, we are referring to men who had undergone an extended education and enjoyed a reputation as prominent, intellectual figures, a reputation which has persisted. Indeed, ‘culture heroes’ are those men whom today we recognise as renowned and educated. They were the elites who enjoyed a high level of education and culture, as evidenced by the survival rate of their work. The following discussion uses the term ‘culture hero[es]’.

⁴ Barnes 1987, 206-207.

chagrin of their neighbours.⁵ Class sizes were relatively small, but tended to fluctuate. Libanius reported that he taught sets of ten. His assistants also took similar sized classes, while Libanius himself corrected exercises and oversaw things.⁶ Based on a survey of his letters and 196 identifiable students, it seems that in 359/60, a maximum number of twenty-six students were attending the school of Libanius in Antioch, with a relatively low average number. He taught about eighty students overall during his first years in Antioch, a number which declined to about fifteen in his last years.⁷ These seem to be reasonable numbers, though perhaps low when we compare them to the class sizes of prominent teachers in Athens. Himerius's class sizes are difficult to gauge, but we know that Chrestus of Byzantium had over 100 fee-paying students, and both Julianus and Prohaeresius enjoyed similarly high numbers.⁸ Such was the draw of Athens, as we shall see in greater detail below.

Upon returning to Antioch in 354 from Constantinople, Libanius started with fifteen students, most of whom had followed him from Nicomedia, but this number quickly rose to such a number that he 'could not get through them all before sunset'.⁹ He boasted to a friend that he was too busy even for lunch because he had built up a following of fifty within a few days.¹⁰ Libanius put this rapid increase down to his reputation as an orator, but his choice of location also contributed.¹¹ He never taught in a building designated for teaching. Libanius initially worked at his home. This was a common arrangement which both Eunapius and the archaeological evidence at Athens attest to.¹² Libanius then moved to the edge of the market place in Antioch, popular amongst other teachers, which proved successful, though he resented his rivals' use of the advantageous Museum.¹³ He eventually set himself up with a larger cohort of students in the city hall, previously used by the official sophist and ex-teacher of Libanius,

⁵ Lib. *Or.* 58.8-9; *Ep.* N36.7.

⁶ Lib. *Or.* 34.15-16; Criboire 2007b, 149. Libanius had four assistants in 361 (*Or.* 31).

⁷ Criboire 2007b, 97. This is based on the assumption that there were more students travelling from abroad during the first years of his school in Antioch.

⁸ Philostrat. *VS.* 591. Watts 2006, 32n.36 argues that a prominent teacher at Athens would have at least 100 students, due in part to the high student population in Athens.

⁹ τοσοῦτόν τε εἶναι τὸ ποιμνιον ὥστε μὴ οἶόν τε εἶναι, πρὶν ἥλιον δῦναι, διὰ πάντων ἰέναι, Lib. *Or.* 1.101, 104; Criboire 2007b, 96.

¹⁰ Lib. *Ep.* 6.6. Criboire argued that the majority of these initial students came from Antioch and its surroundings (2007b, 97).

¹¹ Lib. *Ep.* 6.5.

¹² Eunap. *VS.* 483; Criboire 2007b, 45. Archaeological evidence has revealed a number of houses on the slopes of the Areopagus in Athens, thought to be used for teaching due to their larger size: Frantz 1988, 37-47. The teachers likely also lived in these houses: Fowden 1990, 496.

¹³ Lib. *Or.* 1.101, 102.

Zenobius.¹⁴ Himerius, meanwhile, described a makeshift auditorium built by his students in Athens, and later mentioned that his teaching space was small, which suggests a more modest class size.¹⁵

The number of students at a school could be affected by external events: Libanius complains that the Riot of the Statues in 387 reduced his numbers first to twelve and then to seven.¹⁶ Similarly, a famine in 385 meant many parents recalled their sons home, and numbers diminished.¹⁷ In a speech directed against his misbehaving students, he chided their behaviour towards a pedagogue, arguing it could cause a reduction in the numbers of his ‘flock’.¹⁸ The size of his school was a source of constant concern for Libanius, as it would be for many rhetors, especially later in his career as rival subjects threatened the primacy of rhetoric, discussed in chapter four, and he took great pains to admonish bad behaviour which could do damage to his reputation and hence livelihood.

2.2.1 Corporal punishment

Discipline was an important part of education, and the use of corporal punishment in response to misbehaviour was a common and a shared experience, although it was a matter that teachers considered carefully. It was also thought to be the main stimulus to learning and a way of correcting any faults in a child.¹⁹ The forms of corporal punishment included being beaten or flogged with a cane, sandal, strap, bull-tail, fennel-rod, or walking stick.²⁰ The use of force in school has been linked to its use in the home,²¹ as elite boys learned as students how to wield their future power as heads of households by observing the use of force in the classroom. Their education prepared them for ‘positions of dominance’, and the use of physical force was one aspect of this.²²

Despite its prevalence, there were differing views on the use of corporal punishment, or flogging, in the classroom, much as there is now. It seems that, while it

¹⁴ Lib. *Or.* 1.104.

¹⁵ Himerius, *Orr.* 68.11; 64.3-4.

¹⁶ Lib. *Or.* 34.14. He continued to teach even such a small number.

¹⁷ Lib. *Or.* 1.233.

¹⁸ Lib. *Or.* 58.36.

¹⁹ Marrou 1956, 272; Cribiore 2001b, 65.

²⁰ *Anth.Pal.* 6.294; Cribiore 2001b, 68.

²¹ Libanius often expressed paternal feelings towards his students, and regularly referred to them as ‘sons’. He was well aware of the role of the teacher *in loco parentis* (*Epp.* C9; C112; C115.3; C105.3), as was Himerius (*Orr.* 44; 45; Penella 2007, 11).

²² Cribiore 2001b, 69, 71.

was general practice to discipline students in this way (a law of 370 required those students who misbehaved in Rome be publicly flogged),²³ the personal preference of teachers dictated the use of the physical force. Our writers express, in general, a dislike of the practice, both because they felt it was wrong to use such force on children,²⁴ but also due to the fear of losing disgruntled students to rival schools if one relied too heavily on force. Libanius relates that many teachers had stopped using the strap and the cane not because they had found other ways of dealing with students, but because it led to defections – a recurrent problem.²⁵ While students being beaten by teachers became *topoi* and their experience was widely shared, it seems that some parents were unwilling to have their sons punished by force and voted with their feet.

Libanius was expansive on the issue. In a speech dated to 388-390, he argued that he preferred his students to be well-disciplined as a result of his verbal admonitions and the respect he gave them, rather than because of a beating.²⁶ For Libanius, there were other ways to keep a class well behaved. He argued that beatings and floggings were of no use and often had a detrimental effect. He maintained that advice was more advantageous and corrective. Thus, Libanius's main approach to discipline was to verbally scold his class.²⁷ He claimed he did not even own a cane with which to beat his students, though he knew other teachers who had broken hundreds of canes, to no avail.²⁸

Earlier in his career, however, he had found reason to use force: in 365 he replied to a father, unhappy that his son had been beaten with a strap, that the behaviour of the child had warranted such punishment. He explained that beatings were used only against idle students, as in this case, and were demonstrably effective.²⁹ A speech dated to 382 also suggests that he had used a cane to punish idle students, but that he also employed particularly harsh words, indicating he was not a teacher who relied exclusively on

²³ *CTh.* 14.9.1.

²⁴ Quintilian, for example, disapproved of flogging students, stating it was a punishment fit only for a slave (*Inst.* 1.3.13).

²⁵ *Lib. Or.* 43.9-10. Himerius addressed *Or.* 35 to new students who had defected from other sophists, though does not give details on this defection.

²⁶ *Lib. Or.* 58.38.

²⁷ He scolded his students about their poor treatment of a pedagogue in a speech rather than using the lash or whip, (*Or.* 58.1), and he mentioned that he often shouted at misbehaving students, those who were lazy and paid no attention (*Or.* 3.15-16). This same speech mentions that he often had cause to throw students out of his class.

²⁸ *Lib. Or.* 20.2.

²⁹ *Lib. Ep.* N139.

physical force to ensure good behaviour or respect.³⁰ Nor was he a teacher who used force to punish moral failings.³¹ Indeed, Libanius argued against punishment for punishment's sake, and encouraged others to help those who had wronged.³² We could argue that Libanius is presenting himself in speeches as one against the use of corporal punishment, while revealing in private letters something different (perhaps something more pragmatic). However, it seems instead that we see his attitude developing from his earliest days of teaching through to the end of his career, when he consistently argued against corporal punishment. Thanks to the chronological spread and the range of genres of Libanius's surviving works, we can see a teacher developing his own style and attitude towards a significant aspect of handling a classroom and running a school.

Both Himerius and John Chrysostom echoed Libanius's opinions on corporal punishment. Himerius detested it and preferred instead to use verbal punishments: a number of orations survive in which he scolds his students for bad behaviour.³³ In one, he compares his students to nymphs, and just as Apollo refrained from shooting nymphs with his arrows, Himerius did not punish his students physically, instead composing an oration.³⁴ He implied there was something lacking in the teacher who felt the need to use physical punishment rather than harsh words.³⁵ John Chrysostom, too, thought there were better ways to teach a child. In a speech delivered in Antioch in 388, he advised parents not to constantly flog their sons because it would frustrate any efforts to teach them. Instead, John recommended punishment based on stern looks, reproachful words, and gentle coaxing.³⁶ He saw the rod as something to be used as a threat, meant to inspire fear, which would in turn inspire good behaviour, rather than an instrument for constant use. He said sons should fear the blows without receiving them. He advised mothers to relate Cain's fear of divine punishment with the fear their sons felt in school when anticipating being beaten by their teacher.³⁷ This fear was universal, one which would easily be recognised by his audience and their children, suggesting beating and flogging were common practice. Indeed, Ausonius advised his grandson not to fear his teacher and his cane, and not to cry out during a beating; his father and mother had suffered similar

³⁰ Lib. *Or.* 62.6.

³¹ Festugière 1956, 112.

³² Lib. *Ep.* 126.3.

³³ Himerius, *Or.* 16; 65; 66.

³⁴ Himerius, *Or.* 66.2, 5, 7. The speech references Aesop.

³⁵ Himerius, *Or.* 54.2; 33.27-28.

³⁶ John Chrysostom, *On Vainglory*, 30.

³⁷ John Chrysostom, *On Vainglory*, 39. This is interesting as it places the teacher in the role of God.

treatment but had lived.³⁸ Augustine, too, wrote about his own suffering at the hands of his masters, and argued that his fear of flogging contributed to his hatred of studying Greek.³⁹ Interestingly though, he argued in a letter to Nectarius that there were indeed benefits to this type of punishment. He thought that had their parents and teachers not used force, they would have grown up to be intolerable and learned nothing of any use. He stated that ‘such punishments are administered by wise care, not by wanton cruelty.’⁴⁰ Julian does not mention suffering any physical punishment; presumably it would have been improper, or even potentially dangerous, to beat an imperial prince.

2.2.2 Pedagogues

Discipline was also part of the role of pedagogues; they could apparently be harsher than the rhetoricians and sophists.⁴¹ Libanius presented pedagogues as integral to education: it was their job to preserve the lessons and learning of the rhetorical school; they would reinforce the lessons, applying pressure, shouting and using the cane if necessary.⁴² Pedagogues, usually literate slaves employed as a tutor to a young boy (and occasionally girl) were thus an important presence in education and the life of a student, at least for elite families, second only to teachers.⁴³ They were entrusted with the care of the boys *in loco parentis*, and acted like a father.⁴⁴ This was more important for those who travelled for their education, as the pedagogue provided a link with the boy’s family and, along with their teachers, became authority figures.⁴⁵ Libanius felt that a pedagogue was advantageous to the pupil, there to not only care for the boy and guide them to good behaviour, but to aid in his education by urging him to work, often helping with

³⁸ Ausonius, *Protr.* 24-24.

³⁹ August. *Conf.* 1.9.14-15; 1.14.23.

⁴⁰ *providenter ista, non crudeliter fiunt*, August. *Ep.* 104.7.

⁴¹ Lib. *Prog.*, *The Exercise in Anecdote*, 2.9. Libanius wrote to one father about his son’s pedagogue, known for being particularly violent and quick with the whip (*Ep.* B80).

⁴² Lib. *Or.* 58.9.

⁴³ Lib. *Or.* 58.7.

⁴⁴ Lib. *Or.* 58.8.

⁴⁵ Criboire 2001b, 48. However, Libanius felt that at times they could wield too much power (*Or.* 34). A saying of Diogenes, and common subject in *progymnasmata*, also attests to the authoritarian role of the pedagogue (Gibson 2008, 55 n.19). Libanius argued that a pedagogue was responsible for the behaviour of the boy in a sample exercise (*Prog.*, *The Exercise in Anecdote*, 2).

homework.⁴⁶ Augustine confirms this: he had little love of learning at a young age, and was forced to study by his pedagogue.⁴⁷

Libanius briefly mentions his own pedagogue in his *Autobiography* and describes him as a disabled man whom he supported even whilst he was in Athens (suggesting he did not travel with him).⁴⁸ However, it is from Julian that we see the image of the perfect pedagogue. Throughout his writings, Julian presented Mardonius as the man who influenced and shaped his life more than any other.⁴⁹ Mardonius entered Julian's life when he was seven and was responsible for introducing Julian to Homer and the other canonical writers who would shape Julian's sense of Hellenism and *paideia*.⁵⁰ Julian described how Mardonius influenced him and formed his views, taught him to value literature, and even to govern.⁵¹

Mardonius was also responsible for Julian's moral training and taught him proper comportment: he taught him to look at the ground whilst walking, to be polite, modest and unobtrusive – to live by 'Homeric simplicity'.⁵² It is significant that Julian discusses Mardonius in both the *Letter to the Athenians* and the *Misopogon*. Both were addressed to communities he hoped to gain support from, and he undertook to explain his behaviour and actions to them. For example, Julian recalled that it was Mardonius who had advised him that there was no need to attend the theatre, races or dances, as Homer had described a horse race perfectly well: the consequences of this were felt keenly by the Antiochenes, who wanted an emperor who would attend such entertainments.⁵³ Mardonius is consistently presented as the man who shaped Julian and his character, revealing the profound influence a pedagogue could have. Mardonius has come down to us as the ideal pedagogue, though it is reasonable to suspect this image is somewhat idealised by Julian, especially when we consider how it sharply contrasts with the description of his miserable

⁴⁶ Lib. *Epp.* C18; C2.2. His speech in defence of the 'carpeted' pedagogue shows this clearly also, (*Or.* 58.6-10)

⁴⁷ August. *Conf.* 1.12.19.

⁴⁸ Lib. *Or.* 1.12; 58.13.

⁴⁹ Jul. *Misopog.* 353b.

⁵⁰ Jul. *Misopog.* 352b. Mardonius had been tutor to Julian's mother also, (*Misopog.* 352c). He gives us some insight into the level of education expected from pedagogues as he was evidently well educated.

⁵¹ Δεινὸς δὲ ἀνέπεισε γέρον, ὃν καὶ ὑμεῖς ὡς ὄντα μάλιστα αἰτιώτατον τῶν ἐμῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ὀρθῶς ποιοῦντες ξυλλοιδορεῖτέ μοι, Jul. *Misopog.* 353b; 352c.

⁵² Jul. *Ep ad Ath.* 274d; *Misopog.* 351a; Athanassiadi 1992, 16.

⁵³ Jul. *Misopog.* 351c-d.

time in Macellum with Bishop George.⁵⁴ Despite this, we can see in Mardonius the potential of a pedagogue: he could indelibly shape his tutee's character. He could also be beloved: Julian described the anguish he felt at leaving Mardonius when he was sent to Macellum in Cappadocia in 342.⁵⁵ Those five years with Mardonius shaped Julian, his character and his outlook. A pedagogue could be as vital to education (and future life) as the teacher.

2.3 Memorisation in the classroom

We now turn to the methods used in the classroom, and it is clear there was an emphasis on memorisation at both the grammatical and rhetorical level.⁵⁶ When his teacher of rhetoric Ulpianus died, Libanius took the direction of his learning into his own hands and concentrated only on the memorisation of the classic texts, those 'most renowned for their stylistic abilities'.⁵⁷ Thus, at fifteen he abandoned the usual course of composition and oratorical practice, and spent five years working on this memorisation, with a teacher whom he pursued doggedly for instruction.⁵⁸ Libanius's description of his early education in Antioch suggests that such an intense focus on memorisation was somewhat unusual, and that he had abandoned for a time the usual road to rhetoric. However, as a teacher, he also emphasised memorisation of texts as a main component of education. He chastised his students for misbehaving, and mentions that students previously would each memorise a different passage of a speech, and would meet in order to reconstruct the whole.⁵⁹ This uses the familiar theme that the younger generation is not as virtuous or hard-working as the older (the 'in my day' trope), which is common in his later speeches.⁶⁰

⁵⁴ Julian also idealised Aedesius and Maximus, suggesting a tendency to eulogise certain parts of his education and demonise others: Smith 1995, 24-5.

⁵⁵ Jul. *Or.* 8.241c. Interestingly, we do not have any firm information regarding the death of Mardonius; perhaps he outlived Julian. However, Julian referenced his 'guide to the poets' (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπαιδοτριβήθης καλῶς οὐδὲ ἔτυχεσ καθηγέμενος, οἴοιου περὶ τοὺς ποιητὰς ἐγὼ τουτουὶ τοῦ φιλοσόφου, *Or.* 7.235b) who was present in Constantinople for his speech against Heracleios in the first half of 362, and Athanassiadi has argued this was a reference to Mardonius rather than Maximus (1992, 23 n.40). Julian's time at Macellum is discussed below.

⁵⁶ Quintilian emphasised the importance of memorisation in education (*Inst.* 1.1.36) and recommended constant rereading of material to help with this (10.1.19).

⁵⁷ Συνειλεγμένων τοίνυν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν τῶν ὑπερ τοὺς ἄλλους κατὰ λόγου δύναμιν θαυματομένων ἀνδρῶν, *Lib. Or.* 1.8; 1.11.

⁵⁸ *Lib. Or.* 1.5; 1.9. His teacher at this time was possibly a grammarian; Libanius is unclear. Cribiore 2007a, 79 n.26

⁵⁹ *Lib. Or.* 3.17.

⁶⁰ This speech is dated to the late 380s.

The speech Libanius expects to be memorised is one of his own, rather than swathes of Demosthenes, but the ability to memorise entire chunks of a speech, if not the whole, is a skill which he feels his students should have mastered, and should be practising regularly. Indeed, he claimed that during his time teaching in Nicomedia his speeches were recited ‘continually [...] everywhere’.⁶¹ Libanius also expected students to memorise parts of the classical texts they studied: he criticised at length a student upon his return to school as being idle and having little regard for study, because he did not spend his time memorising classical literature.⁶² Memorisation of large parts of texts was a skill which was expected and practiced. Augustine confirms that memorisation was a significant part of study: his friend Simplicius apparently knew huge chunks of Virgil and Cicero by heart.⁶³ The evidence of the schooltext papyri also indicates that copying extracts from the canonical texts formed part of learning too, particularly at a grammatical level; this, too, was a way of aiding the memorisation of texts.

2.3.1 *Progymnasmata*

Memorisation was not, of course, the only common method in ancient education. Composition and the practice of declamations also formed a significant part of study. Early declamation often involved the refutation of classical authors and undertaking exercises found in *progymnasmata*. These preliminary exercises in prose composition were usually undertaken at the rhetorical stage, though the first exercises could have been completed under a grammarian, and were a characteristic of late antique education.⁶⁴ A large number of model exercises written by Libanius, probably collected after his death, survive.⁶⁵ These examples show us what students of a rhetorical school were learning and by which methods, not least because they were probably used in his own teaching. Indeed, Libanius mentions in a speech that his programme of study included practising

⁶¹ πανταχοῦ διετέλουν, Lib. *Or.* 1.55. He mentions, too, that entire sections of the speech he delivered upon his return to Antioch were learnt by heart (*Or.* 1.88).

⁶² Lib. *Or.* 34.12. Himerius composed a speech in which he advocated study in the academic break: practice makes perfect (*Or.* 74.2, 4).

⁶³ August. *de.anim.et eius orig.* 4.7.9.

⁶⁴ Kennedy 1983, 53. *Progymnasmata* were first referred to in the fourth century BC, and while they continued to be used in schools, they became more popular in the first century BC and the term itself came into common usage in the Christian era (Clark 1957, 179). There were many treatises on *progymnasmata*, though only four survive, written by Theon of Alexandria in the first century AD, Hermogenes probably written under Marcus Aurelius, Aphthonius, a student of Libanius, and Nicolaus in the fifth century.

⁶⁵ Gibson 2008, xxv. The authenticity of some of these exercises is doubted.

the rebuttals of statements by Homer and Demosthenes, before moving on to more advanced compositions.⁶⁶

Progymnasmata were used to teach students how to compose and structure their own declamations, before they were ready for ‘true *gymnasmata*’ – which were a preliminary to the practice of declamation.⁶⁷ They were graded exercises, which increased in the skill level required as the student progressed and often built on the previous exercise. The length of the exercise also increased; exercises in fables and narrative spanned a couple of paragraphs while anecdote and refutation were much longer. Libanius’s examples cover fourteen exercises and consisted of: fable, narration, anecdote, maxim, refutation, confirmation, common topics, encomium, invective, comparison, speech in characters, description, thesis and introduction of a law. There are more surviving examples of exercises in narration, speeches in character and descriptions, which suggests that these were considered the most important.⁶⁸ All of the exercises dealt with general themes and had a preoccupation with morals and proper conduct; they also required knowledge of Greek literature, particularly fables, proverbs and episodes from poets and historians, chief among them the ubiquitous Homer.⁶⁹ Thus, students were taught how to utilise the texts they were reading, using them in persuasive arguments with repetitive structures.⁷⁰ The exercises and themes were common to the four surviving treatises and Libanius’s models, suggesting the existence of both a consistent curriculum and a method for teaching prose composition and rhetoric. It also implies a continuing acceptance of *progymnasmata* as the best way to prepare students for a life and career which would call for rhetorical skills.

Progymnasmata were repetitive tasks, with a well-defined sequence, and the exercises themselves had rigid structures: their purpose was to have the student internalise

⁶⁶ Lib. *Or.* 34.15.

⁶⁷ Kennedy 1983, 53; Gibson 2008, xx.

⁶⁸ Sometimes thesis and law were omitted from collections, indicating their relative unimportance: Gibson 2008, xxi; xxi, n.15. In Libanius’s collection, example exercises included a refutation of the statements ‘That it is not plausible that Chryses went to the harbour of the Greeks’, and ‘That the accusations against the Locurian Ajax are not plausible’; a confirmation of the statement ‘That the account of the judgement of the arms of Achilles is plausible’, and speeches on a common topic which attacks, for example, a murderer, traitor, tyrant or tyrannicide, or which supports a benefactor, such as a war hero or law giver. Speeches in character often featured mythical characters - Achilles was particularly common (Cribiore 2001b, 226) - but could also be more general, for example, a painter or a prostitute (*Prog. Exercise in Refutation*, 1; 2; *Exercise in Confirmation*, 1; Gibson 2008, 141; 355).

⁶⁹ Clark 1957, 181; 208-9; Gibson 2014, 139-140.

⁷⁰ Clark 1957, 210.

and practice a specific way of writing and speaking (that is, with clarity and utilising their knowledge of literature) in preparation for the composition of their own declamations. The composition and delivery of declamations was a standard feature of education, though one which many students would not necessarily undertake if they left school after the average two years.⁷¹ This only enhances the importance of *progymnasmata* as a main method of training young men in rhetoric.

2.3.2 *Florilegia*

The process of memorisation and the continued use of *progymnasmata* in schools raises questions of content, what we might term the *de facto* curriculum,⁷² and also the related issue of the use of *florilegia*. Firstly, though, we need to be clear about what is meant by the terms ‘pedagogical aids’ or ‘*florilegia*’, often described as ‘anthology’. As Barns noted, the term ‘anthology’ is applied to such diverse collections of texts that the only real defining characteristic can be the purpose of those collections.⁷³ While some anthologies could comprise a writer’s favourite texts, they were largely concerned with a ‘didactic purpose’, meant to aid education and, in later life, the style of one’s own writing.⁷⁴ For this discussion, *florilegia* are defined by this didactic purpose and their use in education. Primarily, these were anthologies: that is, collections of selected literary extracts of differing lengths and collections of *gnomai* and *chreiai* – moralizing sayings and proverbs. Collections contained mainly poetry, though they could also include prose or, indeed, exclusively prose.⁷⁵ Anthologies were often organised by theme, for example, under headings such as women or wealth; they could also comprise extracts from only a single author, such as Plato.⁷⁶ With all these collections, moral content was always a significant factor in what was preserved and selected for teaching.⁷⁷

⁷¹ Criboire 2007b, 146.

⁷² The phrase ‘*de facto* curriculum’ is used here, and throughout, to reinforce the idea that the contents of education at this time was not decided by a central authority; there was no state intervention or statute declaring a preferred curriculum. Rather, the texts and authors which were widely taught became canonical over time due to high regard. Thus, while there was no *de jure* curriculum, it is worthwhile to talk of a *de facto* curriculum.

⁷³ Barns 1950, 132.

⁷⁴ Cameron 1993b, 6.

⁷⁵ Barns 1951, 14-5.

⁷⁶ Barns 1950, 132; Chadwick 1969, 1142.

⁷⁷ Barns 1951, 1. Athanassiadi referred to *florilegia* as ‘instruments of ideological propaganda’ and spoke of its ‘invasion’ in traditional education in the fourth century (1994, 13, 14 n.58). The moral purpose of education is discussed more fully at chapter 5.3.

Pedagogical aids, including handbooks, digests and epitomes, were already in common usage by the Second Sophistic, both during education and after.⁷⁸ Their popularity can hardly be overstated: they were used regularly by writers such as Sextus Empiricus, Alexander of Aphrodisias, Themistius and John Lydus.⁷⁹ Chadwick pointed to St. Paul as the earliest proponent of anthologies, and Clement of Alexandria as someone whose works demonstrated the wide use of anthologies. Origen and Gregory of Nazianzus, too, were no strangers to the anthology. This should not be surprising, as the use of anthologies, particularly those containing maxims, was common by late antiquity.⁸⁰ Norman argued that Libanius also used *florilegia*, noting that he had access to a collection of proverbs and an ‘encyclopaedia’ of New Comedy which he mined, while Julian mentioned the compiler Damophilus by name in his *Misopogon*.⁸¹

By the fourth century, the use of *florilegia* was a well-established educational practice, attested by the schooltext papyri and the continued production of anthologies by Gregory of Nazianzus and, famously, Stobaeus.⁸² Both Cribiore and Bouffartigue note the proliferation of *florilegia* in late antiquity, particularly epitomes of historical works, anthologies and commentaries, which might act as way of accessing the primary text.⁸³ It was part of the job of a teacher, at least at the earliest levels, to make a ‘textbook’ for students; students would rely on ‘models’ provided by the teacher, which included copying short passages provided by the teacher.⁸⁴ The survival of such a large number of *florilegia* without any significant variations, even in a Christian context when we might expect some measure of difference, attests to the consistency of education and is suggestive of a *de facto* curriculum.⁸⁵

⁷⁸ Plato mentioned the use of anthologies in his *Laws* (7.810e; 7.811a) and both Plutarch and Seneca referenced their usage in education (Plut. *Quomodo adul.* 15a; 32e; Sen. *Epp.* 84.5; 33.5-6).

⁷⁹ Chadwick 1969, 1139. Ogilvie argued that Lactantius also used *florilegia* for his knowledge of Latin prose, while anthologies provided him with many of his biblical and apologetic quotations (1978, 109).

⁸⁰ Chadwick 1969, 1144-6.

⁸¹ Norman 1964, 160-1; 165-6. Jul. *Misopog.* 358c. Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen discuss Julian’s naming of Damophilus, and suggest that he was being dismissive and displaying intellectual snobbery by naming him, as a way of insulting the Antiochenes (2013, 213-217).

⁸² Morgan argued that the schooltext papyri contained various passages copied by both schoolhands and more sophisticated hands, suggestive of an anthological system (1998, 200). She also noted that ‘an enormous number’ of anthologies have survived (1998, 122). See Chadwick 1969, 1133.

⁸³ Cribiore 2007b, 175; Bouffartigue 1992, 171.

⁸⁴ Cribiore 2001b, 131, 132.

⁸⁵ Morgan 1998, 124.

2.4 The curriculum before the fourth century

Marrou wrote that ‘tradition, or rather routine, had fixed the famous passages once and for all, and these were learned by one generation after another.’⁸⁶ This is evident when one looks at the remarkably similar and consistent references and allusions made by writers in this period, and demonstrates the lasting popularity of Homer and Demosthenes, both of whom remained at the centre of Greek rhetorical education.⁸⁷ This section will explore this issue but will also look at which books were consistently popular and whether it is possible to notice any trends in the status of writers and texts, using both the primary sources and also the work of Bouffartigue and Morgan, who assessed the allusions found in the work of Julian and the schooltext papyri respectively. A comparison with the most frequently cited authors in the Second Sophistic, for example those referenced by Lucian, will offer valuable insight into trends, particularly the similarities between the fourth century and the Second Sophistic, perhaps reinforcing the view that the fourth century should represent an extension of the Second Sophistic or mark a Third Sophistic.⁸⁸

Quintilian’s *Institutio Oratoria* is an important source for a view on the development of education, but also provides us with an explicit and exhaustive description of the ideal rhetorical curriculum, featuring both Greek and Latin writers. Though Quintilian acknowledges that listing a full record of authors and texts required for a true orator would be ‘an endless task’, his list is nonetheless long.⁸⁹ Indeed, he names 44 Greek authors, and 58 Latin, though, for our purposes, only the Greek are significant.

The author deemed most important is, as we might expect, Homer, recommended at both a grammatical and rhetorical level.⁹⁰ Quintilian advises trainee orators to begin with Homer, and praises him to the extreme.⁹¹ He noted books one, two and nine of the *Iliad* as particularly worthy of attention.⁹² Hesiod is only given a grudging mention, mainly for his maxims, which Quintilian judges to be merely ‘useful’.⁹³ He also

⁸⁶ Marrou 1956, 153.

⁸⁷ Marrou 1956, 102.

⁸⁸ The validity of the term ‘Third Sophistic’ is debated: Quiroga 2007, 31-32; Van Hoof 2010, 212-213

⁸⁹ *Sed persequi singulos infiniti fuerit operis*, Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.37. Criboire refers to the ‘pluralism and inclusiveness’ of this catalogue (2007b, 158).

⁹⁰ Quint. *Inst.* 1.8.5.

⁹¹ Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.46. Only Virgil comes close to Homer in Quintilian’s estimation (*Inst.* 10.1.85).

⁹² Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.47.

⁹³ *utiles*, Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.52.

recommends tragedy and lyric poets at an early stage.⁹⁴ Pindar is claimed to be the best of the nine lyric poets.⁹⁵

Of the ‘Old Comedy’, Eupolis, Aristophanes and Cratinus are mentioned.⁹⁶ Sophocles and Euripides are both praised, with the latter deemed better for law court training; both are considered better than Aeschylus.⁹⁷ Menander is particularly celebrated: Quintilian recommended both his comic plays and declamatory speeches.⁹⁸ Of the historians, Thucydides and Herodotus are both endorsed, the former for his ‘vigour, speeches and the expression of the stronger passion’, the latter for ‘charm, conversations and the delineation of the gentler emotions’.⁹⁹ Theopompus, Clitarchus and Timagenes are also praised.¹⁰⁰ Of the ‘vast army of orators’, Demosthenes is given extravagant praise.¹⁰¹ Aeschines, Hyperides, Lysias and Isocrates are also considered worthy of mention.¹⁰² Of the philosophers, Plato is judged ‘supreme’, though Xenophon, the ‘Socratics’, Aristotle, and Theophrastus are also named.¹⁰³

This is, as stated, a vast list. Cribiore noted that it is usually considered a product of ‘idealism’, though she argues this list, and others like it, did reflect the breadth of reading with which a ‘first-rate orator was supposed to have at least some acquaintance.’¹⁰⁴ Many of the authors recommended by Quintilian are familiar to us, and, with few exceptions, would form a canon of classical authors. Excluding Pindar, Quintilian proved his tastes were ‘that of a rhetorician’, suggesting this list is actually quite standard and to be expected.¹⁰⁵ Indeed, that of Dio Chrysostom, though not as extensive, is similar to Quintilian’s list of recommended authors, despite being aimed at a

⁹⁴ Quint. *Inst.* 1.8.6. Interestingly, he recommended the careful selection of both the authors and passages from these works, due to the ‘licentious’ nature of the Greek lyric poets. This is reminiscent of the advice many Christians gave regarding pagan literature, namely Basil, who also advised careful selection of texts. Quintilian’s advice to select appropriate passages also looks forward to the increased use of anthologies, in which the most salient (and perhaps appropriate) passages were presented.

⁹⁵ Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.58; 61.

⁹⁶ Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.66.

⁹⁷ Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.67.

⁹⁸ Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.69.

⁹⁹ *Densus et brevis et semper instans sibi Thucydides, dulcis et candidus et fusus Herodotus: ille concitatis, hic remissis adfectibus melior, ille contionibus, hic sermonibus, ille vi, hic voluptate*, Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.73.

¹⁰⁰ Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.74-75.

¹⁰¹ Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.76; 105.

¹⁰² Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.77-79.

¹⁰³ *praecipuum*, Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.81-83.

¹⁰⁴ Cribiore 2007b, 158. We might compare this to a BA and MA degree in, for example, English Literature: there are certain texts one is expected to have at least sampled.

¹⁰⁵ Kennedy 1969, 108.

more mature audience of men who had finished their rhetorical education.¹⁰⁶ He also recommended Menander and Euripides as the best examples of comedy and tragedy, but like Quintilian, argued that Homer was central and valuable to every age: ‘Homer comes first, and in the middle and last’.¹⁰⁷ Herodotus was endorsed for enjoyment, though he argued that Thucydides and Theopompus were better historians in the strictest sense.¹⁰⁸ Dio argued that Demosthenes surpassed all others, while Lysias was commended for his brevity, simplicity of style and coherence.¹⁰⁹ We can see that the recommended curriculum for those aiming for a public career was remarkably consistent.

Indeed, this aligns well with what we find from Anderson’s discussion of Lucian’s citations and allusions, and Morgan’s analysis of schooltext papyri. Anderson analysed the quotations and allusions in Lucian’s work in order to assess not only the literary culture of Lucian but also his audience – the literary culture of the Second Sophistic. Anderson saw certain limitations in Lucian’s reading, as far as we can tell from a collation of his quotations and allusions, noting that many of Lucian’s references were from either the first lines or ‘suspiciously’ near the beginning of classic texts and arguing that ‘as far as learning is concerned, he travelled light.’¹¹⁰ While the nature of a book-roll meant that these passages would be most read and easily accessible, it implies that Lucian only referenced particularly well-known and easily recognisable passages: ‘an entertainer scores no points by quoting what his audience is not going to recognise.’¹¹¹ Lucian did not make any deep cuts with his allusions; to be obscure was not a requirement for him when it came to making references. By referencing more obvious passages from the canon of classic authors, Lucian has offered an insight into what was popular in education during his time. Though such lists can be misleading, the writers Lucian referred to tell us what was taught, and what would be expected to be known and recognised; it gives us an indication of the celebrated writers during the Second Sophistic.¹¹² A comparison of this

¹⁰⁶ Kennedy described it as a ‘kind of cram course for a public official whose education has been neglected’ (1969, 107).

¹⁰⁷ Ὅμηρος δὲ καὶ πρῶτος καὶ μέσος καὶ ὕστατος, παντὶ παιδὶ καὶ ἀνδρὶ καὶ γέροντι τοσοῦτον ἀφ’ αὐτοῦ διδοὺς ὅσον ἕκαστος δύναται λαβεῖν, D. Chr. Or. 18.6; 8.

¹⁰⁸ D. Chr. Or. 18.10.

¹⁰⁹ D. Chr. Or. 18.11.

¹¹⁰ Anderson 1976, 59. Anderson concluded that Lucian made frequent use of short cuts and dismissed *florilegia* as a less intellectual method of learning, since deemed too negative and unfair. Lauwers said it was a hasty conclusion which underestimated the ‘performative character of these very texts’ (2011, 227, 237).

¹¹¹ Anderson 1976, 60; Lauwers 2011, 232.

¹¹² Anderson 1976, 64.

with those writers referenced by, for example, Julian and Libanius can indicate elements of continuity in the content of education in the fourth century.

The most frequently cited author by Lucian was Homer, who accounted for 41% of his total citations, with a focus on the *Iliad*, particularly books two, four, eight, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen and twenty, and books one, nine and eleven of the *Odyssey*. Plato accounted for 6%, with the *Georgias* and *Phaedrus* proving most popular (or quotable), while Herodotus, Hesiod (particularly *Theogony* and *Works and Days*), Thucydides and Euripides each accounted for 4% of Lucian's citations. 'Comici Incerti', meanwhile, represented 10%. Demosthenes, Aristophanes, Pindar, Xenophon, Aeschines, Menander, Sophocles and Eupolis (plus the *Lyrice Incerti* and *Tragice Incerti*) were referenced much less than the others.¹¹³

This can be compared to Morgan's statistics gleaned from a catalogue of schooltext papyri.¹¹⁴ While there are some issues with this data,¹¹⁵ it is possible to use, to some extent, her numbers and relate them to the Second Sophistic for comparison with those of Lucian already discussed. The evidence of schooltext papyri gives insight into what education consisted of for more 'typical' and anonymous students, rather the litterati or 'culture heroes'.

From Morgan, we can establish that Homer was the most popular (and thus, by extension the most important) author. Morgan argues that of the 'roughly 150 other texts by known authors, 97 are extracts from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.'¹¹⁶ This complements the picture given by the catalogue of Lucian's references, as well as the lists provided by Quintilian and Dio. The first two books of the *Iliad* were the most widely copied, which is perhaps unsurprising, and aligns well with Quintilian's advice: the first book introduces themes and characters, while the second book is popular not only due to proximity but also favour.¹¹⁷ Further, the first six books of the *Iliad* were the most widely copied and read.¹¹⁸ Books four, five, eight and ten also are copied in what Morgan deems 'literary

¹¹³ For example, Demosthenes is cited 17 times, while Euripides, making up 4% of the total citations, is cited 50 times (Anderson 1976, 66).

¹¹⁴ These papyri reflect the most frequently cited texts and authors between the third century BC and the seventh century AD.

¹¹⁵ Morgan herself warns that this evidence may be misleading, and that Egypt should not be taken as wholly representative of education across the empire (1998, 43-44).

¹¹⁶ Morgan 1998, 69; Table 15.

¹¹⁷ Morgan 1998, Table 11; Cribiore 2001b, 194.

¹¹⁸ Cribiore 2001b, 194.

hands'.¹¹⁹ The first book of the *Odyssey* was the most copied too, following the general trend in antiquity to focus on the beginnings of an author's work, though books four, nine, ten and eleven also enjoyed popularity, perhaps because they included key characters from the *Iliad*.¹²⁰ This supports the trends in Lucian, as well as other Second Sophistic writers.¹²¹ It is clear that there was an unequal representation of the surviving texts: the *Odyssey* is much less well represented than the *Iliad*, with only eleven surviving schoolhand texts compared to the *Iliad*'s 86.¹²² The mismatch might be explained by the fact that the *Iliad* was viewed as a better representation of a tragic epic.¹²³

The papyri indicate that Euripides was the second most common author, after Homer, though with considerably fewer surviving extracts – Euripides counts for 20 of the texts in comparison to Homer's 97.¹²⁴ Similar to the Homeric content, the most popular Euripidean works come from the beginnings of plays, or relate in some way to Homeric content, a contributing factor also in the enduring popularity of Euripides' *Phoenissae*, further proof, if it were needed, of the influence and importance of Homer in ancient education.¹²⁵ Isocrates and Menander merit some mention, each with seven surviving texts.¹²⁶ This varies somewhat from the picture we get from Lucian's citations, who cited Euripides, Menander and Isocrates less.

It is difficult to make a definitive argument based on an analysis of the schooltext papyri in comparison with Lucian's references.¹²⁷ We can conclude, though, that Homer reigned supreme, that Euripides enjoyed enduring favour, and that the beginnings of texts were the most frequently copied and cited. By the Second Sophistic, we see a remarkable

¹¹⁹ Criore argues that advanced students would read the whole of the *Iliad*, including those books less appreciated by the public, who were deterred by the more 'unheroic' side of Achilles and 'aspects of the divine that people found offensive and lacking in dignity', citing books 14, 19, 20 and 21 (2001b, 195).

¹²⁰ Morgan 1998, table 12; Criore 2001b, 196.

¹²¹ Criore 2001b, 196-7.

¹²² Morgan 1998, 105.

¹²³ Criore 2001b, 195.

¹²⁴ Morgan 1998, 69; Criore 2001b, 194.

¹²⁵ Morgan 1998, 115; Criore 2001a.

¹²⁶ Morgan 1998, 69. Criore referred to a papyrus which records a list of books to be acquired or an inventory; noted next to Homer, Euripides and Menander are the words 'all that one can find', suggestive of their centrality (2001b, 199).

¹²⁷ It is particularly difficult as there is disagreement over what these papyri represent. Criore 1999 argues they 'primarily consist of written passages that served as penmanship exercises, analyses of similes and descriptions,' which indicate the parts of an author's work that the students were studying at the moment. Morgan does not necessarily allow that written exercises only represented one method of education, and her conclusions reflect this. Thus, we find that writers such as Xenophon, described by Swain as a 'favourite Second Sophistic author' (1996, 80) and used by Arian, are absent from her discussion.

continuity in the *de facto* curriculum, as the somewhat idealistic lists of Quintilian and Dio correspond remarkably well with the evidence of Lucian and the schooltext papyri.

2.4.1 *The curriculum in the fourth century*

We now turn to a discussion of how these lists (we could tentatively refer to curricula) compare to what we find in the fourth century in the works of Libanius, Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil of Caesarea. This will encompass both the more explicit statements about the contents of education, as well as taking cues from their citations. While never as explicit or expansive as Quintilian, Libanius did give some insight into the authors and texts he taught, as well as those prominent in his own library. It is also possible to reconstruct, to some extent, a likely syllabus or library from the citations of Julian and Gregory of Nazianzus, discussed by Bouffartigue and Ruether respectively. Further, Basil's treatise *Ad Adolescentes* is instructive in determining which texts were considered central and important, even for Christians who were debating the place of pagan literature. Similarly, the attempts by Apollinaris the Elder and his son to recast Biblical texts in the style of pagan works in response to Julian's school edict, also reveal what was considered essential. Kelly's recent discussion on the allusions of Ammianus will also be included for discussion.¹²⁸

This method of enquiry is, of course, not without its dangers.¹²⁹ Reconstructing a reading list from citations and allusions can be misleading and result in overly pessimistic conclusion about the reading habits of prominent figures. However, despite its limitations (and in the absence of a definitive and exhaustive list from prominent teachers such as Libanius or Himerius), it is interesting and worthwhile to compare what was most often alluded to by writers in the fourth century with those authors and texts most commonly recommended.

¹²⁸ Despite writing in Latin, Ammianus was Greek (possibly from Antioch; see Matthews 1994, who asserts that he was a correspondent of Libanius) and would have likely shared in the education and culture of his compatriots, Amm. 31.16.9.

¹²⁹ Criore 2007b, 158.

2.4.1.1 Libanius's reading list

In his more explicit comments about which authors his students studied, Libanius suggested that there was such a thing as a 'curriculum' (*ta pragmata*). In response to criticisms about his teaching and the continued focus on Homer and Demosthenes, he blamed such a curriculum.¹³⁰ He viewed the syllabus as set; he was following a course which was generally agreed upon, not of his own creation. The curriculum was bigger than him and his school, something to be observed and followed by all.

In terms of the authors which were part of this curriculum, Libanius wrote in a letter to a father that his sons had spent the first of two months in his school studying the 'old writers' and Libanius's own work, while the second month was spent studying just the old writers.¹³¹ We can see from other brief discussions that Homer and Demosthenes were central, and were often used as shorthand to describe the syllabus. There were some criticisms from students who felt they spent too long practicing rebuttals of statements of Homer and Demosthenes, as part of the *progymnasmata*. Homer and Demosthenes are mentioned again in a letter to the father of a student, as is Plato.¹³² Demosthenes was a staple of rhetorical schools, as students read his work for use in *progymnasmata* and also looked to them as models in the composition of orations.¹³³ Plato was used as a model for prose writing, and Libanius wrote to Themistius that his student was able to discuss Plato.¹³⁴ Libanius praised a correspondent for having read and filled his soul with 'Homer, Hesiod, and the rest of the poets, and Demosthenes, Lysias, and the rest of the orators.' Herodotus and Thucydides, 'and all their company' were also listed.¹³⁵ This is suggestive of a syllabus, one which encompassed the major, canonical writers. Alongside his own works, Libanius also encouraged his students to read other modern compositions: we can see that his students read Themistius and also the speech of an ex-student.¹³⁶ Libanius's *progymnasmata* reflect this list and also give an indication of what students

¹³⁰ Lib. *Or.* 34.15.

¹³¹ Lib. *Ep.* C93. Himerius seems, also, to have presented his own work as an example of literary achievement to his students upon their arrival: *Or.* 61.

¹³² Lib. *Ep.* C64.

¹³³ Criboire 2007b, 150.

¹³⁴ Lib. *Ep.* C117; C118. Themistius himself favoured philosophy, particularly Plato and Aristotle, but demonstrated knowledge of the other canonical writers. He wrote that his father knew well Homer, Menander, Euripides, Sophocles, Sappho and Pindar (*Or.* 20.236). His father sought to use rhetoric alongside philosophy, and, as he taught his son, we can reasonably expect Themistius also knew these authors.

¹³⁵ 'Ομήρου τε καὶ Ἡσιόδου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ποιητῶν Δημοσθένους τε καὶ Λυσίου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ῥητόρων. [...] Ἡρόδοτος τε καὶ Θουκυδίδης καὶ πᾶς ἐκείνων ὁ χορος, Lib. *Ep.* 181.4-5.

¹³⁶ Lib. *Ep.* C49; C125.

were expected to read. As always, Homer was central. Hesiod, Sophocles and Euripides were also frequently alluded to.¹³⁷

Libanius also referred to his own reading habits and knowledge, and to his library. He continued to read Demosthenes, and we know that he had a much-loved copy of Thucydides.¹³⁸ His writings quote or allude frequently to Homer, Demosthenes and Plato; less often, though still frequently, to the tragedians, particularly Sophocles and Euripides, a particular favourite.¹³⁹ He also demonstrates knowledge of Herodotus, Xenophon and Isocrates. References to Hesiod, Pindar and Aristophanes are rarer, but still discernible.¹⁴⁰ From the Second Sophistic, Libanius imitated and referenced Aelius Aristides, Philostratus, Aelian and likely Lucian and Dio Chrysostom.¹⁴¹ He also shows acquaintance with contemporary works, chief among them Julian – he read the *Misopogon* and *Letter to the Athenians* for use in his own orations after Julian's death. Himerius, Themistius and Eusebius's *Vita Constantini* are also evident.¹⁴²

Norman took a rather minimalistic view of Libanius's reading range. He argued that while Libanius presented a 'wide literary expertise' and 'deep knowledge', this was misleading in all cases except the Attic orators.¹⁴³ Norman argued that this was partly due to the 'culture of the commentator and excerptor' and the increasing reliance on the 'intermediary' – that is, *florilegia*.¹⁴⁴ Cribiore, however, has argued that, instead, Libanius was alluding to works which would be 'very familiar' to an audience. She also noted that his library was, in fact, 'much richer than might be expected', pointing to his knowledge of Aratus, Callimachus and Apollonius.¹⁴⁵

2.4.1.2 Julian's reading list

Like Norman on Libanius, Bouffartigue took a minimalist view on Julian's scope of reading and library, and argued that Julian relied more on *florilegia* than we might

¹³⁷ Gibson 2008, xxvi.

¹³⁸ Lib. *Or.* 1.148-150, 237.

¹³⁹ Lib. *Ep.* B151.9.

¹⁴⁰ Festugière 1956, 216.

¹⁴¹ Norman 1964, 171-2. Libanius mentions that he owned a portrait of Aristides, which he sat next to as he read his work (*Ep.* N143.1-2). Swain discusses the influence of Aristides on Libanius (2004, 368-373).

¹⁴² Norman 1964, 172-3.

¹⁴³ Norman 1964, 159; 169.

¹⁴⁴ Norman 1964, 160-62.

¹⁴⁵ Cribiore 2007b, 159.

assume.¹⁴⁶ Julian both alluded to and directly referenced a number of authors, resulting in a ‘real’ and ‘ideal’ library: the ‘real’ library constituted those authors and texts cited or alluded to by Julian, while the ‘ideal’ library included only those authors Julian named and wished to signpost.¹⁴⁷ Bouffartigue argued that for an author to be significant in the works of Julian, he had to be named more than seven times.¹⁴⁸ It is the difference between knowing an author by name and reputation only and knowing a text well enough to cite it; a veneer rather than intimate knowledge.

The most named author, and thus first in the ‘ideal’ library, is Plato: he was named 53 times by Julian, mostly without reference to a specific text.¹⁴⁹ The second most named author is Homer, with 45 mentions, often accompanied by a citation.¹⁵⁰ The real joins the ideal here, as Homer was the most commonly cited author by Julian, with 171 evocations, while Plato was quoted 81 times with a focus on *Timaeus*, *Republic* and *Laws*.¹⁵¹ Plato and Homer were the most important authors for Julian, not only naming but citing them frequently. Indeed, in a letter to his uncle, he said as much, noting that the only books he had with him in Constantinople 362 were by Homer and Plato; he did not even have with him a pamphlet (πυκτίον).¹⁵² He mentioned Homer and Plato as if they were a category apart, it being obvious that he should have their books with him because they were so important. He compared them to an amulet, and remarked they were always with him.¹⁵³ Two thirds of Julian’s Homeric citations were from the *Iliad*, confirming the trend we have seen thus far. Bouffartigue confirms this with a breakdown of the Homeric citations in Plutarch, Lucian, Dio Chrysostom, Aelius Aristides and Maximus of Tyre: all followed the trend to quote more from the *Iliad* than the *Odyssey*. Most commonly cited by Julian were books one, two, five, nine, eleven and twenty-one of the *Iliad*, which aligns reasonably well with what we have seen previously.¹⁵⁴

¹⁴⁶ Bouffartigue noted that with the exception of Homer, Julian’s quotations and examples come in sets of two or three, suggesting a type of catalogue and resulting in a breadth of knowledge without the depth of specialism (1992, 675; 327).

¹⁴⁷ Bouffartigue 1992, 52. Julian names eighty authors in total (1992, 138).

¹⁴⁸ Bouffartigue 1992, 137.

¹⁴⁹ Bouffartigue 1992, 53.

¹⁵⁰ Bouffartigue 1992, 60.

¹⁵¹ Bouffartigue 1992, 143; 158; 170.

¹⁵² One could speculate that this contained *florilegia*.

¹⁵³ Jul. *Ep.* 29.

¹⁵⁴ Bouffartigue 1992, 143.

After Plato and Homer, Diogenes and Aristotle are the most commonly named by Julian, 40 and 23 times respectively.¹⁵⁵ Pythagoras follows, named thirteen times.¹⁵⁶ Hesiod is the next most named poet, with eight mentions, while Antisthenes, Crates, Marcus Aurelius and Iamblichus were each named between eight and twelve times.¹⁵⁷ Surprisingly, Euripides was only named four times, though we can see that *Phoenissae* was cited often by Julian, in line with the general trend. Only Thucydides and Herodotus among the historians were named.¹⁵⁸

Marcus Aurelius was named mainly in Julian's *Caesars*, which is to be expected as he is a main character. It would be easy to conclude from this that he was not particularly influential on Julian. However, it is here that we meet the limits of this type of analysis, and need to use other evidence. We know from Ammianus, for example, that Marcus Aurelius was an important figure in Julian's life.¹⁵⁹ Though Bouffartigue argues that Julian probably did not read many works by Marcus Aurelius (*Meditations* does not seem to have been read by Julian, though he probably knew some of his letters), he also argues that this silence only leaves us in the dark and does not definitively tell us that Julian did not read Marcus or view him as significant.¹⁶⁰ Thus, Demosthenes was not named often, but can be seen to be the main rhetorical model for Julian's work.¹⁶¹ Similarly, Bouffartigue suggested the reason Iamblichus was only named eleven times was that Julian had synthesised so many of his arguments. More convincingly, he suggested it was because Iamblichus was more modern and therefore less attractive as a

¹⁵⁵ Bouffartigue 1992, 61; 65.

¹⁵⁶ Bouffartigue 1992, 66.

¹⁵⁷ Bouffartigue 1992, 69. Both Diogenes and Pythagoras are somewhat problematic as it is unclear what they had actually written and thus which texts Julian could have read.

¹⁵⁸ Bouffartigue 1992, 95; 98.

¹⁵⁹ Ammianus noted that Julian strived to be like Marcus in both his actions and character (16.1.4), which suggests that Ammianus had access to some of Julian's writings, such as *Caesars* and letters, particularly his letter to Themistius in which Julian explains that he felt he had to live up to the model of Marcus, *Jul. Ep. ad Them.* 253B. Smith, however, has argued that this reference to Julian's need to imitate Marcus (and Alexander) actually referred to the past, and was something which Julian had outgrown. Further, Smith remarks that this was an 'amplified cliché' and a platitude in response to Themistius's own platitudes, and that both Alexander and Marcus operated as 'conventional models of excellence' rather than genuine sources of imitation (2013, 218). Smith noted the limited references to Marcus's policies and activities as emperor in *Caesars* and concluded that Marcus was present only as an example of 'philosophic piety' and that Julian's admiration of Marcus was 'thoroughly conventional' (220). Hunt 1995 also argues for the conventionality of the admiration of Marcus.

¹⁶⁰ Bouffartigue 1992, 73; 74-5. While Bouffartigue (and Hunt 1995, 289-290) judges Julian to have no knowledge of *Meditations*, Themistius makes a possible allusion to them in a speech for Valens given in 364 as he referred to the 'precepts', παραγγέλματα, of Marcus, *Or.* 6.81C. Smith also notes that there is little emulation of Marcus by Julian, and concludes that he 'may' have read only some of the correspondence (2013, 219).

¹⁶¹ Bouffartigue 1992, 98.

named source: indeed, Julian tended not to cite or name contemporary authors unless in correspondence with them.¹⁶² Julian clearly favoured ancient Greek authors, and the Classical over the Hellenistic ones. He also tended towards philosophy. This is confirmed when we consider Julian's correspondence concerning the library of Bishop George.

Julian's description of Bishop George's library, which he evidently knew well, provides us with a reasonable idea about the type of books Julian had access to and read while he was living in Cappadocia. Julian wrote two letters requesting George's library after his death in Alexandria. Julian described it as containing 'many [books] on philosophy, and many on rhetoric; many also on the teachings of the impious Galileans.' A further letter described it as 'very large and complete', containing 'philosophers of every school and many historians, especially, among these, numerous books of all kinds by the Galileans.'¹⁶³ This confirms what we have seen so far: that Julian had read widely and that his readings included philosophy, which was reflected in his writing. His letters, though, demonstrate that he also knew the Scriptures (and, likely, books by contemporary Christians). This is somewhat surprising, considering Julian's reputation as the champion of Hellenism. However, he knew them well: the Scriptures were quoted 99 times, mainly in *Against the Galileans*, obviously owing to the very nature of this piece.¹⁶⁴ This is where the difference between the 'real' and 'ideal' libraries is at its starkest: from any study of the 'ideal' library of authors named by Julian, his knowledge of the Scriptures would remain obscured. While we might be able to infer from his upbringing and letters about Bishop George's library that Julian knew the Scriptures (or at least Matthew, Mark and John), it is through an analysis of citations and allusions that we see this most clearly.

Julian's list of named authors demonstrates how clear the programme of Greek literature was. This is furthered when we consider the convergence between the 'ideal' and 'real' libraries. Homer and Plato were the most named, but also have a large presence in Julian's work through quotations and allusions. Diogenes, Aristotle, Hesiod and

¹⁶² Bouffartigue 1992, 76. This is seen with Priscus, Themistius, Libanius, Prohaeresius and Constantius, while of the Second Sophistic writers, only Dio Chrysostom and Plutarch were named (1992, 103, 101).

¹⁶³ πολλά μὲν γὰρ ἦν φιλόσοφα παρ' αὐτῷ πολλά δὲ ῥητορικά, πολλά δὲ ἤ και τῆς τῶν δυσσεβῶν Φαλιλαίων διδασκαλίας, Jul. *Epp.* 23.378b; Πολλή τις ἦν πάνου και μεγάλη βιβλιοθήκη Γεωργίου παντοδαπῶν μὲν φιλοσόφων, πολλῶν δὲ ὑπομνηματογράφων, οὐκ ἐλάχιστα δ' ἐν αὐτοῖς και τὰ τῶν Γαλιλαίων πολλα και παντοδαπα βιβλία, Jul. *Ep.* 38.411c. Knowledge of the Bible would not have figured in a standard fourth century rhetorical education, but was something specific to Christians and usually learned at home or at a church.

¹⁶⁴ Bouffartigue 1992, 156-58. The fragmented survival of *Against the Galileans* means that citations of the Old Testament outnumber the New, which is potentially misleading.

Iamblichus were also well represented in Julian's work through quotations and allusions as well as being named more than eight times.¹⁶⁵ However, Demosthenes, Heraclitus, Damophilus and the Scriptures were also well represented, without being named often.¹⁶⁶ Bouffartigue concluded that the authors most frequently cited by Julian (that is, those demonstrably read and used by him) and which constituted the main correspondences between the 'real' and 'ideal' library were Homer, Plato, Hesiod, Euripides, Demosthenes and Xenophon. This is a short list that has more in common with the recommended reading lists and bears a resemblance to the curriculum.¹⁶⁷ What is interesting is the difference between this list and that in Julian's rescript on the Christian teachers. This rescript is our most explicit comment by Julian on the curriculum. In the rescript he named the expected Homer, Hesiod, Demosthenes, but also Herodotus, Thucydides, Isocrates, and Lysias.¹⁶⁸ This suggests that for Julian these authors represent the basis of Greek rhetorical education. They also correspond well with the curriculum suggested by Quintilian and the papyri.

Julian's list of authors in the rescript is reminiscent of Libanius's letter to Postumianus, in which he listed Homer, Hesiod, Demosthenes, Lysias, Herodotus and Thucydides: a very similar sequence to Julian's, which only omits Isocrates.¹⁶⁹ These writers look to have become shorthand for classical Greek rhetorical education, rather than the sum total of the curriculum. In the absence of an exhaustive list and discussion, these few came to represent the curriculum. These are the writers who would be recognised as central to rhetorical education – indeed, proof of this is given in that they were used in a rescript on education.

2.4.1.3 *The list of Apollinaris the Elder and Son*

We see the development of a *de facto* curriculum too in the description of Apollinaris the Elder and his son's work in response to Julian's rescript.¹⁷⁰ According to Socrates

¹⁶⁵ Bouffartigue 1992, 414-18.

¹⁶⁶ Bouffartigue 1992, 419. On Julian's reference to Damophilus and Plutarch at *Misopog.* 358a-359, see Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2013.

¹⁶⁷ Bouffartigue 1992, 420.

¹⁶⁸ *Jul. Ep.* 36.423a. The ordering is Julian's. The absence of Plato here is surprising, especially when we consider how significant he was for Julian but also that he was studied as a prose writer in rhetorical schools.

¹⁶⁹ *Lib. Ep.* 181.4-5.

¹⁷⁰ Nothing remains of these attempts, apparently produced in a remarkably short space of time.

Scholasticus and Sozomen, they recast the Bible to resemble Greek literature, aping the forms and style of various authors to circumvent Julian's rescript. One of the interesting things about their efforts are the texts and authors they tried to replicate. According to Socrates, Apollinaris the Elder was a grammarian, while his son was a rhetorician. They were thus well placed to know the most important and prevalent texts and authors in education. Socrates claimed that Apollinaris the Elder translated the Pentateuch into heroic verse, paraphrased the historical books of the Old Testament as well as turning them into tragedies and putting them partly in dactylic verse. His son recast the Gospels as Platonic dialogues.¹⁷¹ Sozomen confirmed this and stated that Apollinaris substituted the antiquities of the Hebrews to the reign of Saul for the *Iliad*. Further, he produced comedies in the style of Menander, Euripidean tragedies, and Pindaric odes.¹⁷² Thus, they reproduced in style and form the works of Homer, Euripides, Sophocles, Plato, Menander and Pindar. These authors are very similar to those to who achieved canonical status and were found in curricula, both explicit and implicit.

2.4.1.4 Basil's reading list

Basil's *Ad Adolescentes* foregrounded classical texts, in contrast to his treatment of the Scriptures, and he recommended, or assumed prior knowledge of, a number of Greek authors and texts.¹⁷³ As this treatise argued that one should take from pagan literature only what is useful, we can assume that the references and allusions are those which Basil himself considered essential and most advantageous, as well as those he had knowledge of.¹⁷⁴

There are references to Hesiod and Homer throughout, particularly *Works and Days* and books four, six, seven and ten of the *Odyssey*.¹⁷⁵ He praised poets, and singled out Homer as a purveyor of virtue.¹⁷⁶ It is interesting that he referred only to the *Odyssey*, rather than the *Iliad*, by far the most frequently cited Homeric text by others. Also

¹⁷¹ Socr. *HE* .3.16.

¹⁷² Soz. *HE* .5.18. The absence of Attic oratory is surprising.

¹⁷³ McLynn 2010, 107. Basil's work is discussed in chapter three.

¹⁷⁴ The performative aspect of this text is not to be dismissed: Basil was displaying his own knowledge and superior education, possibly to an audience of his peers. McLynn argues it was an oration (2010, 106, 109-112).

¹⁷⁵ Basil, *Ad Adol.* 1.3; 4.2; 5.3-8; 6.1; 9.27.

¹⁷⁶ Basil, *Ad Adol.* 4.1; 5.6. McLynn has discussed some of Basil's mistaken allusions to Homer (2010, 108-109).

interesting are the books of the *Odyssey* which he referenced: while books four and ten have been shown by Morgan to have been copied often, books six and seven are not, or rather, not so much to be noteworthy. While it might be something of stretch to call these references ‘deep cuts’, Basil was not only referencing the best-known passages; he was clearly expecting some level of knowledge and education, which suggests a specific audience.

There are allusions to Euripides, to *Hippolytus* and *Heracles*,¹⁷⁷ as well as references to Diogenes, Solon, Theognis, Prodicus, Pittacus, and Pythagoras.¹⁷⁸ The influence of Plato is apparent, in both Basil’s arguments and allusions, the *Republic* particularly.¹⁷⁹ Basil referenced and alluded to sayings and characters via works of Diogenes and Plato.¹⁸⁰ He also demonstrated knowledge of Plutarch.¹⁸¹ This aligns reasonably well with those authors common to ideal curricula and school papyri: Basil’s use, particularly, of Homer, Hesiod, Euripides and Plato not only reflect Quintilian’s list and Morgan’s analysis of the papyri, but also the references in Libanius and the accounts of the efforts of the Apollinariii. It speaks to a consistent curriculum, in which there is a select band of authors, favoured in Greek rhetorical education.

2.4.1.5 Gregory of Nazianzus’s reading list

This select band is reflected in an analysis of Gregory’s of Nazianzus’s references and allusions. Demoen, in a study of *exempla* in Gregory’s poems, concluded that though many poems contained only biblical material,¹⁸² there was a ‘remarkably large share’ of pagan exempla in the poems.¹⁸³ Gregory’s letters, meanwhile, contained more pagan exempla than biblical.¹⁸⁴ Genre is a contributing factor here, as is audience: the more limited an audience (for example, letters), the more likely it was for pagan elements to be

¹⁷⁷ Basil, *Ad Adol.* 6.5; 10.5.

¹⁷⁸ Basil, *Ad Adol.* 9.3; 9.20. McLynn 2010, 107.

¹⁷⁹ Wilson 1975, 11; Basil, *Ad Adol.* 9.6; 6.5; 2.5; 5.3; 9.12.

¹⁸⁰ Basil, *Ad Adol.* 10.3; 9.25; 5.11; 8.12.

¹⁸¹ Basil, *Ad Adol.* 7.2; 7.9; 5.9.

¹⁸² Demoen 1996, 74. Demoen indicated that the particularly pagan material was concentrated: in the poems, 50% of pagan exempla is concentrated in 6 poems, while 50% of the pagan material in orations is derived from the invectives against Julian.

¹⁸³ Demoen calculated 36% (1996, 128), and noted that literary convention played a part as we can see that epigrams, epistolary poems and the *moralia* showed a strong pagan bias.

¹⁸⁴ Demoen 1996, 129.

included.¹⁸⁵ Demoen also noted that pagan exempla were more likely to be used as ornaments, while the biblical were used as models.¹⁸⁶

In Ruether's survey of Gregory's citations,¹⁸⁷ Homer was referenced or alluded to the most, with 27 named mentions, direct quotations and clear allusions. Elm further discusses Gregory's use of Homer, particularly in his invectives against Julian in which he alluded to the *Odyssey*, notably book 22.¹⁸⁸ This is as we might expect, and is in line with the previous discussion. Like Basil, Gregory also referenced or alluded to Plato frequently, with sixteen references. Plato was an important influence on Gregory's first invective against Julian; he invoked Plato's *Republic* and its arguments on the allegorical interpretation of myth, along with Homer and Hesiod.¹⁸⁹ There are six clear references to Euripides, particularly to *Orestes* and *Phoenissae*, eternally popular.¹⁹⁰ Gregory also seems to have known Pindar and Aristotle well, with nine and six references respectively. Aristotle's place is somewhat surprising as he was not particularly prevalent amongst Gregory's fourth century compatriots, though Gregory seemed to have used him quite frequently.¹⁹¹ Also surprising is the relatively small showing Demosthenes made: only three clear references or allusions. However, as Elm has shown, this is somewhat misleading as Gregory was well versed in Demosthenes: his invectives against Julian were consciously modelled on his *Philippics*. Demosthenes was a definite influence on Gregory and his writing.¹⁹² Gregory made limited use of Hesiod, with Ruether counting only one reference, though he did allude to Hesiod's myths in the first invective.¹⁹³ This is perhaps indicative of his preferred audience and topic, which were more religious and philosophical than Libanius and Basil's treatise. Gregory also referenced Julian's *Misopogon* in his second invective, and there are allusions to it in the first invective. However, it is disputed whether Gregory had actually read the text due to the lack of

¹⁸⁵ Demoen 1996, 130. This also has implications for Gregory's attitude towards the Christian debate surrounding the use of pagan literature, discussed at chapter 3.3.1; at the least, awareness that a larger Christian audience might have some concern about a wide use of pagan material.

¹⁸⁶ Demoen 1996, 139.

¹⁸⁷ Ruether 2003, Appendix I. What follows here is largely based on this survey, which is explicitly not definitive.

¹⁸⁸ Elm 2012, 433-4; 465-6; GNaz. *Or.* 5.1; 5.39.

¹⁸⁹ GNaz. *Or.* 4.113; 71; 72; 115; 114; Elm 2012, 341; 483-4.

¹⁹⁰ Criore 2001b, 199; Criore 2001a, 241-259.

¹⁹¹ Elm 2012, 407.

¹⁹² Elm 2012, 341.

¹⁹³ GNaz. *Or.* 4.114.

‘verbatim citations’.¹⁹⁴ Nevertheless, he knew the arguments well enough to engage with them.¹⁹⁵

Ammianus, too, frequently alluded to those same authors who constituted the curriculum and whom we see recurring throughout this discussion. While we cannot be sure that he studied rhetoric, his conformation to the curriculum is less surprising when we consider that he was (likely) from Antioch and from a curial family.¹⁹⁶ It is more surprising, however, when we consider that he was writing in Latin (a language familiar to him, as a soldier) and consciously engaging with Tacitus, Livy and Sallust, as well as Cicero and Gellius.¹⁹⁷ However, Homer, Hesiod, Greek lyric poetry, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, Isocrates, plus contemporaries such as Eunapius, Eutropius, Aurelius Victor and Festus, are all discernible presences in his *Res Gestae*, albeit not all to any great extent.¹⁹⁸ He also demonstrated use of Libanius, Gregory’s invectives and Julian’s work, particularly the *Caesars*, his panegyrics to Constantius and the *Letter to the Athenians*.¹⁹⁹ The use of *florilegia* is almost certain: Fornara has demonstrated the ‘superficial’ engagement with canonical writers such as Herodotus and Thucydides, and, like Julian, allusions in Ammianus are often found in pairs or group, which suggests the use of *florilegia*.²⁰⁰

Eunapius, meanwhile, can be seen to have been mainly influenced by near-contemporaries and Second Sophistic writers. Philostratus was a guiding influence, as was Plutarch, for Eunapius’s *Lives*. Thucydides and Dexippus likely influenced his (largely lost) *History*.²⁰¹ He knew his near-contemporaries well, particularly Himerius, Libanius, Prohaeresius, Plotinus, Porphyry’s *Life of Plotinus*, Iamblichus and Julian. In terms of the standard canonical authors, Eunapius referenced Plato and Homer the most, with a focus on the first half of the *Iliad*. There are some echoes of Thucydides,

¹⁹⁴ GNaz. *Or.* 5.41; Elm 2012, 467; 165.

¹⁹⁵ Elm 2012, 467-69.

¹⁹⁶ Fornara 1992, 420. Fornara did not think it likely that Ammianus undertook any extensive Greek rhetorical training, and overserved his familiarity with Latin literature (1992, 425). His rhetorical education was likely curtailed by his military training.

¹⁹⁷ Fornara 1992, 424, 427.

¹⁹⁸ Kelly 2009, 161. Fornara argued that Ammianus drew no ‘direct inspiration’ from Herodotus, Thucydides or Demosthenes, but that his recollection of Homer seemed genuine (1992, 421).

¹⁹⁹ Kelly 2009, 255; Amm. 15.8.14; 16.10.8. There is little ancient testimony to Julian’s *Caesars*, so the importance of Kelly’s argument cannot be understated. This suggests some Greek rhetorical education, though one which was not as extensive as, for example, Libanius or Gregory’s.

²⁰⁰ Fornara 1992, 420-424; Kelly 2009, 161. Fornara stated that Ammianus’s references to many Greek authors were ‘mostly ornamental and derivative’ (1992, 426-427).

²⁰¹ Wright 1921, 321.

Aristophanes and Demosthenes, but it is clear that Homer and Plato were the most significant.²⁰²

Overall, we can see from this discussion that Homer, Hesiod, Euripides, Thucydides, Demosthenes, and Plato were the most commonly cited and alluded to, suggesting that they were studied and read frequently. This discussion also confirms the centrality of Homer in education. Homer, particularly the *Iliad* and its first ten books, had become a cultural touchstone and was cited by each of our authors, as well as having a large presence in the papyri. Homer was the central pivot, the educator of Greece.²⁰³ As Bouffartigue stated, not having read Homer was akin to illiteracy.²⁰⁴ We can also see how important Plato was, if not as a philosopher, certainly as a prose writer: he had a significant presence in each of the fourth century authors we discussed. Euripides and Hesiod, too, were shown to have been important authors, while Thucydides and Demosthenes were cited and used often. Later writers such as Philostratus and Plutarch may not have reached canonical status in the same way Homer and Plato had, but we can see they were read widely and used in the fourth century.

There was a remarkable consistency in the authors and, indeed, texts which were studied and read in the fourth century. While there is some divergence (Basil focused on the *Odyssey*, for example), we find the same few authors consistently cited and alluded to. This is more striking when we consider the similarity between the most commonly cited authors in the fourth century and the earlier lists of Quintilian and Dio. Homer, Hesiod, Demosthenes, Thucydides, Euripides and Plato had become a curriculum, canonical.

We must be careful, however, in emphasising that this represents the broad outline of reading habits. As Norman argued, the list of Libanius's references would not necessarily be the same for all sophists in the fourth century, or even entirely representative of Libanius's attitudes towards the material. Himerius showed more engagement with lyric poetry, odd for the time, due to his own poetic style and aims.²⁰⁵ Indeed, he was explicit that Homer was not enough for him, despite his extensive engagement with and allusions to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and that he favoured the lyric

²⁰² Eunap. *VS.* 456; 462; 482.

²⁰³ Plato, *Resp.* 606e.

²⁰⁴ Bouffartigue 1992, 144.

²⁰⁵ Norman 1964, 158-9; Barnes 1987, 206.

poets: Anacreon, Alcaeus, Simonides, Pindar and Sappho are often cited.²⁰⁶ He also favoured Plutarch and Menander more than the majority of those we have discussed.²⁰⁷ However, there is still benefit in taking an account of the allusions and references available in an author's work: it enables us to discern which were the basic texts in Greek rhetorical education. Constant reference to a few authors and texts suggest what was central and what would be recognizable for an audience: no writer would allude to something particularly obscure and they would score no points by referencing something abstruse. They would, rather, benefit from knowing those key texts and references which had become part of the cultural milieu and language, as it enabled both writer and audience to demonstrate their high level of education. It was necessarily a shared experience, based on commonly held knowledge.

2.5 The education of 'culture heroes'

Thus far, our discussion has primarily focused on prominent fourth century writers. However, we need to assess to what extent we can accept the works of Libanius, Julian, Gregory and others discussed as representative of the whole of Greek rhetorical education. We also need to discuss what a 'typical' student experience might entail (if, indeed, there is such a thing) and how this compares to the testimonies of Julian, Gregory and their peers. This will be done through a discussion of the education of our 'culture heroes', including the locations and period of study. This will be compared to the evidence about 'typical' students from Libanius's school letters and speeches. A discussion of fees will also be included, relevant to the socio-economic status of these students.

There are a number of characteristics common to 'culture heroes'. The majority commenced their studies in their hometown or nearby, an experience which seems to have been common to all students. Gregory's preliminary studies took place in Nazianzus, while Basil studied with his father, a local teacher, in Neocaesarea. Augustine studied in Thagaste, Libanius in Antioch, and Eunapius in Sardis.²⁰⁸ Himerius's father was the rhetor Ameinias, and it would be reasonable to suggest that he undertook his

²⁰⁶ Himerius, *Orr.* 69.5; 27.24-33; 28.1-2. Penella 2007, 15.

²⁰⁷ Bouffartigue 1992, 285.

²⁰⁸ GNaz. *Or.* 43.12; August. *Conf.* 1.9.14; Lib. *Or.* 1.4-5; Eunap. *VS.* 500.

initial studies in Prusias with his father.²⁰⁹ This was not uncommon; nor was it uncommon for students to then move to the nearest big city or educational centre to study rhetoric as a teenager. In 345/6, Gregory travelled to Caesarea with his brother Caesarius, where he first met Basil and his brother Gregory of Nyssa.²¹⁰ Libanius stayed in Antioch to study rhetoric, though his path was somewhat complicated: his first teacher, Ulpianus, died and Libanius, disliking the other rhetorical teachers, studied rhetoric with a grammarian for five years.²¹¹ Augustine studied at Madaurus, the nearest ‘university-town’.²¹² Eunapius differs slightly from this, apparently moving from Sardis to Athens for rhetorical studies.²¹³

One of the more striking aspects of the education of these ‘culture heroes’ was a tendency to undertake a tour of educational centres before settling at a major centre. Gregory, along with Caesarius, studied in both Caesarea Maritima and Alexandria following Cappadocian Caesarea.²¹⁴ Basil moved from Caesarea to Constantinople, where he studied under Libanius in the late 340s.²¹⁵ In total, Gregory studied in five places, while Basil studied in four, and Augustine in three.

Even those figures who did not ‘tour’ as extensively as Gregory of Nazianzus still travelled for education, usually quite far. They moved from their hometown to a more renowned city, with a coterie of prominent teachers. This is the most significant aspect: culture heroes start their education like the majority by studying in their birthplace before moving to the nearest big city for further study. Familiar even now, however, these ‘culture heroes’ tend to go further than this and continue their education: they move on to one (or more) of the most prominent educational centres. In the fourth century, these were Athens, Alexandria and Antioch, with Constantinople and Nicomedia also gaining in status (further discussed below). Berytus, too, was quickly becoming celebrated as the home of law studies. So, we see in the late 340s Gregory moving from Alexandria, where his brother Caesarius stayed to study medicine, to Athens, the first city of rhetoric. Basil

²⁰⁹ Barnes 1987, 210.

²¹⁰ GNaz. *Or.* 43.13; 7.6. Gregory of Nyssa was also taught for a time by Basil in Caesarea, and did not travel extensively for study (*Ep.* 13; Ludlow 2015, 85).

²¹¹ Lib. *Or.* 1.8-9.

²¹² August. *Conf.* 2.3.5; cf. Brown 2000, 9.

²¹³ Eunap. *VS.* 485.

²¹⁴ GNaz. *Or.* 7.6; Elm 2012, 23.

²¹⁵ GNaz. *Or.* 43.14. Socrates and Sozomen both stated that Gregory, with Basil, was a student of Libanius at Antioch, though there is no other evidence for this, Socr. *HE.* 4.26; Soz. *HE.* 6.17.

joined him soon after.²¹⁶ Eunapius studied in Athens from 362 for five years before he returned to Sardis at nineteen.²¹⁷ Libanius had studied in Athens, where he possibly met Himerius, who had travelled from Prusias to study.²¹⁸ Athens was still the centre of rhetorical education.

Studying in prominent centres also meant access to some of the most famous rhetoricians and sophists. Basil, as mentioned, had studied under Libanius. In Athens, it is likely that both he and Gregory studied under Prohaeresius, the celebrated sophist who also taught Eunapius and Himerius.²¹⁹ Eunapius had been taught by the Neoplatonist Chrysanthius of Sardis as a boy.²²⁰ Prohaeresius himself had moved from Armenia to Antioch at eighteen to study ‘for a long time’ under Ulpian, before travelling to Athens where he studied under Julian of Caesarea.²²¹ Libanius, meanwhile, studied mainly under Diophantus, though he also took classes with Ephiaphianus and Prohaeresius.²²²

Travelling to a prominent university town far from your hometown or native country was not an experience unique to culture heroes, though. There were plenty of students who travelled to Athens and studied under Prohaeresius or Himerius, or to Antioch for Libanius. However, it does seem that our culture heroes tended to study in these centres for an extended period. The most striking example of this is Gregory: after studying in Caesarea, Caesarea Maritima and Alexandria for approximately three years, he spent ten years in Athens.²²³ Basil spent around five years in Athens, as did Libanius and Eunapius.²²⁴ As we shall see, this is well above the average amount of time spent on rhetorical education.

²¹⁶ GNaz. *Or.* 7.6; 43.14. Gregory makes it clear that he had established himself in Athens prior to Basil’s arrival, and used his influence to prevent Basil from undergoing the traditional hazing, *Or.* 43.16.

²¹⁷ Banchich 1996, 304, 307. Goulet 1980 argued against this traditional dating and suggested Eunapius did not arrive in Athens until autumn 364, because Prohaeresius did not teach following Julian’s rescript (1980, 61–62). However, see Banchich’s convincing argument that Prohaeresius continued to teach privately, and thus that the traditional dating of Eunapius’s time in Athens is to be accepted (Banchich 1987, 165; 1993, 10).

²¹⁸ Lib. *Or.* 1.14; Eunap. *VS.* 485; Himerius, *Orr.* 10.20; 41.2. Penella 2007, 6.

²¹⁹ Gregory only says that his instructors were well known, *Or.* 43.22, though Watts notes a suggestive epigram on Prohaeresius (*Epitaphia.* 5; 2006, 63 n.67). Rousseau (1994, 31) suggests Basil also studied under Himerius. *Soz. HE.* 6.17; *Socr. HE.* 4.26.

²²⁰ Eunap. *VS.* 500.

²²¹ ‘χρόνον οὐκ ὀλίγον’, Eunap. *VS.* 487. Watts (2006, 49n.3) suggests that this indicates less than ten years.

²²² Lib. *Or.* 1.16. Eunapius contradicted this (*VS.* 495).

²²³ Ruether argues for ten years (2003, 19) while Elm states he arrived in 348/9 and stayed for ‘nearly a decade’ (2012, 23).

²²⁴ Basil left in 355 before Gregory, *Or.* 43.24. Van Dam (2002, 160) argues he stayed for ‘several’ years and left in 355, while Rousseau (1994, 40) says he stayed for ‘at least five’.

Linked to this is the purpose of these extended studies, which is seen in both the explicit statements but also their career paths. Many of our culture heroes went on to teach, if only for a short time. After Athens, Basil taught in Nicomedia for a short period, before pursuing the ascetic life in Pontus.²²⁵ His brother, Gregory of Nyssa, also taught rhetoric, despite Gregory of Nazianzus's pleas.²²⁶ Gregory of Nazianzus himself also taught rhetoric for a short time upon his return to Nazianzus, before his ordination and a life largely spent in the church hierarchy. Libanius and Himerius had successful careers as teachers of rhetoric in educational centres, while Eunapius and Augustine also taught.²²⁷

That Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil were employed as teachers, if only for short period, suggests that extended education was viewed as preparation for this career.²²⁸ This is also apparent in the careers of our other culture heroes. That is not to say, however, that all rhetorical teachers were 'culture heroes' or, indeed, that all those who spent five plus years studying at a centre were either. This is not an equation in which a tour of schools plus five years in Athens plus time spent as a teacher equals the status of 'culture hero'. However, it is striking and there are undoubtedly remarkable similarities in the paths our 'culture heroes' took; it becomes clearer as to what qualities and characteristics contributed to the making of a 'culture hero'. Other qualities of course also contribute, not least of which is talent, and the linked preservation of their work. All those figures discussed have works which have survived. While the survival of sources might be considered somewhat indiscriminate, the majority were copied and preserved for a reason, usually the quality of their writing, which can be linked to their extended education under the guidance of eminent teachers in prominent educational centres. This is something of circular argument: culture heroes are those whose work has survived, but this text has survived due to their great education. Of course, there are exceptions: Themistius is a prominent figure of the fourth century and should be considered a 'culture hero', but he did not attend rhetorical studies in Athens or a similar city, or for such an extended period. Indeed, he wrote an entire speech arguing against the trend of students leaving for Athens and explaining his own rhetorical education in a small town in Pontus, possibly Neocaesarea.²²⁹ This involved some travel from Paphlagonia: his father, himself

²²⁵ Lib. *Ep.* N19.2.

²²⁶ GNaz. *Ep.* 11.

²²⁷ Wright 1921, 319; Brown 2000, 15; Penella 2007, 2.

²²⁸ Himerius suggests as much: *Orr.* 10.17; 54.6.

²²⁹ Them. *Or.* 27.332. Perhaps an example of talent overcoming circumstance. Vandervoel suggests Themistius undertook rhetorical studies in Neocaesarea from the normal age of 12/13, before philosophy at

a philosopher who taught Themistius in Constantinople,²³⁰ sent him there, evidently trusting the talents of the unnamed rhetor.²³¹ Like our other ‘culture heroes’, Themistius went on to teach in Nicomedia, possibly Ancyra and then Constantinople, with a focus on philosophy rather than rhetoric.²³²

There are also those students who likely did follow a similar path to Gregory, Basil and Libanius, who studied in a renowned city to a high level, but are not considered part of this elite group and whose works have not survived (if there were any).²³³ There are a set of qualities common to those discussed, and combined with talent we can start to define a ‘culture hero’. It is a combination of factors – a tour of rhetorical schools, a long period of time spent at one or more centres of education with eminent teachers, an aspiration to teaching and writing, and a degree of talent that ensures preservation – which makes a ‘culture hero’.

2.5.1 Julian’s education

Thus far Julian’s education has been excluded from the discussion on culture heroes. This may seem odd due to his reputation as a man of great education and culture. However, his education and status are different to those of the other figures discussed, and deserves to be taken separately.

Julian’s early education was supervised by Mardonius and Bishop Eusebius in Nicomedia. They moved upon Eusebius’s transfer to the see of Constantinople, after which he was sent with his half-brother Gallus to Macellum in Cappadocia by Constantius.²³⁴ Julian took a dim view of the move. He claimed he was ‘dragged’ from

15/16. He may have continued to study rhetoric alongside philosophy, but it seems he spent less time than our other ‘culture heroes’ devoted to rhetoric (1995, 36-37).

²³⁰ *Demegoria Constantii*, 23a; Vanderspoel 1995, 37. In his funeral oration, Themistius said philosophy was his inheritance, and described his father’s devotion to philosophy (*Or.* 20).

²³¹ *Them. Or.* 27.333. It is possible that he was taught by Basil’s father: Vanderspoel 1995, 34-35.

²³² *Them. Or.* 24; Vanderspoel 1995, 42-44, 48.

²³³ For example, Celsus 3 (PLRE I: 193-194) was a student of Libanius who also studied in Athens with Basil and went on to study in Constantinople under Themistius, where he also enrolled in the Senate. He taught rhetoric there, and eventually became governor of Cilicia, Syria and Syriarch. Henck 2001, 178.

²³⁴ *Jul. Misopog.* 252c; *Ep. ad SPQ Ath.* 271b-c. Described by Sozomen, *HE.* 5.2. It is debated whether Julian stayed at Macelleum between 342-48 or 344-50. Browning favours the latter date (1975, 39), but this limits the possibility of Julian having met or had notes from the lectures of Libanius in Nicomedia.

the schools at a young age, and was imprisoned in Macellum, with little company.²³⁵ He stayed there with Gallus for six years, possibly under the guidance of Bishop George and his extensive library.²³⁶ He was then allowed to study in Constantinople and Nicomedia, where he undertook rhetorical studies with Nicocles and Hecebolius, whilst surreptitiously accessing the lectures of Libanius.²³⁷ He also attended the lectures of Themistius, at this time chair of philosophy in Constantinople.²³⁸ After the appointment of Gallus as Caesar in 351, Julian was allowed to spend a short time studying with Neoplatonists in Pergamum and Ephesus, namely Aedesius, Chrysanthius, Eusebius of Myndus, and Maximus of Ephesus, and was introduced to theurgy and initiated into the Mysteries.²³⁹ In 355, after being called to court following the fall of Gallus, Julian was permitted to continue his rhetorical studies in Athens, thanks to the intervention of the empress Eusebia, presented as a kind benefactor by Julian.²⁴⁰ Thus, Julian was at Athens with Basil and Gregory, who memorably, and disparagingly, described Julian as a student.²⁴¹ He also met Priscus, ex-student of Aedesius, at Athens, who would become a close friend, and Maximus, who would be present at his death.²⁴² Though Julian does not mention his teachers in Athens, it is possible that Himerius taught him, and perhaps also

²³⁵ ἀπαγαγόντες, *Jul. Ep. ad SPQ Ath.* 271b; 274a suggests that Constantius visited them once during this period. Eunapius described eunuchs watching over the boys at this time, ensuring their Christian education, *VS.* 473. Libanius omitted any mention of Macellum in his funeral oration for Julian.

²³⁶ Julian sent two letters requesting this library after George's death, and describes their contents, *Epp.* 23 and 38. *GNaz. Or.* 4.23; *Sozom. HE* 5.2.

²³⁷ It is unclear why Julian and Gallus were permitted to leave Macellum; Bowersock suggests they were judged 'safe' after such a long period of exile (1978, 27). *Lib. Or.* 15.27 praises Nicocles, while 18.12 disparages Hecebolius, with whom he was feuding. Julian used an intermediary to access the lectures of Libanius after Constantius sent him to Nicomedia, *Or.* 18.13-15. Julian made no mention of Nicocles, but wrote to Hecebolius, *Ep.* 63.

²³⁸ *Jul. Ep ad Them.* 257d.

²³⁹ Julian claimed he was kept in Milan for seven months in 351 (*Ep. ad SPQ Ath.* 273a). Eunap. *VS.* 474-475. Smith 1995, 29-30. Libanius suggests (*Or.* 18.19-21.) that Julian returned to Nicomedia at this time also, though Bouffartigue (1992, 45) doubts this.

²⁴⁰ *Jul. Ep. ad SPQ Ath.* 274a; *Or.* 3.118b-c. Julian described the danger he was in at this time, *Ep. ad Them.* 259c. Ammianus described Julian's salvation at the hands of Eusebia (21.6.4) but at 15.8.3 presents Eusebia as more politically engaged and canny when she intervened to allow Julian to study at Athens and aided his elevation to Caesar, an image slightly different to Julian's. Ammianus also describes Eusebia conniving to prevent Julian's wife Helena from having a child (16.10.18-19). The contradictory image of Eusebia presented in Ammianus is discussed by Tougher 2000. Tougher 1998 suggests that Eusebia was actually a woman cooperating with her husband's wishes (597) and was cast as Julian's advocate by Constantius (598).

²⁴¹ Gregory described Julian as a man with shifty eyes, unsteady feet, ridiculous facial expressions, unrestrained laughter and breathless, excited speech, *Or.* 5.23-24. Julian may have met Basil at this time, as he later invited him to court, *Ep.* 26. Libanius (*Or.* 18.29-30) described Julian's stay at Athens as one marked by Julian's superior learning, in which he impressed all and ended up instructing others. The similarities between this and Libanius's own time in Athens (*Or.* 1.17) have been noted by Norman 1969, 297n.c.

²⁴² Julian wrote to Priscus from Gaul, *Epp.* 1, 2. Eunap. *VS.* 477-478; *Amm. Marc.* 25.3.23.

Prohaeresius.²⁴³ Julian always looked fondly upon his time in Athens, describing the city in glowing terms.²⁴⁴ To his distress, he was recalled to Milan after a matter of months and his formal education ended. He was appointed Caesar on 6 November 355.²⁴⁵

There are a number of ways in which Julian's experience differs from that of our other culture heroes. Despite studying in a number of places, including Athens, and studying with prominent teachers, Julian only spent about seven years studying rhetoric and philosophy.²⁴⁶ This is by no means a short period of time and his education was undoubtedly extensive and to a high level. However, compared to ten or more years spent on rhetoric by those discussed – his contemporaries Gregory and Basil each spent five plus years in Athens alone, while he spent only a few months – it becomes clear that his education was actually quite different and fragmented.

His status as imperial prince is a significant factor. Being a prominent member of the imperial family (heir apparent, even) would have some effect on one's education and experience, particularly in Athens following the execution of Gallus. Even if Gregory's description of Julian at Athens is exaggerated, it implies that Julian was noticeable and noticed; he drew some attention, despite Libanius's assertion otherwise.²⁴⁷ His imperial status also interrupted his studies as he was at the mercy of Constantius or Eusebia. His position and the decisions of Constantius certainly curtailed his studies: he described his grief at being forced to leave Athens, and regret at not having learned more; it is likely had he not been made Caesar these studies would have continued.²⁴⁸

While Julian's education was in some ways unlike that of our culture heroes, it was also unusual in that it differed from other imperial figures. Gallus, for example, could be directly contrasted with Julian: half-brothers who both survived the slaughter of 337 and went on to serve as Caesar under their cousin. We know relatively little about Gallus's education, though Ammianus claimed he knew both Latin and Greek.²⁴⁹ It seems

²⁴³ It is unclear whether Julian studied under Prohaeresius, though it seems likely they would have encountered one another in Athens before their correspondence in 361/2, *Jul. Ep.* 14. Eunap. *VS.* 494. Elm 2012, 90-1.

²⁴⁴ *Jul. Ep. ad Them.* 362d; *Ep. ad SPQ Ath.* 269d-270a.

²⁴⁵ He described how he wept to leave Athens in *Ep. ad SPQ Ath.* 275a. It was thanks to Eusebia, again, that he was appointed Caesar, *Or.* 3.121a-c.

²⁴⁶ Approximately 348-355, though he was confined in Milan between 354 and summer 355 while Constantius deliberated over his fate.

²⁴⁷ *Lib. Or.* 18.11.

²⁴⁸ *Jul. Ep. ad SPQ Ath.* 275a; *Ep. ad Them.* 266d.

²⁴⁹ *Amm.* 14.1.9. Gallus was born in Italy to a Roman mother.

Gallus was initially sent to Tralles for his preliminary studies, while Julian studied in Nicomedia.²⁵⁰ However, they both were sent to Macellum and were presumably both taught by Bishop George.²⁵¹ However, while Julian continued his education upon returning to Constantinople in 348/9, Gallus went to court, married Constantina and was made Caesar in 351. Libanius claimed Gallus preferred not to continue his studies. This follows Julian's own statement that rhetoric and philosophy, with the gods, saved him, while Gallus suffered from the brothers' apparent seclusion at Macellum.²⁵²

We know more about the education of Constantius. Ammianus claimed that Constantius had aspirations to learning, though adds that he was not equipped to be an orator.²⁵³ This is also the impression given by Julian. In his first panegyric, Julian described Constantius's education, but deals in general virtues rather than specifics. Julian did mention the literary studies of Constantius, though implied they were somewhat perfunctory and not suited to his character or way of life.²⁵⁴ Rather, Julian focussed his praise on Constantius's physical and more practical training.²⁵⁵ This reflects what Eusebius tells us about Constantius's education: Constantine took care to appoint both religious and secular teachers for his sons, while they also studied military science, politics and law.²⁵⁶ This was standard for imperial heirs: for example, Constantius's older brother Crispus had been taught by Lactantius at Trier, and Gratian would be taught by Ausonius at court. Julian and Gallus suffered in this respect due to the intrigue surrounding the deaths of their father and other male relatives and their subsequent precarious position. Constantine, too, had likely been taught by a tutor at court, possibly

²⁵⁰ Julian claimed that Gallus was recalled from exile in Tralles before being sent to Macellum, *Ep. ad SPQ Ath.* 271b. Socrates (*HE.* 3.1) claimed he had been in Ephesus.

²⁵¹ Gregory of Nazianzus was certainly under the impression that Julian and Gallus were taught together in Macellum and he described their efforts to construct a shrine to the martyr Mamas, *Or.* 4.25-27.

²⁵² *Lib. Or.* 18.11; *Jul. Ep. ad SPQ Ath.* 271d-272a.

²⁵³ *Amm.* 21.16.4.

²⁵⁴ *Jul. Or.* 1.11d. Constantius's education apparently gave him 'courage, justice, temperance and wisdom' (*Or.* 1.10c), while his looks and health benefited from education (*Or.* 1.16a). *Or.* 2.50c mentions that Constantius studied Homer.

²⁵⁵ For example, the military training such as dancing (*χορεία*), running in heavy armour and riding, *Or.* 1.11b.

²⁵⁶ *Euseb. VC.* 4.51. Downey suggested Constantine's dedication to his sons' learning came from his awareness that his own education had not been thorough (1957b, 57). Henck suggested Arborius was a tutor of Constantius (2001, 172). Sozomen outlines a similar curriculum for Gallus and Julian at Macellum, with an emphasis on Scriptural study aided by suitably pious men (*HE.* 5.2).

one of the philosophers at Diocletian's court.²⁵⁷ Eusebius praised the excellence of his rhetorical education, though elsewhere described him as having little education.²⁵⁸

We might consider Marcus Aurelius a reasonable counterpoint to Julian, as both were (and are) perceived to be educated and cultured emperors. Both Marcus and Julian shared philosophic interests and their literary output attests to their learning. However, their education was quite different. Marcus spent a considerable time studying, though unlike Julian he was taught by several private tutors, in both Latin and Greek as the heir apparent, rather than publicly attending a school in, for example, Athens.²⁵⁹

It is clear that Julian does not fit neatly with either the imperial figures or with those 'culture heroes' discussed above. His education has more in common with the culture heroes than the imperial figures because he was not raised at court, so was free (to an extent) to study in a number of centres just as Gregory and Basil had. However, his status as a member of the imperial family, and the circumstances surrounding his upbringing, set him apart, from both the culture heroes and the imperial heirs. Despite this, both Smith and Bouffartigue have suggested that his education was more conventional than we might expect. Smith argued his intermittent attendance did not compare with the years spent in study by Basil or Gregory, and further, the evidence we have for his philosophical curriculum suggests 'standard school-procedure' rather than in-depth specialist knowledge. Bouffartigue argued similarly: while Julian was certainly educated, he was not learned due to his relatively brief studies. Bouffartigue referred to him as 'à l'honnête homme', stating he was 'éclairé sur tout, mais spécialiste de rien.'²⁶⁰ Julian himself was aware of his limitations.²⁶¹ It follows that perhaps Julian had more in common with the 'typical' students than either the 'culture heroes' or his imperial peers. We now turn to a discussion of what a 'typical' or 'average' student looked like in the fourth century.

²⁵⁷ Barnes argued that 'by the standards of his time' he was an educated man (1996, 74). The quote is in the context of a discussion of Constantine's *Speech to the Assembly of the Saints*.

²⁵⁸ Euseb. *VC*. 19.2; *Origo* 2.

²⁵⁹ Marcus was taught rhetoric by Aninus Macer, Caninius Celer, Herodes Atticus and Fronto, and studied philosophy with Apollonius. Birley 1987, 62-3, 69.

²⁶⁰ Smith 1995, 34-5. Bouffartigue 1992, 675.

²⁶¹ Jul. *Ep. ad Them.* 266c-d.

2.5.2 A 'typical' education

It is difficult to determine exactly what a 'typical' student was, or what a 'typical' education involved – even if the term 'typical' is even appropriate. However, we can determine some common factors, largely based on information from Libanius; his school letters are particularly valuable because they give insight into the education of a wide range of students, including otherwise unknowable students. This corpus includes letters of recommendation and progress updates to families, as well as correspondence with ex-students.

The most striking difference between the 'culture heroes' and more typical students is the length of time spent on rhetorical studies. Whilst it is difficult to accurately assess the length of time spent on a course for a number of reasons, we can come to some reasonable conclusions.²⁶² It is clear that the majority of students did not study rhetoric for ten years, and were unlikely to spend five years either.²⁶³ The basics of a rhetorical course with Libanius (he is comparable to other rhetors and sophists in this respect) took three years, during which time students would learn theory, study prose works and start the *progymnasmata*. The fourth and fifth years were used to reinforce the 'student's ability to compose discourses', and in the sixth year, a student might be promoted to assistant teacher.²⁶⁴ However, few finished this full course. On average, rhetorical education lasted between two and five years, though some would study for less time and some for more. Few were spending over five years.

If we examine the attendance of some of Libanius's students, we can determine more clearly what a more typical rhetorical education might involve. In an oration meant to address his critics, Libanius pointed to a number of students whom he saw as successful, and giving evidence of his effective teaching. Among those alluded to were Albanus and Strategius, sons of Agesilaus of Ancyra.²⁶⁵ Libanius had previously written to Albanus that his success had silenced the critics of his school.²⁶⁶ Libanius remarked that in reputation both brothers outshone their father and their uncle Achillius, *principales*

²⁶² Criore 2007b, 176-9. Criore states the length of attendance cannot be 'tidily determined' in part because letters of Libanius are not necessarily a complete record, and because we cannot always assume continuous study.

²⁶³ Criore 2007b, 179.

²⁶⁴ Criore 2001b, 56.

²⁶⁵ *Lib. Or.* 62.37. Dated to 382, probably to an audience of 'local literati' and with the intention of reaching a wider audience (Norman 2000, 87-8). Albanus ii (Seeck 1906, 47). Strategius ii (Seeck 1906, 284).

²⁶⁶ *Lib. Ep.* C8.

of Ancyra. Albanus entered public service in Ancyra, delivered an apparently much-admired panegyric to the *Comes Orientis* Domitius Modestus, spoke in the law courts of Ancyra and was also part of the retinue of the governor of Galatia.²⁶⁷ His brother Strategius, meanwhile, was employed in public service in Ancyra, apparently quite successfully.²⁶⁸

As Cribiore noted, that Albanus is put forward as an example of a successful ex-student is striking given his relatively short attendance.²⁶⁹ While Festugière estimated an attendance of four years (autumn 355-359), Cribiore argues for an attendance of only two.²⁷⁰ The attendance of Strategius was shorter: he left school before the start of his second year after the death of his father in 356/7.²⁷¹ This was a common reason for short attendance.²⁷² Pressure from family to leave was also a common reason: Albanus suffered because his mother and uncle preferred him to work than study. We also see this in the case of Pandorus. Pandorus apparently had great promise (he had interned with a governor upon the recommendation of Libanius during summer 362) but his father recalled him home at the end of his second year (in 363) because he thought his son had learned enough rhetoric to start a career. Libanius attempted to persuade him to allow Pandorus one more year of study, even sending back the donkeys meant as payment.²⁷³

Here we see the different attitudes towards rhetorical education and its purpose: Libanius would always argue for longer attendance, would always see the goal as perfecting the art of rhetoric (betraying his ‘culture hero’ sensibilities), while for many families the purpose of rhetorical education was to ensure a career, quickly, which often meant a shorter attendance in which the student acquired enough rhetoric to get by – something of a veneer – especially in such cases as Pandorus when the family was poor.²⁷⁴ This difference can also be seen in the culture heroes, many of whom, as mentioned, went on to teaching rather than positions in the administration or public service.

²⁶⁷ Lib. *Epp.* C7; B127; C12. His panegyric was admired by Priscianus, Cribiore 2007b, 146; 182.

²⁶⁸ Lib. *Ep.* C9.

²⁶⁹ Cribiore 2007b, 182. Lib. *Ep.* 180.

²⁷⁰ Festugière 1956, 518; Cribiore 2007b, 182, Appendix 2.

²⁷¹ Festugière 1956, 520. Lib. *Ep.* 536.

²⁷² Cribiore 2007b, 179-180.

²⁷³ Lib. *Epp.* C157, 158.

²⁷⁴ Lib. *Ep.* C157.

Two other notable students of Libanius, students with whom he had a lasting relationship or were the subject of several letters, are Titianus and Eusebius.²⁷⁵ Titianus studied with Libanius in the late 350s, for a discontinuous period of time. While Festugière argued for an attendance of eight years, from 357-362 (with the possibility of another attendance in 365), Criboire calculated an attendance of little over three years, considering the intermittent nature of his attendance.²⁷⁶ He was recalled home in 359 due to the ill-health of his father, apparently having made good progress.²⁷⁷ He returned in the winter, having read a great deal under his father's tutelage, but in 360 he returned home again.²⁷⁸ He was also absent from Antioch to attend a wedding in 358, and his father kept him home during that same summer also, fearing the temptations of Antioch's spectacles.²⁷⁹ The lure of amusements and pleasures, particularly the theatre, were constant for students, as Himerius warned.²⁸⁰ There seems to have been some tension between Libanius and Titianus's father over the scope of his education.

In a letter dated to 388, Libanius stated that Eusebius studied with him the longest.²⁸¹ However, it is difficult to calculate the length of his attendance, particularly because Libanius's letters concerning him are all from 388. Libanius referred to Eusebius as *koryphaios*, the head of the chorus, and as a particularly hard-working student.²⁸² This suggests a longer attendance – Petit argued students became *koryphaioi* after four or five years – but it cannot be determined surely.²⁸³ Eusebius also taught the class when Libanius was sick, and Libanius had ambitions for him to take up teaching as a career, though he instead became a lawyer and harboured ambitions to enter the Constantinopolitan Senate.²⁸⁴

Counter to these (relative) success stories based on shorter attendance is Hyperechius of Ancyra, whose father, Maximus, was a wealthy decurion; he was also the brother-in-law of Strategius. Hyperechius had initially been a student under Libanius in

²⁷⁵ Eusebius 25 (PLRE I: 305). Titianus was the son of Acacius 7 (PLRE I: 6-7), a poet and rhetor with whom Libanius often corresponded.

²⁷⁶ Festugière 1956, 521, 179; Criboire 2007b, Appendix 2.

²⁷⁷ Lib. *Epp.* C194; N27.

²⁷⁸ Lib. *Epp.* C196, C197, C199.

²⁷⁹ Lib. *Epp.* C188, C189.

²⁸⁰ Himerius, *Or.* 69.7.

²⁸¹ Lib. *Ep.* C78.

²⁸² *κορυφαῖος*, Lib. *Ep.* C80.

²⁸³ Petit 1957, 88.

²⁸⁴ Lib. *Epp.* C78, C81.

Nicomedia, but travelled to Antioch in 355, where he stayed until 360.²⁸⁵ This is quite a lengthy attendance, though it may have been discontinuous.²⁸⁶ What is most striking about Hyperechius is his struggle to acquire a position or embark on a career after leaving Antioch, especially when we consider the number of letters Libanius wrote in order to help him.²⁸⁷ Libanius advised Hyperechius to accept any official ranked post he was offered.²⁸⁸ It seems Hyperechius became unhappy with Libanius and a rift ensued.²⁸⁹ Eventually he joined the revolt of Procopius and likely died in 366.²⁹⁰

The unsuccessful career of Hyperechius suggests that longer attendance did not always guarantee success or ‘culture hero’ status; nor did countless letters of recommendation from Libanius. There has been speculation about the cause of Hyperechius’s failure to find a suitable post: perhaps he was, despite his lengthy attendance and connections, actually a man with little talent and quite ordinary.²⁹¹

We can see from this discussion that an attendance similar to Gregory or Basil’s at Athens was not a choice the majority of students made, and that those who did stay in one centre for an extended period of time were not always guaranteed success – indeed, Libanius pointed to students who stayed with him for two years or less, rather than those who had attended for longer. We can also see that while Julian’s education did not mirror that of the other ‘culture heroes’, it did not entirely reflect the paths of more typical students either. Like Titianus, it was discontinuous and cut short due to family pressure. Like many of those discussed, it was also shorter than that of the ‘culture heroes’. Julian also studied in a number of places, and while Hyperechius had studied in Nicomedia, it was not common for the average student to extend their education in order to study in more eminent cities.²⁹² Julian’s education in many ways was unique to him; his education shared characteristics with both the ‘culture heroes’, imperial figures and the typical students, but did not fit any one exactly.

²⁸⁵ Festugière 1956, 519. Hyperechius (PLRE I: 449-450).

²⁸⁶ Cribiore 2007b, Appendix 2.

²⁸⁷ Cribiore refers to a ‘flood’ of letters, (2007b, 223).

²⁸⁸ Lib. *Ep.* N117.

²⁸⁹ Lib. *Ep.* C116.

²⁹⁰ Amm. 26.8.4-5. Cribiore 2007b, 223-225.

²⁹¹ Cribiore 2007b, 224. Festugière 1956, 149, though, notes Hyperechius’s talents, perhaps influenced by Libanius’s many letters of praise.

²⁹² Cribiore 2007b, 179.

2.6 The costs of education

One of the main reasons behind a shorter attendance, then as now, was money and the cost of education. Of our culture heroes, we know of two who struggled with the costs associated with education, which not only meant fees to the teacher but also travel and board if one was going to a main centre rather than the local school. Augustine's family could not afford to send him to Carthage for further rhetorical training and he was only able to eventually study in Carthage thanks to the patronage of a local noble, Romanianus.²⁹³ Eunapius also described the poverty of Prohaeresius when he was studying at Athens: he and his friend Hephæstion had one cloak and one mantle between them which they took turns wearing, and had only a few threadbare rugs in their room.²⁹⁴

The other information we have about fees and the costs of education comes from disgruntled teachers. Libanius complained about not receiving his fee, stating he was long used to this treatment.²⁹⁵ Augustine, too, noted with surprise that students in Rome avoided payment.²⁹⁶ Libanius mentioned this same treatment in an earlier speech, claiming that a student paid him or not as he chose. He noted that the number of non-contributors had increased, leading to idleness among these students. However, he implied that this was a situation of his own making, a policy in which he purposely considered their financial situation and did not exact fees from students who could not afford it. To his regret, many families took advantage of this generosity, even some of those families who could well afford the fees.²⁹⁷ Nor did Themistius take payment from his students.²⁹⁸ Libanius's attitude towards fiscally challenged families was lenient: he repeated that he did not mind waiving fees and described it as part of the teacher's lot, arguing that his income from fees was small as a result.²⁹⁹ That Themistius and Libanius could waive fees, and be largely gracious about this was because they did not rely on these fees primarily – as holders of official chairs, they were entitled to an imperial salary which was only supplemented by fees and gifts from students.³⁰⁰ However, that Libanius

²⁹³ August. *Conf.* 2.3.5-6; *C.Acad.* 2.2.3. Brown speculates that they were related, (2000, 9).

²⁹⁴ Eunap. *VS.* 487. That Gregory of Nyssa did not travel for his education, like Basil, might suggest some financial difficulty.

²⁹⁵ Lib. *Or.* 3.6; 9. Dated to late 387 by Norman 2000, 183.

²⁹⁶ August. *Conf.* 5.12.22. Apparently, this was not done in Carthage.

²⁹⁷ Lib. *Or.* 62.19-20.

²⁹⁸ Them. *Or.* 23.288c-d.

²⁹⁹ Lib. *Or.* 3.7; 31.30-31.

³⁰⁰ His assistants were entitled to a civic salary, though largely had to rely on fees and gifts. Libanius argued for a higher salary for his assistants, *Or.* 31. Kaster 1988, 114-5; Cribiore 2007b, 184-5. Cribiore 2015, 82 suggests this speech was successful.

portrayed so many families taking advantage of his leniency and willingness to waive fees is suggestive of the socio-economic status of his students, especially when we consider that the giving of gifts at holidays was a traditional expectation, if not obligatory.³⁰¹ Libanius mentioned boys who could not afford fees and families of good standing and learning who had fallen on hard times and could not pay fees.³⁰² He also noted the case of a student who, though an orphan, still paid Libanius. That he makes a point of this is telling of its rarity and implies that students in similar circumstances struggled financially.³⁰³

It is difficult to accurately assess the cost of rhetorical education, though it was likely high.³⁰⁴ Gratian's school law of 376 gives us some indication of fees as it set imperial salaries for teachers in Gaul: rhetoricians would receive 24 *annonae* (a multiple of a soldier's yearly ration, with one *annona* converting to 5 *solidi*) while grammarians received 12. Kaster concluded that this was a respectable salary.³⁰⁵ Diocletian's Edict on Maximum Prices of 301 is also informative, if problematic due to its prescriptive nature. It sets a rate of 250 *denarii* per pupil per month for rhetoricians, with grammarians receiving slightly less. This might represent less than what was paid in practice, as these rates were meant to counter inflation.³⁰⁶ There also seemed to be differences according to location, suggesting unsurprisingly that fees for rhetorical training in the celebrated centres would cost more than the local city.³⁰⁷ We cannot be sure these figures accurately represent the price actually paid, though they are suggestive of a generally good income for rhetoricians. Indeed, Eunapius wrote that Julianus of Cappadocia was able to build a house that contained a marble theatre and which was decorated with statues of his students, because he had so many students and received so much in fees.³⁰⁸ Philostratus, too, remarked that the yearly fees of Lollianus were equal to the cost of a shipload of

³⁰¹ Kaster 1988, 121; Cribiore 2007b, 188-9.

³⁰² *Lib. Orr.* 3.7; 31.29.

³⁰³ *Lib. Or.* 34.3. We might also sense a wry tone and a sly reference to those sons of well-off families who still do not pay their fees.

³⁰⁴ Cribiore 2007b, 185.

³⁰⁵ *CTh.* 13.3.11. Kaster 1988, 117.

³⁰⁶ *Ed.pret.* 7.66 as cited in Kaster 1988, 119.

³⁰⁷ Lollianus received 2000 dr. in Oxyrynchus while in Athens, Apollonius received 6000 (Kaster 1988, 116n.86).

³⁰⁸ *Eunap. VS.* 483. Watts 2006, 41.

grain.³⁰⁹ Further, he informs us that the imperial chair of rhetoric in Athens paid a salary of 10,000 drachmae.³¹⁰

A good, respectable income, though, usually meant high fees that could be difficult to pay for families, and we see that money was a motivating factor in students curtailing their rhetorical education, not only due to high fees but also in order to start earning themselves. While it is far from certain that Libanius's students were largely poor or struggled to pay fees – Albanus, for example, made a point of paying Libanius, and Hyperechius received his inheritance early³¹¹ – the fact that he discussed this in several orations implies it was not uncommon to have students who struggled financially. This is something we do not see with the culture heroes. There is no suggestion that Gregory or Basil's families struggled to send their sons to several cities for extended studies. Likewise, Julian never mentions the financial cost. Though, as noted, there were exceptions in Augustine and Prohaeresius, we can conclude that 'culture heroes', unlike the more typical students, were unconcerned with the financial burden: they could travel to Alexandria, Constantinople and study in Athens for upwards of five years without worry, and, as discussed, this was one of the markers of this group. Not only did they study for longer than average: they studied in several places, often at major cities with renowned teachers. They undoubtedly had talent, evidenced by their literary output, but they also benefited from the good financial status of their families and the educational opportunities this afforded. This was a path which was not open to all, and we get the impression that for many families, sending their sons to Antioch for even two years was something of a stretch.

2.7 Educational centres and their specialisations

The role that certain educational centres played, particularly Athens, has become clear from this discussion. The majority of those figures discussed had links to Athens, and studied there, often for an extended period. Athens was still the leading rhetorical centre, with a great reputation: it was an icon of *paideia*.³¹² Gregory of Nazianzus referred to it as

³⁰⁹ Philost. VS. 526-7.

³¹⁰ Philost. VS. 591.

³¹¹ Lib. *Epp.* C11, C109.

³¹² Wenzel 2010, 265.

the home of letters, as did Julian, who extolled the city's virtues at length.³¹³ Eunapius, too, presented Athens as the centre of the educational world, a city where the most intelligent and talented people congregated. Athens was a place which attracted students, based not only on its historical reputation but also due to its resident rhetoricians, such as Julianus of Cappadocia, Prohaeresius and Himerius.³¹⁴ We have seen this with our culture heroes: though they studied at other places, they largely found themselves drawn to Athens.³¹⁵ Athens in the fourth century was a city dominated by rhetoric: its schools and prominent sophists were its only draw as the Herulian attacks in the third century had negatively affected its general economic outlook.³¹⁶

Athens's dominance was something which both Libanius and Themistius railed against. Libanius was most relieved when it was decided a student would stay in Antioch rather than transfer to Athens.³¹⁷ The competition Athens presented was felt keenly.³¹⁸ Themistius, long-time resident of Constantinople,³¹⁹ spoke on the reputation of Athens and advised students not to be swayed by it. Rather, he told them to do as he did: study with the best teachers available, who might be found closer to home. He argued that those teaching in Athens were not necessarily the best in their fields, something that Libanius also found, to his disappointment.³²⁰

One of the most notable student experiences in Athens was the famous kidnapping. Gregory of Nazianzus provides the most vivid account of this, though it is described also by Libanius, Eunapius and Himerius.³²¹ An arriving student was picked up at the port by competing established students and marched through the market to the baths while being pushed, jeered at and threatened. Eventually it was revealed to be an initiation, and upon an oath of loyalty to a specific teacher, the new student was

³¹³ GNaz. *Or.* 43.14. Jul. *Or.* 3.118c, 119; *Ep ad SPQ Ath.* 268a.

³¹⁴ Lib. *Or.* 1.53 on the flow of students to Athens, and 1.82-3 on its reputation. Julianus apparently attracted students from all over the world, and Prohaeresius was such a draw and aggressive recruiter that several rival teachers banded together to have him exiled (Eunap. *VS.* 483, 488).

³¹⁵ Libanius described his longing for Athens after hearing tales of its greatness, (*Or.* 1.11). Himerius describes similar: *Or.* 10.20.

³¹⁶ Castrén 1994, 4-5; Watts 2006, 21, 24, 41-42. Frantz 1988 describes state of the Agora in the aftermath of the Herulian incursions (3-5, 13-14).

³¹⁷ Lib. *Epp.* C201, B127, B126.

³¹⁸ Lib. *Or.* 62.15.

³¹⁹ Themistius seems to have lived in the city from the 330s, though he also spent some time in Rome: *Or.* 23.298b; *Demegoria Constantii*, 21d.

³²⁰ Them. *Or.* 27; Lib. *Or.* 1.17.

³²¹ GNaz. *Or.* 43.15-16; Lib. *Or.* 1.16; Himerius, *Or.* 69.8. Julian does not mention this.

welcomed.³²² Apparently, this was done with the approval of the teachers, and in the case of Prohaeresius, assistance also.³²³ This demonstrates the level of competition there was between the teachers and schools, and also what was expected of students. This is also seen in the student riots, which take place with increasing regularity in the fourth century.³²⁴ These student riots were between the most dedicated (fanatical, even) students of rival teachers. They are described by Libanius, Himerius and Eunapius as normal occurrences, suggestive of their regularity. Libanius described a series of skirmishes and the ‘Great Riot’ of 339, which involved the majority of students, though he expediently refrained from fighting himself.³²⁵ Himerius was wounded in a show of academic violence, apparently the result of envy, which prompted a break in his teaching, while his students also engaged in such violence, resulting in some injuries and absences.³²⁶ He also reminded new students not to be distracted by the conflicts at the expense of their rhetorical training.³²⁷ Prohaeresius had also been involved in these activities, and Eunapius described a fight between the students of Julianus and his rival Aspines. The students of Aspines won, but subsequently filed a complaint with the proconsul, who arrested Julianus and his students. Charges and a trial were avoided only on the strength of a speech delivered by Prohaeresius.³²⁸

While kidnapping seems to be unique to Athens, violent behaviour was not confined to Athens. Augustine described similar events in Carthage, and legislation was published to counteract rioting in Rome.³²⁹ Libanius, though apparently never directly involved in riots in Athens, expressed his expectation that his students would fight on his behalf, and also his disappointment that they did not.³³⁰ Student riots and violence were also endemic in Alexandria, particularly in the fifth century.³³¹

³²² GNaz. *Or.* 43.16. The oath is mentioned by Libanius (*Or.* 1.16).

³²³ Eunapius (*VS.* 485) suggested Prohaeresius enlisted the help of a captain to aid with these kidnappings.

³²⁴ It does not seem to have happened with the same regularity in the third century, as Philostratus only mentioned one example, (*VS.* 587-88). Watts 2006, 42.

³²⁵ *Lib. Or.* 1.19-22; Eunap. *VS.* 483; Himerius, *Or.* 48.37.

³²⁶ Himerius, *Orr.* 69.1; 65.2. *Or.* 16 operates as a plea to quell the strife with oratory.

³²⁷ Himerius, *Or.* 21.1.

³²⁸ Eunap. *VS.* 483-85. Watts 2006, 50-51. The implications of this speech are discussed in chapter six.

³²⁹ August. *Conf.* 3.3.6; *CTh.* 14.9.1.

³³⁰ *Lib. Or.* 3.21-23.

³³¹ Watts (2006, 151-2) notes attacks on the Jewish community in 38 and on Christians in 248. In the fifth century, political and doctrinal disputes also involved students and teachers, such as the destruction of the Serapeum and the murder of Hypatia (Watts 2006, 197-99; Socr. *HE* 7.15).

Athens in the fourth century was particularly renowned for its rhetorical schools (though its Neoplatonists were also a draw), and benefited from its historic reputation. Other centres of rhetoric had to compete, particularly cities such as Nicomedia and Antioch. While Gregory of Nazianzus remarked that Caesarea was famed for its teaching, and Libanius boasted that his reputation encouraged students to remain at Nicomedia, they never reached the heights of Athens.³³² Nor did Antioch, despite Libanius's later best efforts. Antioch's status as a major city, and administrative, military and trading centre, which hosted the imperial family on several occasions, lent it a certain cachet. While it was something of a centre for rhetorical studies,³³³ its schools were not its main economic strength. Antioch was not a small city, in size or reputation, but in the fourth century, it, along with Caesarea and Nicomedia, was still largely considered a stop on the way to Athens and the extended study of rhetoric and philosophy. Libanius noted bitterly that there was little reward for students who studied rhetoric in Constantinople, Antioch or Nicomedia.³³⁴ Constantinople, too, had to compete with Athens. Libanius only had negative things to say about the city, in contrast to Nicomedia; he claimed that the city was morally bankrupt and students fled to Berytus or Athens because of it.³³⁵ This is contrary to Himerius's praise of the city as a centre of learning.³³⁶ Constantinople drew students and its status as the new capital and seat of the Eastern Senate gave it a certain prestige absent from the likes of Caesarea. The presence of Themistius (and possibly Himerius, for a time) certainly would not have harmed the reputation of the city, nor Constantius's concerted efforts to promote the city as a centre for learning.³³⁷

Cities such as Alexandria and Berytus were known for other subjects and were able to recruit students this way. Although Alexandria could compete with Athens and the other centres for its teaching of rhetoric and philosophy – the Museion, the Royal Library and later the Serapeum were certainly draws; its students included Origen, Clement and Synesius – it was also a centre for medicine, mathematics and science, as well as

³³² GNaz. *Or.* 43.13; Lib. *Or.* 1.53. Libanius thought well of Nicomedia, and it was considered a good city as Julian studied there. Libanius mentioned Caesarea as a rival to Antioch, *Or.* 31.43, dated to 361.

³³³ Ulpius enjoyed a reputation as an eminent teacher, as did Zenobius as official sophist and predecessor to Libanius.

³³⁴ Lib. *Or.* 62.15.

³³⁵ Lib. *Or.* 1.76. His contrast of Nicomedia and Constantinople is undoubtedly coloured by his own experience teaching in these cities.

³³⁶ Himerius, *Or.* 41.

³³⁷ *Demegoria Constantii* 20d-21a; Henck 2001, 177-178. It is not certain that Himerius taught at Constantinople 343-52, as Barnes argued (1987, 212). Penella is not convinced (2007, 3-4).

philosophy.³³⁸ Gregory studied there for a while, though his brother Caesarius stayed there longer, and studied geometry, astronomy, mathematics and medicine. He became a doctor and the court physician under both Constantius and Julian.³³⁹ Hypatia is also a prime example of Alexandria's educational prowess, and drew a great number of students.³⁴⁰ Meanwhile, Berytus was more specialised and became the main centre for legal studies. Though it seems to have hosted law students as early as the third century,³⁴¹ it was during the fourth that it flourished; Libanius witnessed many students leave Antioch for this city.³⁴²

Educational centres in the West also competed for students. Rome and Carthage were the main Western rhetorical centres, as noted by Augustine.³⁴³ This was something which Libanius was also aware of: he wrote letters to an ex-student in Rome asking him to return to teach in Antioch, and to help him stem the flow of students to Rome.³⁴⁴ Autun and Bordeaux were also major western centres of rhetoric, and nurtured a number of culture heroes, notably Eumenius and Ausonius. These centres, though, are outside the geographical remit of the present discussion.

We have already noted that one of the defining features of the culture heroes was their tendency to study at one (or more) of the most prominent educational centres. There were a number to choose from: Athens, Alexandria, Antioch, Nicomedia, Constantinople and Berytus were the most attractive and offered excellent educations in rhetoric, philosophy and other subjects, under eminent teachers, for a wide student base.³⁴⁵ Athens, though, was clearly the leader and outstripped the rest in the fourth century. As Watts stated, 'Athenian *paideia* placed one on yet a higher pedestal'.³⁴⁶ Its reputation alone secured its place as the major centre for rhetorical studies. Thus, we see many renowned teachers opening schools in Athens, competing for students and chairs, and students from

³³⁸ Lib. *Ep.* C45 mentions a student who travelled to Alexandria to study medicine. Julian mentioned that music was also studied in Alexandria, under Dioscorus (*Ep.* 49). Watts 2006, 154.

³³⁹ GNaz. *Or.* 7.7-8.

³⁴⁰ Watts 2006, 187.

³⁴¹ Hall 2004, 203. Gregory Thaumaturgus is the earliest documented law student of Berytus.

³⁴² Lib. *Ep.* B167. This development is discussed more fully in chapter four.

³⁴³ August. *Ep.* 118.2.9. Students also travelled to Rome to study law.

³⁴⁴ Lib. *Ep.* C151.

³⁴⁵ Libanius boasted about the variety of places his students had travelled from, (*Or.* 62.27-28). Eunapius suggested that students in Athens often studied with teachers from the same geographical area, (*VS.* 487). Himerius taught students from number of places: he mentions Egypt, the Caicus river and the Argaeus mountain (*Orr.* 69.1, 8-9; 14), Pamphylia and Bithynian Prusias (*Orr.* 61.4; 26), Cyprus (*Or.* 17), Cappadocia (*Or.* 18), Ephesus and Mysias (*Or.* 26).

³⁴⁶ Watts 2006, 24.

across the empire flocking to study there. The primacy of education in Athens also created a heightened atmosphere, fraught with competition which often expressed itself violently. This intensity may have contributed to its status, and may explain why so many of our culture heroes studied there: it was a hothouse for learning.

2.8 Conclusion

Education in the fourth century was, in many ways, consistent and standardised. In terms of teaching methods, the experiences of students in Athens, Antioch and Constantinople were similar. Though class sizes could vary, students were still taught the importance of memorisation and practice, and the value of *florilegia* – anthologies, epitomes, handbooks – in education. These were the distinctive characteristics of education in the fourth century, and, indeed, they were more significant than in earlier centuries: the use of *florilegia* became a staple of the fourth century classroom. Students, too, across the empire felt the threat of the lash, from parents, teachers and their all-important pedagogues. Despite the more enlightened attitudes of Libanius, Himerius, and John Chrysostom, corporal punishment was common enough that it became a *topos*.

It is in the curriculum that we see the clearest evidence for consistency. The ideal reading lists detailed by Quintilian and Dio Chrysostom match well the libraries of our culture heroes as well as the most frequently copied authors and texts on papyri. Homer, Hesiod, Euripides, Thucydides, Demosthenes and Plato were dominant figures in Greek rhetorical education. Homer was central: his works were copied by students and cited by culture heroes far more than any other Greek author. Both poems were very well represented, but the *Iliad*, particularly, was the mainstay of Greek rhetorical education, and thus also a frequent source for the letters and orations of prominent public figures. These individuals reflected a trend in education, but they also demonstrated the extremes of this model of education. As ‘culture heroes’, they reflected, but did not necessarily represent the average experience. Their education spanned a wide geographical area and lengthy period of time: they attended classes with eminent teachers in the leading institutions of the day, often undertaking a tour of the Greek East in the process. At root, their education was similar and consistent with a more average or typical student: memorisation, practice, *florilegia*, *progymnasmata*, the threat of punishment, the presence of pedagogues, the dominance of Homer, Hesiod, Plato, and Euripides. However, their

status and family background meant that their education was taken to extreme: they studied in more esteemed locations for a much longer period; they took it further than was possible for the majority of even the elite. Gregory of Nazianzus spent ten years at Athens alone, while Albanus spent only two in Antioch. Julian, meanwhile, had a more fragmented education which shared elements with both a Gregory and an Albanus. His status as imperial prince set him apart and resulted in an education which reflected the consistency and common characteristics of rhetorical education in the fourth century Greek East, but was also quite unique.

This chapter has made clear the consistencies of rhetorical education, even for an imperial prince, but external forces encouraged debates and developments in education, which threatened the primacy of rhetorical education in the Greek East. The following chapter will discuss one aspect of this: the Christian debate on the appropriateness of rhetorical education for Christians.

Chapter three: The Christian debate on pagan literature

“Whom then, men of Greece, do you call your teachers of religion? The poets?” – Ps-Justin¹

“But of that which has always been ours and was formerly yours the roots not only remain but will remain as long as you live, and no lapse of time could ever excise them, not even if you should almost wholly neglect to water them.” - Libanius²

3.1 Introduction

The previous chapter discussed education in the fourth century and explored the educational experience of both teachers and students, with a focus on the Greek East, and concluded that in many ways it had remained consistent. This has been taken as one of the most striking features of Roman education.³ A classroom in the first century would largely resemble a classroom in the fourth century. However, the growth of Christianity in the second century and its status as the dominant religion by the close of the fourth, thanks to imperial support, generated a debate among some elite Christians about the place of pagan literature in Christianity. They saw an underlying tension between their faith and their education.

As we have seen, Christian children attended studies with non-Christians and were taught from the same texts.⁴ While churches offered access to book-based learning in the form of Bible studies, they did not offer an alternative to the traditional educational system, especially for the elite, who were expected to know and use an educated and Atticizing style.⁵ Traditional education might be subordinated to the quest for Christian wisdom, but it was a continual presence because there was no alternative to such a structure.⁶ Indeed, the writers who commented on the tension between Christianity and pagan literature were themselves educated in the traditional way; they were bound by

¹ Τίνας τοίνυν, ὧ ἀνδρες Ἕλληνες, τῆς θεοσεβείας ὑμῶν διδασκάλους εἶναι φατε; Τοὺς ποιητάς; Ps-Justin, *H. ad. Gr.* 2.

² τῶν δὲ ἡμετέρων μὲν αἰεὶ, σῶν δὲ πρότερον, αἱ ρίζαι μένουσί τε καὶ μενουσιν ἕως ἄν ᾗς, καὶ οὐδεὶς μήποτε αὐτάς ἐκτέμῃ χρόνος, οὐδ' ἄν ἤκιστα ἄρδοις, Lib. *Ep.* 340. Translation from Defferrari 1934.

³ Morgan 2001, 14; Cribiore 2001b, 4.

⁴ Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil, as Christians, attended classes with non-Christians in Athens, for example, and were taught by Prohaeresius, a Christian, who does not seem to have taught along religious lines, and also taught the pagans Himerius and Eunapius. Libanius also taught Christians, famously Basil and John Chrysostom. Watts 2006, 20; Cribiore 2007b, 2. The curriculum is discussed in chapter 2.4.

⁵ Clark 2004, 87, 89.

⁶ Brown 2000, 262.

‘strong, half-conscious ties to the old world’, and were well versed in the classic, pagan authors, being in the main part of the highly educated elite.⁷ Those converts in the second century who were from the educated class could not help but use classical rhetoric, though they often felt the need to justify their pagan education.⁸ Cameron, however, is also keen to stress that there was not a great divide between Christians and pagans, and this debate should not be styled as a conflict, due to their shared education.⁹ However, while they were inclined to use their education, many Christians also wished to separate themselves from it. It remained convenient to be able to ‘decry classical rhetoric even while drawing heavily on it’ in order to stress the simplicity of Christianity versus the trickery of rhetoric; it should be noted, though, that this ‘simplicity’ was often constructed in order to play up the differences.¹⁰ Elite Christians, though, felt there was an issue that needed to be reconciled, namely pagan learning with their spiritual life. Mainly, this was in terms of the content of the pagan literature, with its constant reference to pagan gods and rituals, but it also concerned style: the literary quality of the Bible was often considered too simple and uneducated, ‘inappropriate for members of the elite’, while the implicit persuasive and competitive nature of rhetorical culture was at odds with the Christian emphasis on simplicity and truth.¹¹ This is made apparent by their reactions, which all express some level of anxiety or guilt, not only in what they say but also in the fact that they felt the need to say anything at all.

This chapter will explore the tensions surrounding Christian attitudes to pagan literature and traditional rhetorical education, particularly the perception by some of its incompatibility with Christian faith, focusing on the third and fourth centuries. The debate was ever present in the background; there was an unease amongst some Christians about the appropriateness of studying pagan authors and texts, and it was in this climate that Basil and Gregory undertook their extended studies and Julian issued his education edict and rescript. Already ongoing in the second century,¹² the debate reached a head in the

⁷ Brown 2000, 262.

⁸ Cameron 1991, 86. Gemeinhardt 2012, 89.

⁹ Cameron 1991, 121-22.

¹⁰ Cameron 1991, 86, 85.

¹¹ August. *Conf.* 3.5.9; Williams 2006, 47, 9.

¹² Justin Martyr, for example, was aware of the tension between Greek culture and Christianity in the mid-second century, and touched on it in his two apologies. He variously claimed Socrates and Heraclitus as Christians because they lived their lives reasonably (1 *Apol.* 46); argued that Plato was inspired by God (1 *Apol.* 59-60); and noted that the pagan writers had grasped some of the truth of God thanks to their *logos* (2 *Apol.* 13). This claim to antiquity was followed by other Christian apologists, such as Tertullian: Droge 2006, 232-233.

fourth and continued well into the sixth and beyond: Cassiodorus comments on it in the sixth, as does Pope Gregory in the seventh.¹³

As this study is concerned primarily with Julian and the fourth century, our focus will be on significant programmatic statements and attitudes from between the third and fifth centuries, though reference will be made to statements outside these chronological limits. This chapter will examine how reactions developed through the centuries, and will open with a discussion of the views of Tertullian (3.2), who in the late second and early third century made some of the most famous contributions. Then, following a brief discussion of the views of Clement, Origen and Lactantius in the period at the turn of the third century to the early fourth (3.2.1), there will be an analysis of the views of Basil (3.3) and Gregory of Nazianzus (3.3.1) in the mid to late fourth. This will be followed by an examination of the statements made by Jerome in the later fourth century (3.3.2), and Augustine in the late fourth and early fifth centuries (3.4). This section considers a wide range of views, in both chronology and geographical spread. The writers which form the focus of this discussion represent both the Latin West and the Greek East, and an exploration of how far location affected their views is included (3.5), as it is clear that there was a different, if not always consistent, approach to pagan literature across the empire. This chapter will close with a discussion of Julian's education edict and rescript, questioning whether we can reasonably view these documents as being linked to the debate: was Julian involving himself and making a fundamentalist, programmatic statement about the place of pagan literature in Christian life (3.6)?

3.2 The debate in the second and third centuries: Tertullian

Tertullian had an extreme response to the question of the place of pagan literature in Christian life.¹⁴ Arguably the earliest Latin Christian apologist, he was born in mid second century Carthage, in what Barnes was keen to stress was a unique historical environment, the time of both the Second Sophistic and the development of Christianity.¹⁵ He was well educated, at Carthage and perhaps also Rome, and was part of Carthaginian literary circles thanks to family connections: he had a relative who turned a philosophic

¹³ Cassiodorus, *Instit.* 1.1.5-6; Gregory the Great, *Ep.* 2.34.

¹⁴ Cameron 1991, 85.

¹⁵ Barnes 1971, vii.

dialogue into a cento of Virgilian verses.¹⁶ He was well acquainted with traditional rhetorical education and pagan literature. He had demonstrable knowledge of the standard list of Latin authors but also Herodotus, Tacitus, Juvenal and the Younger Pliny; his *Apologeticum*, for example, cites or alludes to over thirty literary sources.¹⁷ He used his education to write a number of works in defence of Christianity, its doctrine and questions of how to live the Christian life.

Probably his most famous comments on the place of pagan thought in Christianity are his rhetorical questions in *The Prescription against Heretics*: ‘What does Athens have to do with Jerusalem? What does the Academy have to do with the Church?’¹⁸ Dated by Barnes to 203,¹⁹ these questions get immediately to the point by asking how pagan literature and Christianity can be reconciled: what has Greek thought and education to do with Christianity? By posing the question in such a way that the Church and Academy are opposed, he hints that they cannot be reconciled, that they have nothing to do with one another, or perhaps, should not. Tertullian argues that the philosophical methods of enquiry taught at the Academy have no place in the teaching of Scripture. He ends this short discussion with the words: ‘Away with all attempts to produce a mottled Christianity of Stoic, Platonic and dialectic composition! We want no curious disputation after possessing Christ Jesus, no inquisition after enjoying the gospel!’²⁰ He is unrelenting in his opposition against anything other than Christianity based on the Bible, despite (and perhaps because of) his own familiarity with pagan literature. Indeed, Barnes has argued that Tertullian would have ‘deplored the attempts of Justin, Clement and Origen to reconcile Christianity and pagan philosophy’, suggesting he had particular Christian opponents in mind when arguing against a ‘mottled’ Christianity.²¹ Tertullian’s familiarity with the works he ostensibly rejects is something which should be stressed:

¹⁶ Barnes 1971, 194-195; Tert. *De praescr. haeret.* 39.4. Barnes asserts that Tertullian’s father was not a soldier (1971, 11, 21), and that Tertullian belonged to the literary circles of Carthage owing to his birth and upbringing, calling his relative a *littérateur*.

¹⁷ Barnes 1971, 196. Knowledge of Tacitus was desirable for the ‘genuinely erudite’, but he was not considered part of the ‘quadriga’ of standard Latin authors, namely Virgil, Terrence, Sallust and Cicero, defined by the grammarian Arusianus Messius in 395 (Cassiodorus, *Inst.* 1.15.7; Marrou 1956, 277-278). Lactantius, for example, did not seem to know Tacitus (Ogilvie 1978, 109).

¹⁸ *Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? quid academiae et ecclesiae?* Tert. *De praescr. haeret.* 7.9.

¹⁹ Barnes 1971, 55.

²⁰ *Viderint qui Stoicum et Platonicum et dialecticum christianismum protulerunt. Nobis curiositate opus non est post Christum Iesum nec inquisitione post euangelium*, Tert. *De praescr. haeret.* 7.11-12; Barnes 1971, 210.

²¹ Barnes 1971, 204, 205. See Justin’s *Dialogue with Trypho* for a link between Christianity and pagan philosophy; Droge 2006, 231.

Tertullian (and indeed, the rest of the writers examined in this chapter) owed a great debt to classical education,²² leading Barnes to state that ‘almost every word he wrote gave the lie to the answer he implies’ when asking what Athens has to do with Jerusalem.

Cameron, meanwhile, argued that the well-educated Tertullian seemed to ‘glory in paradox for its own sake.’²³

While Chadwick warns us not to take too literally Tertullian’s ‘shrill rhetoric’, Tertullian does assert an ‘absolute and radical discontinuity between Christianity and philosophy’, particularly in the famous questions about Athens and Jerusalem.²⁴ Barnes, however, maintains that Tertullian has himself reconciled Christianity and classical culture, in that he frequently uses the fruits of his education to defend Christianity.²⁵ He also points to Tertullian’s work *On the Pallium* as evidence for the reconciliation of Christianity and classical culture. In this work, Tertullian argues that the pallium, typically worn by philosophers, is ennobled only when worn by Christians.²⁶ Barnes further argues that Tertullian shows a Christian can take a pagan intellectual inheritance with him into his new faith, that the tension between Athens and Jerusalem ‘has been resolved’.²⁷ However, it is hard for us to see that for Tertullian this tension had been, or even should be, resolved. As Cameron has argued, the tensions in Tertullian’s work ‘indicate both the closeness of Christian to pagan writing and its struggle to disengage itself from it.’²⁸

It could be argued that Tertullian is arguing primarily against philosophical teaching when he asks what Athens has to do with the Academy, but his comments in *On Idolatry* go further and are broader in scope. Dated to 196 or early 197,²⁹ this work examines how to live a Christian life in a world surrounded by idols, by pagan practices, and is aimed mainly at recent converts.³⁰ Among the subjects he discusses is the question of schoolmasters and ‘their difficulties’. That is, how to reconcile their own faith with the expounding of pagan gods as truth. Tertullian argues that schoolmasters are ‘in affinity

²² Barnes 1971, 213.

²³ Cameron 1991, 85.

²⁴ Chadwick 1966, 1, 2.

²⁵ Barnes 1971, 210.

²⁶ *melior iam te philosophia dignata est, ex quo Christianum uestire coepisti*, Tert. *De Pallio* 6.4; Barnes 1971, 210.

²⁷ Barnes 1971, 231.

²⁸ Cameron 1991, 85.

²⁹ Barnes 1971, 55.

³⁰ Barnes 1971, 96, 100.

with manifold idolatry' in that they are required to preach the gods, 'to express their names, their genealogies, honourable distinctions' as well as observe their festivals, or at the very least collect fees from students at certain festivals.³¹ To Tertullian, then, teaching for Christians is (or, should be) a forbidden occupation as it involved association with idols.

Learning is different however, by virtue of necessity. Tertullian concludes that there is a use for literary education. He allows the learning of pagan literature because an understanding of their Christian faith will lead the young to reject the idols found in Homer and Hesiod. He equates it with accepting poison but not drinking it.³² Whilst teaching involves commendation and affirmation of these idols, learning does not. He argues that a Christian school teacher 'seals the gods themselves' when he speaks their names and refers to them as gods, something prohibited in the Bible. Christian students however do not necessarily encounter this problem. For example, they can avoid school during pagan festivals in a way that teachers, in anticipation of gifts from students on such holidays, cannot. In Tertullian's view, while learning is recommended, or rather permitted, teaching is not, and he concludes, with a sense of practicality, that not teaching literature is much easier than not learning it, which he well knows, having himself benefited from a traditional education.

3.2.1 After Tertullian

Tertullian's recommendation at the start of the third century to avoid teaching came to nothing, as few Christians were willing to abandon traditional education, and the tension and debate about the place of pagan literature in Christianity, whether it should be rejected wholesale or accepted piecemeal, continued. While few other Christian writers made such extreme programmatic statements, we can (cautiously) infer their attitude from their work. They made much use of classical literature and used their, often excellent, education through repeated reference and allusion to pagan authors, as well as using

³¹ *Quaerendum autem est etiam de ludimagistris, sed et ceteris professoribus litterarum. Immo non dubitandum affines illos esse multimodae idololatriae. Primum quibus necesse est deos nationum praedicare, nomina, genealogias, fabulas, ornamenta honorifica quaeque eorum enuntiare, tum sollemnia festaque eorundem obseruare, ut quibus uectigalia sua supputent, Tert. De idol. 10.1.*

³² Tert. *De idol.* 10.

methods typical of pagan philosophy, such as allegory.³³ However, this is not to be taken as definitive proof that those educated in the traditional way were especially in favour of this pagan education, and did not have reservations. As Ševčenko stated, the use of Greek literature did not imply approval.³⁴ Origen, for example, was quite capable of criticising pagan learning and philosophy in his *Against Celsus*, and he made it clear that Scripture was superior.³⁵ Nor does he quote a single Greek poet in his surviving sermons and commentaries, and Eusebius tells us that he sold his books in order to devote himself to Christianity, claiming they were incompatible with holy learning.³⁶ This is suggestive of a particular attitude towards pagan literature and traditional learning, namely dismissive or negative.

However, it does not necessarily equate with total rejection of traditional education. Origen was not explicitly against it: he taught for a time as a grammarian, he engaged with pagan literature throughout his life, particularly philosophy, and the sale of his pagan books in order to devote himself to Christianity arguably had more to do with his unease about teaching the material than reading it.³⁷ Most tellingly, in a letter to Gregory Thaumaturgus he argued that one should use the tools of rhetorical education to further understand Christianity and explain Scripture.³⁸ The idea that traditional education could aid Christian understanding was a common one. At the beginning of the third century, Clement of Alexandria, likely Origen's teacher, argued that pagan literature should be used as a preparation for further Christian knowledge, stating that philosophy was 'conducive to piety; being a kind of preparatory training to those who attain to faith through demonstration [...] Philosophy, therefore, was a preparation, paving the way for him who is perfected in Christ'.³⁹ For Origen, Christian faith and devotion to the Scriptures were paramount, but he did not reject pagan literature out of hand: pagan literature and philosophy supplemented his faith. Thus, some of the early Church Fathers

³³ Chadwick argued that Origen's 'intimate knowledge' of Stoic logic and ethics was evident throughout his writings (1966, 107).

³⁴ Ševčenko 1980, 56.

³⁵ Origen, *C. Celsus* 2.27; 3.12; 4.27; 5.61; 6.2.

³⁶ Ševčenko, 1980, 56; Euseb. *HE*. 6.3.8-9. Chadwick, however, argues that Origen could 'quote his Homer as well as anyone when he wishes', pointing to *C. Celsus* 1.31 as an allusion to *Iliad* 5.1-3, but the issue was that Origen 'did not wish to' (1966, 103).

³⁷ Martens 2012, 39 n.56. See Athanassiadi 1994, 14 on Origen as a teacher at Caesarea Maritima.

³⁸ Origen, *Ep. ad Greg.* 1-2.

³⁹ Ἦν μὲν οὖν πρὸς τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου παρουσίας εἰς δικαιοσύνην Ἑλληνιστὶν ἀναγκαῖα φιλοσοφία· νυνὶ δὲ χρησίμη πρὸς θεοσέβειαν γίνεται, προπαιδεία τις οὕσα τοῖς τὴν δι' ἀποδείξεως καρπούμενοις [...] Προπαρασκευάζει τοίνυν ἡ φιλοσοφία, προοδοποιούσα τὸν ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ τελειούμενον, *Clem. Str.* 1.5.

still saw a place for pagan literature and, particularly, philosophy in Christian life, and did not think Christians should abjure its contents or style. For writers such as Justin and Clement, Athens had much to do with Jerusalem, as Chadwick has argued.⁴⁰

The debate was not assuaged at the advent of the fourth century. Lactantius, during the decade of the Great Persecution, argued along similar lines to Clement, that classical education, particularly philosophy, was a preliminary stage to Christian wisdom: his view was that philosophy inadequately expresses wisdom, which is knowledge of God through Christian faith.⁴¹ Meanwhile, Ps-Justin's *Exhortation to the Greeks*, dated to the fourth century, argued in a more absolutist tone that the pagan poets and philosophers were ignorant, and presented incorrect and contradictory opinions about religion and truth;⁴² the Bible alone could teach true religion.⁴³ Indeed, by the fourth century, the debate had arguably become more relevant due to Constantine's adoption and promotion of Christianity. Even if they were still numerically a minority, their relation to the imperial power meant Christians 'could and did speak with a different voice', and we see the steady urge towards absorption and appropriation in the fourth century.⁴⁴ Jacobs argued that the 're-evaluation of classical education' reached a height during the late fourth century, as well-educated Christians such as Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus, Jerome and Augustine continued to debate the merits of appropriation or rejection of traditional education and literature.⁴⁵ We might also add that the context of the debate had changed considerably. In the second century, the debate was less pressing, perhaps, and more purely intellectual in its disposition. Brown argued that trivialization, pedantry and showmanship were part of this age.⁴⁶ It was less openly competitive, and politically, socially and economically, it was a more stable time. Moving into the third and fourth

⁴⁰ Chadwick 1966, 1; 10. Droge has shown that while Justin argued for Greek philosophy, particularly Platonism, he always stressed the superiority of Christianity (1987, 306-307).

⁴¹ Lactant. *Div. inst.* 3.25-26. Lactantius also showed knowledge of classical pagan texts: while he made limited use of Greek literature (he referred to Homer, Hesiod, Euripides, and Musaeus but only minimally, and made more use of oracular literature), he demonstrated knowledge of Latin poetry, including Lucretius, Horace, Virgil, Ovid and Perseus, as well as prose, particularly Cicero (Ogilvie 1978, 20, 109).

⁴² Ps-Justin, *H. ad. Gr.* 2; 4; 5.

⁴³ Ps-Justin, *H. ad. Gr.* 8; 36; 38. The fact that it was erroneously ascribed to Justin suggests some continuity in the debate; from the second to the fourth century, similar positions were held on the compatibility of this literature with Christianity.

⁴⁴ Cameron 1991, 120, 87.

⁴⁵ Jacobs 2011, 29-30. Cameron noted that the appropriation of all the forms of classical rhetoric within a Christian system was best represented by Gregory of Nazianzus, John Chrysostom and Ambrose, while Augustine and Jerome represented both the 'possibilities and exceptional difficulties of this process' (1991, 87).

⁴⁶ Brown 1978, 27.

centuries, Brown argued, the style of life changed and with it, cultural and social attitudes: there was a change from an age of equipoise to an age of ambition.⁴⁷ In the wake of the third century, competitive urges were unleashed;⁴⁸ less was unspoken and reticence had been replaced with blunt certainty.⁴⁹ We could argue, then, that invested Christians might be (or affect to be) more uncompromising or forthcoming in their positions. This ‘Age of Ambition’ combined with the prominence of Christianity by the mid-fourth century meant the debate over pagan thought and Christian doctrine was increasingly relevant.

3.3 The fourth century: Basil’s advice

By the mid-fourth century Basil of Caesarea was expressing a more balanced and practical view on the place of pagan literature than Tertullian, and one similar to the earlier views of Clement and Lactantius. Basil gives the question more space than those prior to him, who had often included comments on the matter only in the context of longer works aimed at recent converts. While those before had expressed strong opinions, they did not devote a single individual work to it in the way Basil did. Basil was, as one of our ‘culture heroes’, very well-educated, having studied under Libanius of Antioch for just over a year in the late 340s (the two would later correspond),⁵⁰ as well as under Prohaeresius at Athens. As Gane has noted, Basil’s education was typical in methods, though not in extent.⁵¹ Basil later taught rhetoric like his father, but abandoned it to live an ascetic life in Pontus before becoming involved in Church affairs.

Basil mentions his own education in a letter dated to 375 to the bishop Eustathius of Sebaste and recalls: ‘Much time had I spent in vanity, and had wasted nearly all my youth in the vain labour which I underwent in acquiring the wisdom made foolish by

⁴⁷ Brown 1978, 34.

⁴⁸ Brown 1978, 46.

⁴⁹ Brown 1978, 46-47.

⁵⁰ A number of letters between Libanius and Basil have survived, though the authenticity of these letters is debated. Libanian scholars generally only regard *Epp.* N19 and N78 as genuine, though Cribiore further accepts *Epp.* 336 and 338. Scholars of Basil, however, accept more of the collection and view *Epp.* 336-343, 344, 346 and 345-358 as genuine: see Deferrari 1934, xiii-xv; Rousseau 1994, 57-60; Cribiore 2007b, 100-102. Libanius’s letters are coloured by his paganism and commitment to rhetorical education, so we can see the two communicating in a sense on the value of classical literature.

⁵¹ Gane 2012, 2. Basil’s education is discussed more fully in chapter 2.5.

god.⁵² He goes on to say his commitment to the ascetic life was like being roused from a deep sleep. This has been seen as Basil's complete rejection of classical learning, an argument in favour of faith alone and a focus on the Scriptures, though it should be noted that this letter was concerned with asserting orthodox Christian opinions, and may have affected the extent to which Basil dismisses the value of his education.⁵³ However, he offers a different view in his earlier *Ad Adolescentes*, usually thought to have been written for his nephews between 365 and late 370,⁵⁴ and which has generally been interpreted as an attempt to accommodate classical literature in a Christian upbringing.⁵⁵ Throughout, he concerns himself with the idea of the usefulness and the value of secular literature.

While Basil sees value in pagan literature, he argues that discrimination should be used. He feels that Christian students should not 'unqualifiedly give over your minds' to the pagan authors.⁵⁶ While Christians must be 'conversant with poets, with historians, with orators, indeed with all men who may further our soul's salvation', they must 'recognise what it is wise to ignore.'⁵⁷ For Basil, the search for truth can only be helped by engagement with pagan literature, reminiscent of the advice 'seek and ye shall find' in the Gospels.⁵⁸ Indeed, as Gane has argued, the most important theme in this piece is 'clearly that of literature [...] as a *propaideusis*.'⁵⁹ Basil sees its value in terms of a preliminary stage to Christian wisdom, a view which had been expressed earlier, by Clement for example. Indeed, Gane has argued that Basil was very familiar with the work of Clement, and his *Ad Adolescentes* expresses similar views.⁶⁰

While the revealed truths of Christianity take clear precedence, for Basil there is useful knowledge to be gained from the canon of classical authors.⁶¹ However, while he is insistent on the benefits to be gained, he is concerned with the extent to which pagan

⁵² Ἐγὼ πολὺν χρόνον προσαναλώσας τῇ ματαιότητι, καὶ πᾶσαν σχεδὸν τὴν ἑμαυτοῦ νεότητα ἐναφανίσασα τῇ ματαιοπονίᾳ, ἣν εἶχον προσδιατρίβων τῇ ἀναλήψει τῶν μαθημάτων τῆς παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ μωρανθείσης σοφίας, Basil, *Ep.* 223.

⁵³ Gane 2012, 8.

⁵⁴ Wilson 1975, 9; Gane 2012, 15.

⁵⁵ McLynn 2010, 106.

⁵⁶ τὸ μὴ δεῖν εἰς ἅπαξ τοῖς ἀνδράσι τούτοις, ὥσπερ πλοίου, τὰ πηδάλια τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν παραδόντας, Basil, *Ad Adol.* 1.5.

⁵⁷ καὶ ἡμῖν δὴ οὖν ἀγῶνα προκεῖσθαι πάντων ἀγῶνων μέγιστον νομίζειν χρεῶν, ὑπὲρ οὗ πάντα ποιητέον ἡμῖν καὶ πονητέον εἰς δύναμιν ἐπὶ τὴν τούτου παρασκευὴν, καὶ ποιηταῖς καὶ λογοποιοῖς καὶ ῥήτορσι καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ὁμιλητέον, ὅθεν ἂν μέλλῃ πρὸς τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἐπιμέλειαν ὠφέλειά τις ἔσσεσθαι, Basil, *Ad Adol.* 2.7; ἀλλ' ὅσον ἐστὶ χρήσιμον αὐτῶν δεχομένους, εἰδέναι τί χρῆ καὶ παριδεῖν, Basil, *Ad Adol.* 1.5.

⁵⁸ Mt. 7.7.

⁵⁹ Gane 2012, 26.

⁶⁰ Gane 2012, 53.

⁶¹ McLynn 2010, 106.

literature should be pursued. He discusses its detrimental effects more than its benefits. He advises not to read the entirety of the poets, historians or orators, saying ‘when they recount words and deeds of good men, you should both love and imitate them [...] but when they portray base conduct, you must flee from them and stop up your ears [...] for familiarity with evil writings paves the way for evil deeds.’⁶² Interestingly, Basil invokes classical works throughout, proving there is indeed value in pagan literature, if only to add colour to one’s writing. Gane has noted that Homer’s *Odyssey*, Hesiod’s *Works and Days*, Plato’s *Republic* and Plutarch’s *Lives* are the works most referenced or alluded to, with Plato and Plutarch’s works being the most noticeable.⁶³ Indeed, McLynn has noted that this piece was written entirely in a classical idiom and avoids the language of the Scriptures, though aimed at Christians by a Christian.⁶⁴ Wilson, too, noted the Atticizing style of the piece, characteristic of one educated to Basil’s level.⁶⁵ McLynn suggests this is perhaps because it was meant, at least partly, to impress a similarly educated audience.⁶⁶ Basil’s point can be summed up when he says ‘we shall receive gladly those passages in which they praise virtue or condemn vice [...] we, if wise, shall take from heathen books whatever befits us and is allied to the truth, and shall pass over the rest.’⁶⁷ How avoiding certain passages would work in practice, Basil does not explain, and McLynn argues that Basil did not mean to create a coherent system at all; rather he meant to create a temporary disruption and local uneasiness.⁶⁸ Perhaps he felt it only necessary to warn Christians to be on guard against evil writings.

Most modern scholarship views Basil’s contribution as unsuccessful. Rousseau, for example, sees the work as ‘inconclusive’ and ‘disorganised’, while Clark does not see

⁶² Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν τοῖς παρὰ τῶν ποιητῶν, ἵν’ ἐντεῦθεν ἄρξωμαι· ἐπεὶ παντοδαποὶ τινές εἰσι κατὰ τοὺς λόγους, μὴ πᾶσιν ἐφεξῆς προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν· ἀλλ’ ὅταν μὲν τὰς τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν πράξεις ἢ λόγους ὑμῖν διεξιῶσιν, ἀγαπᾶν τε καὶ ζηλοῦν, καὶ ὅτι μάλιστα πειρᾶσθαι τοιούτους εἶναι· ὅταν δὲ ἐπὶ μοχθηροῦς ἀνδραῖς ἔλθωσι, τὴν μίμησιν ταύτην δεῖ φεύγειν, ἐπιφρασσομένους τὰ ὄντα, οὐχ ἤττον ἢ τὸν Ὀδυσσεῖα φασὶν ἐκεῖνοι τὰ τῶν Σειρήνων μέλη. ἢ γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς φαύλους τῶν λόγων συνήθεια, ὁδὸς τίς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τὰ πράγματα, Basil, *Ad Adol.* 4.1-2.

⁶³ Gane 2012, 32-3. Wilson noted the extensive use of Plato (1975, 11).

⁶⁴ McLynn 2010, 107. For a Latin parallel, one could point to Minucius Felix’s *Octavius*, written in the late 2nd century, or perhaps the early 3rd. Thought to have been based on Tertullian or of some use to Tertullian, this Christian apology takes the form of a dialogue between a Christian and pagan, and makes no reference to the Scriptures. Indeed, references are made throughout to pagan philosophers and poets, particularly by the Christian speaker *Octavius* (Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, 19, 26).

⁶⁵ Wilson 1975, 11, 12.

⁶⁶ McLynn 2010, 112.

⁶⁷ ἀλλ’ ἐκεῖνα αὐτῶν μᾶλλον ἀποδεξόμεθα, ἐν οἷς ἀρετὴν ἐπήνεσαν ἢ πονηρίαν¹ διέβαλον. [...] ἡμεῖς τε, ἢν σωφρονῶμεν, ὅσον οἰκεῖον ἡμῖν καὶ συγγενὲς τῇ ἀληθείᾳ παρ’ αὐτῶν κομισάμενοι, ὑπερβησόμεθα τὸ λειπόμενον, Basil, *Ad Adol.* 4.7-8. Kaldellis argued that Basil’s thesis was ‘almost too simplistic’ (2007, 161).

⁶⁸ McLynn 2010, 107.

it as a persuasive argument, instead viewing it as an attempt to justify his own experiences.⁶⁹ McLynn similarly sees this as ‘record of performance’, as does van Dam.⁷⁰ Wilson noted the weakness of Basil’s argument.⁷¹ Kaster meanwhile, views it neither as an encomium of the classics, nor a recommendation of their form with an attached warning of lurking evil, but instead as an ‘exhortation and a guide to right choices.’⁷² Modern scholarship also struggles to agree on the purpose of Basil’s work, and thus view it as either unsuccessful or without any purpose at all.⁷³ Some argue that it is a general treatment of Christianity and classical culture, while for others it was a record of his own learning, a treatise for his nephews or, as McLynn has argued, an oration delivered ‘not from the pulpit but at an elegant soirée’ both to his nephews and a wider circle of literary friends, a piece which was not meant as a resource to help Christian students pick through classical literature.⁷⁴ Whether this was a way to justify his own extensive training in the classical model or an attempt to persuade his nephews (or a congregation) of both the merits and dangers to be found in this training, it is interesting that like so many other well-educated Christians, Basil felt it necessary to write this piece, felt it necessary to justify his education or to offer advice and reassurance about the place of traditional, pagan literature.

3.3.1 *Gregory of Nazianzus*

Basil’s contemporary and friend, Gregory of Nazianzus also had some interesting things to say on the place of classical literature within Christianity. As we have seen, he also was well-educated and active in the Church – indeed, he was briefly bishop of Constantinople. His voluminous writings show his high level of learning, and a list of those pagan authors he referenced is remarkably similar to the ‘curriculum’.⁷⁵ In many of his works, Gregory gives the opinion that Greek literature is a fiction, ‘for the sole purpose of giving pleasure’, with only its style to recommend it.⁷⁶ He was critical of even this at times,

⁶⁹ Rousseau 1994, 50; Clark 2004, 89.

⁷⁰ McLynn 2010, 106; Van Dam 2002, 186.

⁷¹ Wilson 1975, 9.

⁷² Kaster 1988, 77.

⁷³ McLynn 2010, 107.

⁷⁴ McLynn 2010, 107; 109; 112; 117.

⁷⁵ Ruether 2003, Appendix 1. This is discussed at chapter 2.4.1.5.

⁷⁶ καὶ οἷον ἀκοῆς τι δέλεαρ μέχρι τῆς ἡδονῆς ἱστάμενον, GNaz. *Or.* 2.104.

though: pagan literature was full of ‘spurious and unnecessary embellishments’.⁷⁷ This was a common criticism of Greek literature and rhetoric, one which Christians such as Minucius Felix, Jerome, Lactantius, Cyprian and Arnobius would also level, and which is contrasted to the pure simplicity of the Scriptures (though, of course, this was a point pagans could also make, and not entirely the preserve of Christians).⁷⁸ However, it did not prevent Gregory from composing 17,000 lines of verse, which in form and style were compatible with the Greek literary tradition; only the Christian content was new.⁷⁹ Gregory wrote in an autobiographical poem that part of his intention was to compose verse comparable in style to pagan literature: he could not bear it that pagans had a claim to stylistically superior literature. He was aware of the stylistic issues of the Bible, criticised often,⁸⁰ and wrote Christian works using his own pagan training that were refined and polished.⁸¹

Gregory is also critical of Gregory of Nyssa, brother of Basil, for teaching rhetoric, despite the fact that he himself had taught rhetoric. Soon after, though, he would sell his rhetorical handbooks to the teacher Adamantius, calling rhetoric a game and Christianity the true culture.⁸² Gregory chastises Basil’s brother, and seems incredulous that he would want to turn his hand to ‘bitter and unwholesome literature, choosing the name of rhetor rather than Christian.’⁸³ Again, the two are presented as antithetical,

⁷⁷ ταῖς κιβδήλοις καὶ περιτταῖς ἀντιθέσεσιν, GNaz. *Or.* 16.2. Gregory also criticised the use of rhetorical style in Church: *Or.* 21.12.

⁷⁸ Minucius Felix, *Oct.* 16; Jer. *Comm.in Gal.* 3. prol; Lactant. *Inst.* 5.1, 3.13; Arnob. *Adv.nat.* 1.59; Cyprian, *Ad Donat.* 2. Pagans also criticised sophists as insincere or frivolous: for example, Dio Chrysostom displayed hostility towards sophists in a number of his speeches (*Orr.* 8.9; 11.6; 54), as did Epictetus (*Or.* 3.21; Whitmarsh 2005, 47). Themistius criticised sophists as caring only for pleasure (*Or.* 20.336-337; Vanderspoel 1995, 40).

⁷⁹ Demoen called it ‘new wine in old bottles’ (1996, 21). Gregory’s other compositions are also clearly influenced by his rhetorical training and are Atticizing in style.

⁸⁰ Stylistic criticisms of the Bible were common: Basil wrote to Libanius that he had almost forgotten the Atticizing style through his devotion to the Bible, which was ‘in substance true, though in style unlearned’ (νοῦν μὲν ἀληθῆ, λέξιν δὲ ἀμαθῆ, Basil *Ep.* 339). Gregory also contrasted truth with the style of the pagan works (*Or.* 2.104). Celsus famously criticised Christians as unlearned (Origen, *C. Celsum* 3.44). See Kaldellis 2007, 139-140, who quotes Nietzsche: “It was subtle of God to learn Greek when he wished to become an author and not to learn it better.”

⁸¹ τρίτον πεπονηθὼς οἶδα· πρᾶγμα μὲν τυχόν/
μικρορεπές τι, πλὴν πέπονητ’· οὐδ’ ἐν λόγοις/
πλέον δίδωμι τοὺς ξενούς ἡμῶν ἔχειν/
τούτοις λέγω δὴ τοῖς κεχρωσμένοις λόγοις/
εἰ καὶ τὸ κάλλος ἡμῖν ἐν θεωρίᾳ./

ὑμῖν μὲν οὖν δὴ τοῖς σοφοῖς ἐπαίξαμεν, GNaz. *Carm.* II.1.39, vv.47-53; Demoen 1996, 21.

⁸² GNaz. *Ep.* 235; Ševčenko 1980, 60.

⁸³ Τί γὰρ παθῶν, ὦ σοφώτατε, καὶ τί σεαυτὸν καταγνοὺς, τὰς μὲν ἱεράς καὶ ποτίμους βιβλους ἀπέρριψας, ἅς ὑπανεγίνωσκές ποτε τῷ λαῷ (μὴ γὰρ αἰσχυνοῦς ἀκούων), ἢ ὑπὲρ καπνοῦ τέθεικας, ὡς τὰ πηδάλια χειμῶνος ὄρα καὶ τὰς σκαπάνας, τὰς δὲ ἄλμυράς καὶ ἀπότους μετεχειρίσω, καὶ ρήτωρ ἀκούειν μᾶλλον, ἢ Χριστιανὸς

though interestingly in the same letter Gregory sets out the argument against this dichotomy and says he expects his correspondent to reply that a rhetor can behave as a Christian. However, Gregory argues it would appear unseemly, give rise to ‘false suspicions’ and warns that ‘a man’s life is not his own concern exclusively; his neighbour matters too.’ This perhaps provides some insight into the debate - there is still a perceived incompatibility between Christianity and classical culture, and Gregory is suggesting that it would be unseemly for an avowed Christian to teach pagan literature. Indeed, his pointed reassurance that he and Basil did not lose their faith and continued to attend Church even while surrounded by idols as students in Athens in the mid-350s reflects a prevailing unease about Christian association with rhetorical education.⁸⁴ In Gregory, we can see the struggle between pagan literature and Christianity: while he embraced his rhetorical education, and used it in his compositions, he was also bound to the Church and on occasion referred to the Bible, the Word, as that which he took more pleasure in than ‘all other things combined’.⁸⁵

Gregory’s most impassioned work on this subject may be found in his invectives against Julian, which present his reaction to Julian’s rescript on the Christian teachers. Throughout, Gregory is outraged at Julian’s actions, which he views as attempts to control words and bar Christians from public life. He passionately defends the right (he calls it advocating their cause)⁸⁶ of Christians to enjoy Greek words and literature, and admits he not only takes pleasure in words but is ‘addicted to this pursuit’. He again says he cannot leave words, literature behind: ‘all other things I have left to those who like them, riches, nobility, glory, power, which are of the lower world [...] Words alone I cleave to, and I do not begrudge the toils by land and sea that have supplied me with

ἠθέλησας GNaz. *Ep.* 11. Kaldellis argued that Gregory meant that a career as a rhetorician fell short of the quality of devotion owed to God (2007, 159).

⁸⁴ GNaz. *Or.* 43.21; Wenzel 2010, 275, 281, who also notes a possible reference to Acts 17:16.

⁸⁵ τοῦ Λόγου δὲ περιέχομαι μόνου, ὡς Λόγου θεραπευτῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἄν ποτε ἐκὼν τούτου τοῦ κτήματος ἀμελήσαιμι· ἀλλὰ καὶ τιμῶ, καὶ ἀσπάζομαι, καὶ χαίρω μᾶλλον ἢ πᾶσιν ὁμοῦ τοῖς ἄλλοις, οἷς οἱ πολλοὶ χαίρουσιν, GNaz. *Or.* 6.5. This speech was delivered in 364 to mark the end of a local dispute between the monastic community and Gregory’s father, the bishop. Thus, he may be exaggerating his devotion to the Bible over all else.

⁸⁶ οὐ γὰρ φέρω μὴ τουτο πολλάκις ἀνακυκλεῖν, καὶ πειρατέον συνηγορῆσαι τούτοις εἰς δύναμιν, GNaz. *Or.* 4.100.

them.⁸⁷ Gregory argues that Greek words do not belong exclusively to the Hellene, the pagan Greek, but to all.⁸⁸

Gregory does not develop his argument to the extent Basil does; he is more concerned with damning Julian than outlining a way in which Christianity and classical education can be intertwined. However, Ruether has posited it would have been similar to Basil's.⁸⁹ Indeed, in his funeral oration for Basil, he stated 'I take it as admitted by men of sense, that the first of our advantages is education'.⁹⁰ He refers both to Christian education and to 'external culture' (ἔξωθεν, meaning from without or abroad, with connotations of outside or foreign, which is suggestive in itself) which 'many Christians ill-judgingly abhor'.⁹¹ Gregory expresses opinions very similar to Basil's here, and goes on to argue that Christians should 'reap what advantage we can from [secular literature] for our life and enjoyment, while we avoid their dangers', and demonstrates this through repeated allusions to classical literature, including Homer, Euripides and Pindar.⁹² He also credits secular literature with providing Christians 'principles of inquiry and speculation', though Christians have 'rejected their idolatry, terror, and pit of destruction.' He further argues that Christians should not 'dishonour education' as some do, but to regard these men as 'boorish and uneducated'.⁹³ In his *Carmina ad Seleucum*, he recommends avoiding the thorns while plucking a rose; a familiar metaphor which Basil also used, he wanted Christians to avoid what is dangerous while enjoying what is valuable and good.⁹⁴

3.3.2 Jerome's dream

Clark commented that 'the Christians who show most anxiety are those who were themselves most intensely affected by literature.'⁹⁵ While it could be argued that both

⁸⁷ Καί μοι συναγκτεῖτω πᾶς ὅστις λόγοις χαίρων, καὶ τῇ μοίρᾳ ταύτῃ προσκείμενος, ὧν εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸς οὐκ ἀρνήσομαι. Τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλα παρήκα τοῖς βουλομένοις, πλοῦτον, εὐγένειαν, εὐκλειαν, δυναστείαν, ἃ τῆς κάτω περιφορᾶς ἐστὶ καὶ ὀνειρώδους τέρψεως· τοῦ λόγου δὲ περιέχομαι μόνου· καὶ οὐ μέμφομαι χερσαίοις τε πόνοις καὶ θαλασσίοις, οἳ τούτους μοι συνεπόρισαν, GNaz. Or. 4.100.

⁸⁸ GNaz. Or. 4.103-4.

⁸⁹ Ruether 2003, 164.

⁹⁰ Οἶμαι δὲ πᾶσιν ἀνωμολογήσθαι τὸν νοῦν ἐχόντων, παιδευσιν τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀγαθῶν εἶναι τὸ πρῶτον, GNaz Or. 43.11.

⁹¹ ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἔξωθεν, ἣν οἱ πολλοὶ Χριστιανῶν διαπτύουσιν, ὡς ἐπίβουλον καὶ σφαλερὰν καὶ Θεοῦ πόρρω βάλλουσαν, κακῶς εἰδότες, GNaz. Or. 43.11.

⁹² Ševčenko 1980, 58.

⁹³ σκαιοὺς καὶ ἀπαιδεύτους, GNaz. Or. 43.11.

⁹⁴ GNaz. Carm. Ad Seleucum, 1.61; Basil, Ad Adol. 4.9; Ruether 2003, 165.

⁹⁵ Clark 2004, 89; Kaldellis 2007, 139.

Basil and Gregory were intensely affected by literature, having been steeped in it and repeatedly expressing their views on it, it is perhaps Jerome who best exemplifies Clark's assertion. Jerome was a Latin churchman of the late fourth century who had studied in Rome under the grammarian and rhetor Donatus, and his 384 letter to Julia Eustochium, his spiritual protégé, is particularly revealing. It reads like a treatise on virginity and the proper way to live and chronicles Jerome's intense guilt about enjoying Cicero and other pagan authors, in rhetorical fashion.⁹⁶ Jerome states that while he felt quite capable of letting go of his attachment to worldly luxuries, he could not leave his library, collected 'at Rome with great care and toil' (not to mention money), reminiscent of Gregory of Nazianzus's admission of cleaving to words alone.⁹⁷ He explains he would fast only that he might read Cicero afterwards; similarly he would repent his sins and then 'once more take up Plautus.'⁹⁸ These activities are presented throughout as oppositional, something which the audience are expected to acknowledge as wrong. Jerome goes on to explain that while the 'old serpent' continued to make him his plaything, he fell into a fever so intense that preparations were made for his funeral. He recalls a dream, or rather, a nightmare in which he was accused by a judge of being a Ciceronian rather than a Christian. It is noteworthy that the two are here considered mutually exclusive, and the Ciceronian option something to be ashamed of. He was lashed on the orders of the Judge for his enjoyment of Cicero but says his conscience tortured him more. He begged forgiveness and made an oath: 'Lord, if ever again I possess worldly books, or if ever again I read such, I have denied Thee.'⁹⁹ He miraculously recovered from his near-fatal fever and says he read the books of God, which he had previously found rude and repellent in style, with greater zeal than before. Kelly dates the experience recounted by Jerome to Lent 374, prior to his retirement to the desert of Chalcis, though Williams expresses some scepticism towards the dream, arguing it is likely a fiction, at best a literary elaboration, and should be read as a 'stylised reinterpretation of Jerome's younger

⁹⁶ Kelly 1975, 101, 42. Williams notes the description of the dream contains many literary allusions, particularly to Virgil (2006, 27).

⁹⁷ *bybliothecca, quam mihi Romae summo studio ac labore confeceram, carere non poteram*, Jer. Ep. 22.30; Williams 2006, 136.

⁹⁸ *post noctium crebras vigilias, post lacrimas, quas mihi praeteritorum recordatio peccatorum ex imis visceribus eruebat, Plautus sumebatur in manibus*, Jer. Ep. 22.30.

⁹⁹ *Ego, qui tanto constrictus articulo vellem etiam maiora promittere, deiurare coepi et nomen eius obtestans dicere: 'Domine, si unquam habuero codices saecularcs, si legero, te negavi.'* Jer. Ep. 22.30.

self', governed by a sense of incompatibility that he had not felt in the 370s.¹⁰⁰ It is possible that Jerome's time in Constantinople in the early 380s, and particularly his increased knowledge of Origen, inspired a change in Jerome's attitude towards classical literature, evidenced in the letter to Eustochium, and which later developed into a depiction of Christian learning as a form of ascetic piety.¹⁰¹

Though interestingly there is no evidence that he disposed of his pagan books (indeed, Williams argues that it is 'beyond question' that Jerome kept and continued to use books by pagan authors, despite his reticence to advertise it),¹⁰² Jerome uses his dream as an 'object-lesson'¹⁰³ and recommends to Julia Eustochium abstinence from pagan literature, saying: 'How can Horace go with the Psalter, Virgil with the gospels, Cicero with the apostle?'. These rhetorical questions are reminiscent of Tertullian's, and have the same implied answer; that is, Horace cannot go with the Psalter, just as for Tertullian Jerusalem has nothing to do with Athens. Jerome concludes that 'we ought not to drink the cup of Christ, and, at the same time, the cup of devils.'¹⁰⁴ The lesson for Julia Eustochium (and those others in Rome who would read it) is clear: balancing an appreciation for pagan literature and faith cannot work; they are irreconcilable. Jerome acknowledged that there was something to gain from reading Cicero and Virgil and confessed he found their style preferable. However, the style is not the issue; the substance is seen as being at odds with Christianity. There is an assumption that classical literature is incompatible with a Christian religious life.¹⁰⁵

Over fifteen years later, Jerome was still wrestling with the issue, and his continued anxiety was exploited by his rival Rufinus, who accused him of perjury for his continued use of pagan texts.¹⁰⁶ He found himself defending, at length, his use of pagan

¹⁰⁰ Williams 2006, 26-27. She further argues that his writing in the 370s show none of the 'tortured mentality' found in his recollection of the dream, nor betrays any knowledge of the incident; also, these works contain many classical allusions.

¹⁰¹ Williams 2006, 29, 45, 49-50.

¹⁰² Williams 2006, 161.

¹⁰³ Kelly 1975, 42.

¹⁰⁴ *Quid facit cum psalterio Horatii? cum evangelii Maro? cum apostolo Cicero? nonne scandalizatur frater, si te viderit in idolio recumbentem? et licet 'omnia munda mundis et nihil reiciendum sit, quod cum gratiarum actione percipitur,' tamen simul bibere non debemus calicem Christi et calicem daemoniorum,* Jer. Ep. 22.29.

¹⁰⁵ Jer. Ep. 22.30. However, Jerome did praise the style of the Bible in certain contexts: in the prologue to his commentary on Galatians, also addressed to Julia Eustochium and dated to the same period as his letter (Kelly 1975, 43) Jerome found it prudent to praise the simplicity of the biblical style; indeed, he laments the rhetorical skill used in churches, which, he argued, was aimed at winning favour (*Comm.in Gal.* 3. prol).

¹⁰⁶ Ruf. c. *Hier.* 2.6.

quotations, despite his public vow. In a letter to Flavius Magnus, a Roman orator, he argued that since Moses, the prophets and St Paul had used secular literature, he could too, so long as it was cleansed of idolatry, pleasure, error or lust, alluding to the Old Testament to strengthen his argument.¹⁰⁷ As Kelly has noted, this is a more liberal literary theory than the one presented in his letter on the dream.¹⁰⁸ Jerome points out that the classics of pagan literature ‘are extremely full of erudition and philosophy’, and that his continued use of quotations and allusions follow ‘what has always been the practice of the learned’.¹⁰⁹ Clearly he could not and did not abandon pagan literature completely; he found it difficult to abandon the style of pagan literature. At this time, he also plays down the importance of a ‘mere dream’, arguing in his *Apology* against Rufinus that he cannot forget what he has learnt, nor did he promise to.¹¹⁰ The tensions surrounding the use of pagan literature are evidently something he continued to cogitate and remained a sore point which his enemies could, and did, take advantage of. Williams even goes so far as to say that this tension shaped ‘everything Jerome did, thought and wrote’.¹¹¹ For Williams, Jerome represents the attempt to fuse the ‘identities of scholar and monk’ and transform traditional culture, while for Cameron, Jerome represents the ‘exceptional difficulty’ as well as the possibilities of absorption and appropriation of classical rhetoric within a Christian system.¹¹² Jerome’s attempt to reject pagan literature but his ultimate inability to leave his training behind demonstrates this, an issue faced by a number of prominent and educated Christians in late antiquity.

3.4 After the fourth century: Augustine

Augustine, though a contemporary of Jerome’s from Thagaste in Roman Africa, took a similar view to Basil. In *De Doctrina Christiana*, written between 395 and 426, Augustine advised not to ‘follow carelessly any teachings that are conducted outside the

¹⁰⁷ Jer. *Ep.* 70.2.

¹⁰⁸ Kelly 1975, 43.

¹⁰⁹ *quia omnes pene omnium libri, exceptis his qui cum Epicuro litteras non didicerunt, eruditionis doctrinaeque plenissimi sunt. quanquam ego illud magis reor, quod dictanti venit in mentem, non te ignorare quod semper a doctis viris usurpatum est*, Jer. *Ep.* 70.6.

¹¹⁰ *Haec dicerem, si quippiam vigilans promissem. Nunc autem, novum impudentiae genus, objicit mihi somnium meum*, Jer. *Apol.* 1.31.

¹¹¹ Williams 2006, 261.

¹¹² Williams 2006, 5, 18; Cameron 1991, 87.

church of Christ [...] but discriminate sensibly and carefully'.¹¹³ Like Basil, Augustine saw dangers in pagan literature, noting that all branches of pagan learning 'contain [...] false and superstitious fantasies and burdensome studies', but he also recognised some value in traditional education, namely the 'very useful moral instruction, as well as the various truths about monotheism to be found in their writers.'¹¹⁴

Augustine, like many of those discussed, was very familiar with the good pagan literature had to offer, having been a teacher for eleven years, in Thagaste, Carthage and Rome, before being made chair of rhetoric in Milan.¹¹⁵ Augustine did not suggest bypassing traditional education. In the preface to *De Doctrina Christiana*, he urged his readers to 'put away false pride and learn whatever can be learned'.¹¹⁶ Augustine saw value in classical education – he himself turned again and again to Cicero in his early years, and memorably described how he wept at Virgil.¹¹⁷ Marrou would remark that Virgil was always present for Augustine.¹¹⁸ However, he saw classical education as a basis which would then culminate in knowledge of Christian truths. His formidable mother, Monica, also thought classical education would eventually make her son a better Christian, and it seems Augustine agreed that traditional education had its uses in for Christians.¹¹⁹ He argued that after taking all the useful knowledge from the pagan books, one can proceed to the Scriptures, which Augustine regarded as a classic with as much depth as Virgil and Homer, and learn 'things which are learnt nowhere else at all'.¹²⁰ He also argues that having a classical education would help 'consider and analyse the

¹¹³ *Quam ob rem videtur mihi studiosis et ingeniosis adolescentibus et timentibus deum beatamque vitam quaerentibus salubriter praecipere ut nullas doctrinas quae praeter ecclesiam Christi exercentur tamquam ad beatam vitam capessendam secure sequi audeant se eas sobrie diligenterque diiudicent*, August. *De Doct. Christ.* 2.139. Socrates Scholasticus also argued in the fifth century that one should reject the evil but retain what is beautiful and true from pagan culture: τὸ γὰρ καλόν, ἔνθα ἄν ἦ, ἴδιον τῆς ἀληθείας ἐστίν, Socr. *HE.* 3.16; Farkas 2005, 187.

¹¹⁴ *sic doctrinae omnes gentilium non solum simulata et superstitiosa figmenta gravesque sarcinas supervacanei laboris habent [...] sed etiam liberales disciplinas usui veritatis aptiores et quaedam morum praecepta utilissima continent, deque ipso uno deo colendo nonnulla vera inveniuntur apud eos*, August. *De Doct. Christ.* 2.145.

¹¹⁵ Brown 2000, 15.

¹¹⁶ *Immo vero et quod per hominem discendum est, sine superbia discat*, August. *De Doct. Christ.* proem 11.

¹¹⁷ August. *Conf.* 5.10.19; 1.13.20. Ogilvie has remarked how similar Lactantius's library was to both Augustine and Jerome's, in terms of their esteem of Cicero but also their limited knowledge and use of Greek literature (1978, 110).

¹¹⁸ Marrou 1938b, 18.

¹¹⁹ August. *Conf.* 2.3.8; Brown 2000, 17.

¹²⁰ *Et cum ibi quisque invenerit omnia quae utiliter alibi didicit, multo abundantius ibi inveniet ea quae nusquam omnino alibi, sed in illarum tantummodo scripturarum mirabili altitudine et mirabili humilitate discuntur*, August. *De Doct. Christ.* 2.151; *Ep.* 137.3; Brown 2000, 260.

ambiguous signs in the Scriptures’, as they will have knowledge of them from their previous traditional education and ‘will not be held back by unfamiliar signs’.¹²¹ Augustine mentions in his *Confessions* that as an adolescent, ‘swollen with pride’, he, like Jerome, found the style of the Latin Bible crude, and ‘unworthy to be compared to the dignity of Tully.’¹²² Augustine suggests, though, that with age, and with the abandonment of pride, he has learned to appreciate its style, which is ‘lowly as you approach, sublime as you advance, and veiled in mysteries’.¹²³ For Augustine, the value of classical education was revealed through learning from the Scriptures; its usefulness was in helping further Christian understanding. While classical education certainly had a part to play in Christian culture, its role was perceived as relatively minor and supportive to the Scriptures, which contained the true wisdom crucial for the Christian.¹²⁴

Throughout the period in question, the advice to exert caution in relation to pagan literature seems to be not only the most common, but also what happened in practice. Elite Christian families continued to send their children to teachers who taught from pagan texts and followed the traditional curriculum and educated Christians continued to use pagan quotations and allusions.¹²⁵ As Wilson has argued, it would have been unlikely that the classical texts could maintain their prominence in the curriculum had there been a ‘concerted campaign by the church authorities to remove them.’¹²⁶ It would seem that in practice the place of pagan literature posed little problem for the majority of families, that it was primarily a debate amongst the educated elite Christians (and quite a narrow band of those). As Cameron argues, classical culture was too important in relation to the power structure of society at this time to be abandoned.¹²⁷ The debate continued. There was an attempt to recast the biblical books in the forms and styles of Greek literature in the mid-fourth century by Apollinaris the Elder and his son, Apollinaris of Laodicea, who were themselves involved in education as a grammarian and rhetorician respectively, in

¹²¹ *hac igitur instructione praeditum cum signa incognita lectorem non impedierint [...] accedat ad ambigua signa in scripturis consideranda et discutienda*, August. *De Doct.Christ.* 2.152.

¹²² *non enim sicut modo loquor, ita sensi, cum attendi ad illam scripturam, sed visa est mihi indigna quam tullianae dignitati compararem. tumor enim meus refugiebat modum eius et acies mea non penetrabat interiora eius*, August. *Conf.* 3.5.9.

¹²³ *et ecce video rem non compertam superbis neque nudatam pueris, sed incessu humilem, successu excelsam et velatam mysteriis*, August. *Conf.* 3.5.9.

¹²⁴ Lepelley 2010, 477.

¹²⁵ Cameron 1991, 128.

¹²⁶ Wilson 1983, 8.

¹²⁷ Cameron 1991, 139.

response to Julian's rescript.¹²⁸ Their attempts suggest the style of pagan literature was preferred and was a desirable part of education, as Jerome's continued use of pagan quotations shows, though the death of Julian made their attempts unnecessary and their work did not survive. In the sixth century, Cassiodorus, a cleric and member of Theodoric's court, recommended education based on Christian as well as pagan materials, though like Basil and Augustine before him, he thought some things should be culled.¹²⁹ The tensions surrounding classical literature and Christianity were never fully reconciled: Christianity and classical culture are 'ways that never entirely parted'.¹³⁰

3.5 East and West

Throughout this section, reference has been made to the programmatic statements of Christians across the Roman Empire. However, there is a discernible difference between East and West which needs to be noted. Generally, those in the western part of the empire were less likely to include or recommend pagan works than those in the East. In the West, Tertullian insisted that classical education and Christianity had little, if anything, to do with one another, while in the East, Basil argued there was much to be gained from this education, which would encourage further understanding of Christianity. This is by no means a hard rule: Augustine in the West shares more opinions with Basil than Tertullian, for example, despite both being products of Carthaginian schools, albeit 200 years apart. Augustine viewed classical education as a useful preliminary to more rigorous Biblical studies, asserting students could learn valuable lessons from pagan writers, if they discriminate between them, sure in the knowledge that the Bible took precedence, a view expressed also by Basil. Tertullian, however, as discussed, is less forthcoming about the values of secular literature (and perhaps less practical) when he presents them as antithetical in his famous rhetorical questions, and makes it clear that pagan philosophy has no place in the Christian life. However, he is more pragmatic in the earlier piece in which he allows Christian students to continue with traditional education, despite being adamant Christians should not teach secular literature.¹³¹ Tertullian states that learning is

¹²⁸ Socrat. *HE*. 3.16; Soz. *HE*. 5.18. Kaldellis 2007, 157. The attempts of the Apollinarii are discussed at chapter 2.4.1.3.

¹²⁹ Cassiodorus, *Instit.* 1.1.5-6.

¹³⁰ Clark 2004, 117.

¹³¹ Neither Augustine nor Basil presents opinions on teaching; only Gregory of Nazianzus, as mentioned, shows some concern over this. Interestingly, they all taught grammar or rhetoric for a time.

different, due to necessity but also because the believer, if he has knowledge of idolatry, will reject the idols. Further, he argues that knowledge of pagan literature will encourage further understanding of the Bible and their faith. This is similar to Augustine's argument, in that pagan literature encourages understanding of Christianity. However, while Augustine indicates that learning from the Scriptures and a deeper understanding of the Bible should follow traditional education, Tertullian suggests a level of Christian understanding prior to studies with a grammarian and rhetorician, whose lessons would only compound the teachings of the Bible. This is a slight difference, made more complex by Tertullian's seeming complete rejection of pagan philosophy later and insistence that the Bible was more than adequate for Christians.

Modern historians have argued that wider cultural and political factors contributed to the difference in opinions across the empire. Clark has noted that after the fall of imperial government in the West, the Church preserved and transmitted Latin language and literature as well as Graeco-Roman philosophical theology,¹³² while Gane argued that the geographical differences are due to the level of cultural integration and social standing Christians in the East enjoyed. She argues that 'for Eastern Christians the culture and literature of the Greeks were always viewed as part of their own culture, and they did not seek to reject the "outside wisdom" in favour of received Christian revelation.'¹³³ Further, she argues that due to the unifying influence of *paideia*, Christians worked alongside pagans in official positions as equals.¹³⁴ Kaster argued similarly, and added that the Church in the West was more 'inward-turning [...] an alien body in an environment of dangerous contradictions and divisions.'¹³⁵ Kaster comments that to an educated Eastern Christian, 'the stringent puritanism of Tertullian would have seemed strangely backward.'¹³⁶

3.6 Julian and the debate

We have seen that the place of pagan literature was largely debated by elite and highly educated Christians: it was a debate amongst and for Christians, who had a background in

¹³² Clark 2004, 7.

¹³³ Gane 2012, 7.

¹³⁴ Gane 2012, 7.

¹³⁵ Kaster 1988, 74.

¹³⁶ Kaster 1988, 74.

rhetorical studies, usually at prestigious educational centres. However, we might argue that Julian's rescript on the Christian teachers should also be considered as part of this debate, and that Gregory of Nazianzus's intense reaction, which we have touched on above, was due in part to Julian's perceived interference in a purely Christian matter.

Julian's first tentative step in this educational debate came with an edict dated to 17 June 362, which demanded that those who taught must excel first in morals then in eloquence.¹³⁷ His edict and later rescript will be discussed in more detail in chapter five. It is enough for the present to say that Julian's rescript stated that those who do not believe what they teach should not teach it. Thus, Christians who do not believe in the pagan gods referred to in the classical works should instead go to 'the churches of the Galileans and expound Matthew and Luke'.¹³⁸ Julian clarifies that it is aimed at those who teach one thing but believe another. In other words, Christians should not teach pagan literature because it is at odds with their own beliefs. He thought it absurd that teachers should harbour 'in their souls opinions irreconcilable with what they publicly profess'.¹³⁹ A choice is given, either to give up teaching pagan literature and teach only the gospels, or to continue teaching pagan literature if they admit they are wrong to declare Homer, Hesiod and the other canonical authors guilty of 'impiety, folly and error in regard to the gods'.¹⁴⁰

This rescript is usually thought of as a supplement to his earlier education edict, a way of adding further clarification. It could also be argued that this rescript was part of the ongoing and previously solely Christian debate about the place of pagan literature. Julian, though he ultimately was a Neoplatonist pagan and given the epithet 'the Apostate', was brought up as a Christian and taught by Christians, such as George of Cappadocia, later Bishop of Alexandria. Indeed, Julian refers to George's library, which he was keen to acquire after his death and included 'philosophers of every school and many historians, among these, numerous books of all kinds by the Galileans'.¹⁴¹ We cannot be sure which books George owned or which Christian books Julian refers to.

¹³⁷ *CTh*. 13.3.5.

¹³⁸ βαδίζόντων εἰς τὰς τῶν Γαλιλαίων ἐκκλησίας ἐξηγησόμενοι Ματθαῖον καὶ Λουκᾶν, *Jul. Ep.* 36.423d.

¹³⁹ μὴ μαχόμενα οἷς δημοσίᾳ μεταχειρίζονται τὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ φέρειν δοξάσματα, *Jul. Ep.* 36.422c.

¹⁴⁰ δίδωμι δὲ αἴρεσιν μὴ διδάσκειν ἅ μὴ ἠομίζουσι σπουδαῖα, βουλομένους δὲ διδάσκειν ἔργῳ πρῶτον πείθειν τοὺς μαθητὰς ὡς οὔτε Ὅμηρος οὔτε Ἡσίοδος οὔτε τούτων τις, οὓς ἐξηγοῦνται καὶ ὧν κατεγνωκότερος εἰσὶν ἀσέβειαν ἄνοιάν τε καὶ πλάνην εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς, τοιοῦτός ἐστιν, *Jul. Ep.* 36.423B.

¹⁴¹ Πολλὴ τις ἦν πάνυ καὶ μεγάλη βιβλιοθήκη Γεωργίου παντοδαπῶν μὲν φιλοσόφων, πολλῶν δὲ ὑπομνηματογράφων, οὐκ ἐλάχιστα δ' ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ τὰ τῶν Γαλιλαίων πολλὰ καὶ παντοδαπὰ βιβλία, *Jul. Ep.* 38.411c.

Likely, it was the books of the Bible, and perhaps some commentaries. Bouffartigue has argued that the Gospels, Acts and Epistles were an integral part of Christian life, and were likely the books which Julian heard and meditated on most often.¹⁴² We could also make a reasonable guess regarding other Christian books based on those which contemporary Christians, such as Basil, reference. Basil likely had good knowledge of Clement's work, and he was inspired by Origen, so it is not unreasonable that Julian would likewise have knowledge of them, or at least knowledge of the main arguments. It would help this argument if we could suggest Julian had knowledge of Tertullian's *On Idolatry*, though it seems unlikely that he did, as it was composed in Latin. However, Bouffartigue has argued, it is not unreasonable to suggest Julian knew Tertullian's works, as Tertullian wrote in both Greek and Latin.¹⁴³ Julian could, though, be responding in his rescript to Porphyry's critique of Christians as uneducated, Porphyry being a writer we know Julian read.

It is very unlikely that Julian had no knowledge of the debate surrounding the appropriateness of classical literature for Christians, considering it was ongoing during the fourth century and his contemporaries Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus had so much to say on the topic. There are too many references to it by elite Christians for Julian to have been unaware of the debate, especially as he was brought up in a Christian environment, around a man who would one day be a prominent bishop, not to mention Julian's own intellectual leaning and firm opinions about classical literature. It would therefore not be much of a stretch to argue that Julian was consciously engaging in the Christian debate when he issued the edict and rescript. It would be surprising and odd if Julian were not aware, at the very least, of the discussion and the climate in which he was addressing traditional, pagan education and Christianity.

If we agree that Julian's rescript was a comment on this debate, it could be seen in a Machiavellian light, as an attempt to rile and divide Christians on the issue, an attitude Ammianus saw in Julian's edict of toleration.¹⁴⁴ Bowersock saw in Julian an 'utterly intolerant' attitude to Christians from the start, and argued he was bent on 'total elimination', suggesting the edict of toleration and the rescript could be interpreted as

¹⁴² Bouffartigue 1992, 162. Eunapius wrote that Julian knew the Bible by heart (*VS.* 473). This is unlikely, though he probably did know some New Testament texts by heart (Bouffartigue 1992, 162).

¹⁴³ Bouffartigue 1992, 408.

¹⁴⁴ *Amm.* 22.5.4.

ways of purposely antagonising Christians.¹⁴⁵ However, we could argue that it was more likely to be Julian's attempt to end this debate with an executive decision, or as a way of entering into a debate which he felt he could, and should, participate in, having knowledge of Christian thought through his upbringing and a devotion to pagan literature and the gods. After all, Julian felt no qualms about commenting on Christian matters – his *Against the Galileans* immediately springs to mind, but he shows understanding of Christianity in his letters too, particularly in his *Letter to a Priest*.

What Julian stated in his rescript was something which had been debated for a long time. He offered a solution which itself was not new (Tertullian had also argued that Christians should not teach pagan texts) and which would be restated (by Pope Gregory in the seventh century, for example, who wrote 'the same mouth cannot sing the praises of Jupiter and the praises of Christ').¹⁴⁶ However, Julian expressed it as an emperor rather than as a private citizen. He had taken the debate out of Christian intellectual circles and brought it into the wider political sphere. Julian had also taken the debate back to a basic and uncompromising argument: if you do not believe in the gods, or if you believe in the Christian God, do not look to the pagan texts. As Kaldellis argued, Julian was siding with the Christian 'hardliners' and presented the issue with clarity; he was forcing Christians to live up to their own professed principles.¹⁴⁷ That Julian was expressing this, without any nuance or subtlety, could be viewed as extreme. This goes some way to explaining Gregory of Nazianzus's anger, shown in his invectives against what he saw as Julian's attempt to control words and keep Christians from Greek literature.¹⁴⁸

Part of Gregory's reaction was undoubtedly to do with the ramifications of Julian's rescript, which would have effectively been a ban on Christians teaching, as pagan literature made up the entire agreed upon curriculum. As emperor, Julian was in a position to ensure that the debate was not only intellectual, but that it had practical effects. However, we could also argue for another dimension to Gregory's reaction. Perhaps Gregory's intense response could be attributed to Julian's involvement in a debate which was singularly Christian, and that Gregory therefore thought Julian had no

¹⁴⁵ Bowersock 1978, 85.

¹⁴⁶ *Quam rem ita moleste suscepimus ac sumus uchementius aspernati, ut ea quae prius dicta fuerant in gemitu et tristitia uerteremus, quia in uno se ore iouis laudibus Christi laudes non capiunt*, Gregory the Great, *Ep.* II.34.

¹⁴⁷ Kaldellis 2007, 149.

¹⁴⁸ GNaz. *Or.* 4.96.

right to participate: Julian had relinquished his right to comment on Christian matters when he apostatised. The authors discussed in this chapter wrote about this debate as Christians, and, as far as we can determine, largely for Christians. Julian's rescript would constitute one of, if not the only, comments on the place of pagan literature in Christian life by a non-Christian. It is reasonable to suggest that Gregory is not only arguing that Julian cannot tell Christians what they can and cannot teach, but also that he has no right to comment on a debate he is outside of, a debate he has no right to involve himself in as a pagan, not to mention a pagan with imperial power.

3.7 Conclusion

While Julian's rescript prompted outrage from Gregory, we cannot see that it forced a reconciliation between pagan education and Christianity, or indeed the opposite. There was no concerted effort towards a singularly Christian education to replace traditional schooling. Opinions surrounding the matter do not appear to have sharpened in response to Julian's rescript; the volume of the debate does not appear to have increased. Basil makes no mention of it and nor does Jerome in relation to this debate, due probably to the fact that Julian's measures relating to Christians were null and void upon his death. The debate continued, however, with much the same arguments being made by elite and highly educated Christians. With the victory of Christianity safely established by the end of the fourth century, it appears that the debate surrounding pagan literature faded somewhat, and arguments were not made with the same level of urgency or volume that the cultural climate of earlier centuries had witnessed. We can see that, largely, rhetorical education remained consistent and Christians continued to attend classes with pagan teachers who taught from the canonical pagan texts outlined in chapter two. However, in the fourth century, there were developments in the sphere of education. While Basil and Gregory (and Julian) were concerned with the appropriateness of Homer for Christians, the increasing status of shorthand, Latin and law studies in the Greek East was felt by some to be a rival and threat to the primacy of Greek rhetorical education. It is to this area of tension which we now turn.

Chapter four: The challenge to rhetoric

‘Our leading men spurned an orator’s power of speech as a business entailing much effort but little use, while men wished to seem not to desire what they could not attain.’ – Claudius Mamertinus¹

‘Moreover, as regards my studies, they had now lost ground to Latin even more than before, so that I am afraid that they may, through the agency of law, become completely superseded.’ -Libanius²

4.1 Introduction

The late third and fourth century was a time of change (or decline, depending on how closely you cleave to Gibbon), as Diocletian and his successors expanded and restructured the imperial bureaucracy, and the Christianisation of the empire continued in the wake of Constantine. While the methods and content of rhetorical education remained consistent, as we have shown in chapter two, outside forces did challenge and alter the educational landscape of the fourth century. The debate on rhetorical education prompted by the increasing influence of Christianity and elite Christians was discussed in the previous chapter. This chapter, then, will explore the developments in education at this time which were motivated not by religion or morals but by political and economic forces. Our focus will be on the changes to the bureaucracy and their impact on education, as the rival studies of shorthand, Latin, and Roman law sought to improve their status and threaten the standing of traditional rhetorical studies in the Greek East.³

Libanius was well placed to offer strong opinions on the state of teaching throughout the fourth century, and was quite scathing in his assessment, often in contrast to the views of Themistius, himself close to the issue. Libanius viewed the fourth century as a period of decline for rhetorical studies, a point he often repeats. Indeed, he suggested that there was already a decline in education under Constantius II, and continued to talk of a decline in the 380s; the only period in which Libanius saw improvement was, as we might expect, under Julian. This section will examine the perceived decline of (Greek) rhetorical studies (4.2), and the concurrent increasing status of both Latin and law (4.2.1,

¹ *Oratoriam dicendi facultatem, multi laboriosus et minimi usus negotium, nostril proceres respuebant, dum homines noluisse videri volunt, quod assequi nequiverunt*, Mamert. *Pan. Lat.* 3[11].20.2.

² Ἀλλὰ τὰ γε τῶν ἡμετέρων λόγων νῦν πλέον ἢ πρότερον ἡττηται τῶν ἐτέρων, ὥσθ' ἡμῖν καὶ φόβον ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γενέσθαι μὴ ἐκκοπῶσιν ὅλως, νόμου τοῦτο ποιοῦντος, Lib. *Or.* 1.234.

³ Athanassiadi referred to these as ‘vocational subjects’ (1994, 12).

4.2.2). This shift in focus raises questions of Latin translation and bilingualism in the Greek East, and also the extension of the bureaucracy following the reforms of Diocletian, which were continued by Constantine. The reorganisation of the empire potentially affected the aims of education, so that the study of Latin and law rather than rhetoric became more attractive. This chapter will consider the changes to the state bureaucracy (4.3), how they opened up new opportunities for students (4.3.1), and the impact these changes had on the city councils (4.4). We will examine the role of the city councils and explore the repeated attempts to revive them in the fourth century, vigorously by Julian, as linked to a declining interest in rhetorical studies – or, an increasing interest in Latin and law studies, which is not necessarily equivalent (4.4.1). This will include a discussion of the undesirability of service on the councils, the financial pressures associated with the role of decurions, and thus the attraction of a position in the enlarged imperial administration (4.4.2).

4.2 The ‘decline’ of rhetorical studies

In *To the Antiochenes for the Teachers*, a plea for the city council to afford financial help to his assistant lecturers dated to 361,⁴ Libanius discussed the decline of rhetorical teaching as a viable profession, remarking that the times when one could make money from teaching had passed. He blamed the declining prestige of rhetoric on the esteem, or lack thereof, of the ruling emperor.⁵ For Libanius, Constantius II has brought dishonour to rhetorical education by favouring other disciplines, namely shorthand, Latin and Roman law. Libanius, using his sophistic powers, asked if his audience believed that rhetoric or orators were highly valued at court. Libanius believed the opposite to be true, and expected his audience to agree: ‘rhetoric and rhetors are rejected, rebuffed and insulted [...] regarded as mere ciphers and of no account’, he answered.⁶ In his speech *Against the Critics of his Educational System*, dated to 382, Libanius again argued that it was a bad time to be a teacher of rhetoric, due to ‘unfavourable circumstances’. It seems strange that twenty years after the death of Constantius, Libanius would still blame the emperor, but at

⁴ Norman 2000, 68. Libanius had been teaching in Antioch for a number of years at this point, having returned in 354.

⁵ Lib. *Or.* 31.25-6.

⁶ πότερ’ οὖν ὑμῖν δοκεῖ μέγα δύνασθαι ῥητορικὴ καὶ πλεῖστον ἐν βασιλείοις ἰσχύειν καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἀπάσας οἱ λέγειν ἐπιστάμενοι λαμβάνειν κὰν ταῖς περὶ τῶν ὅλων βουλαῖς εἰς ἀπόρρητα καλεῖσθαι καὶ μετέχειν τάξεως ἢ τοῦναντίον ἀπερρίφθαι καὶ ἀπεληγάσθαι ῥητορικὴ τε καὶ ῥήτορες ἔξω καὶ λόγου καὶ ἀριθμοῦ κείμενοι; Lib. *Or.* 31.27.

such a distance from the reign of Constantius, he could be more explicit about the reasons and stated quite simply that these unfavourable circumstances were Constantius and ‘his regime’.⁷ For Libanius, rhetoric had ‘plumbed the depths of degradation’, mainly due to Constantius.⁸

Alongside Constantius, Libanius also blamed fathers for the downturn in rhetorical studies: he argued that fathers brought up their sons to respect rhetoric but ‘see the power that lies in the other system’.⁹ Thus, fathers who wished success and security for their sons responded to the prevailing attitude of Constantius and directed them to study subjects other than rhetoric. He argued that fathers were penalized due to their own rhetorical education, and have ‘caused despondency among the rest’ by having their sons trained in subjects other than rhetoric.¹⁰ These fathers, themselves educated in the traditional rhetorical fashion, directed their sons to shorthand-writing, ‘regardless of intellectual ability’, with the knowledge that while rhetoric is good, shorthand-writing is prestigious.¹¹ He pointed to the success of shorthand writers under Constantius as creating a sense of apathy in students towards rhetorical education.¹² Even the grandchildren of Gregory of Nazianzus took shorthand.¹³

The makeup of the Constantius’s administration and court was the root of the problem: Constantius, by favouring shorthand writers and notaries, those less educated in Greek rhetoric, encouraged fathers to reject extensive rhetorical studies for their sons. Libanius argued that Constantius showed little regard for the philosophers and sophists, having never invited them to court or listened to their orations.¹⁴ Instead, argued Libanius, he surrounded himself and ‘made counsellors and teachers a collection of hooligans, confounded eunuchs’.¹⁵ Later, he would state that Constantius appointed his prefects from

⁷ Τίνα δὴ λέγεις τὴν ἀκαιρίαν; ἐρήσεταιί τις. Κωνσταντῖον καὶ τὴν ἐκείνου βασιλείαν, *Lib. Or.* 62.8.

⁸ ἀλλ’ οὐδεὶς οὕτως οὔτε ἄπειρος τῶν καιρῶν οὔτε φιλονεικία καιρῶν, ὅστις ἂν εἰπεῖν τολμήσαι τὸ μὴ εἰς ἔσχατον ἀτιμίας ἐκπεσεῖν τὴν τέκνην, *Lib. Or.* 31.27.

⁹ καὶ τί λέγω τοὺς νέους; οἱ τούτων πατέρες ἀπο τοιούτων λογισμῶν, ἄνδρες ἐν λόγοις πεπονηκότες, μίξαντες ταῦτα ἐκείνοις τοὺς αὐτῶν υἱεῖς ἔτρεφον αἰσχυρόμενοι μὲν τὸ κάλλος τὸ τῶν λόγων, δροῶντες δὲ τὴν ἐν θατέρῳ ῥώμην, *Lib. Or.* 62.13.

¹⁰ αὐτοὶ τε οὖν εἰς ἐκεῖνα διὰ τούτων ἐζημιῶντο καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους εἰς ἀθυμίαν ἤγον ὡς οὐκ ἀποχρόντων εἰς εὐδαιμονίαν τῶν λόγων. *Lib. Or.* 62.13.

¹¹ ἀμελήσαντες τοῦ τῆς διανοίας κάλλους, *Lib. Or.* 31.28.

¹² *Lib. Or.* 62.16.

¹³ *GNaz. Ep.* 157.

¹⁴ *Lib. Or.* 62.9.

¹⁵ ἡγάπα δὲ καὶ περὶ αὐτὸν εἶχε καὶ συμβούλους καὶ διδασκάλους ἐποιεῖτο βαρβάρους ἀνθρώπους, ὀλέθρους τινὰς εὐνούχους, *Lib. Or.* 62.9. On Constantius and eunuchs, focusing on the narrative of Ammianus, see Tougher 1999, 64-73.

the class of notaries, while ‘the orators stood and trembled’.¹⁶ While Julian appointed as governors those with knowledge of rhetoric and who had been slighted previously, Constantius had preferred the ‘savages who, for all their skill in shorthand, had not a scrap of sense’.¹⁷ This is a familiar criticism of Constantius. Ammianus especially, but also Julian, discussed Constantius’s preference for promoting eunuchs, particularly the notorious Eusebius.¹⁸ Indeed, Constantius had increased the prestige of the notaries, who were generally not educated in Greek rhetoric like the landed elite, but were from the ‘shopkeeper-artisan class’. Three notaries were promoted to praetorian prefect under Constantius, while shorthand writers were also elevated to high office.¹⁹ Libanius’s galled reaction seems justified, and the relative decline of shorthand following the death of Constantius (thanks in part to the efforts of Julian)²⁰ also lends credence to the observations of Libanius.

The evidence of Themistius, however, is at odds with Libanius’s opinion of Constantius. Themistius enjoyed a good relationship with Constantius, and was adlected to the Constantinopolitan senate in 355, ostensibly for his rhetorical and philosophical prowess.²¹ We might suggest this was tokenistic on the part of Constantius, a cynical attempt by the emperor to promote the relatively new senate and bolster his own reputation. However, Constantius himself made sure to present it as a reward for Themistius’s education and devotion to philosophy, which would in turn honour the senate.²² By praising Themistius’s education, Constantius was also demonstrating his own: he was intelligent enough to appreciate the significance of rhetoric and philosophy, and that these were necessary for the senate.²³ Themistius presented Constantius as highly educated and appreciative of rhetoric, counter to the image presented by Libanius. Themistius praised Constantius’s love of learning and called him a friend of the Muses.²⁴

¹⁶ καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐκάθητό τε καὶ προσέτατον, οἱ δὲ ῥήτορες εἰστήκεσάν τε καὶ ἔτρεμον, Lib. Or. 62.51.

¹⁷ τῆς αὐτῆς δὲ διανοίας καὶ τὸ τὰς πόλεις ὑπὸ τοῖς λέγειν ἐπισταμένους ποιεῖν καὶ παῦσαι τοὺς βαρβάρους τῶν ἐθνῶν κυβερνήτας, οἱ γράφοντες μὲν σὺν τάχει νοῦν δὲ οὐκ ἔχοντες ἀνέτρεπον τὰ σκάφη, Lib. Or. 18.158-60.

¹⁸ Amm. 21.15; Jul. *Misopog.* 352.

¹⁹ Liebeschuetz 1972, 242-243.

²⁰ Lib. Or. 18.158; Liebeschuetz 1972, 244.

²¹ In 358/59, Themistius was proconsul of Constantinople. In 384, Themistius was urban prefect of Constantinople.

²² *Demegoria Constantii* 19a-20b. Constantius also praised Themistius in a law dated to May 361, *CTh.* 6.4.12: *Themistius quoque philosophus, cuius auget scientia dignitatem.*

²³ This is discussed more fully in chapter six.

²⁴ φιλόλογος γάρ οὐχ ἥττον ἐστὶν ἢ φιλοπόλεμος καὶ τὰ ξένια τῶν Μουσῶν οὐκ ἀτιμότερα τῶν τοῦ Ἡφαίστου ποιεῖται, Them. Or. 4.54a-b.

His presentation of Constantius as a lover of learning is also seen in Aurelius Victor and Athanasius.²⁵ We might have qualms about the panegyric claims of supporters, but, as discussed in chapter one, Constantius was educated, not to the same extent as Julian's (whose own education Constantius allowed for, if not vociferously supported), but it was adequately rounded.²⁶ His speech on the adlection of Themistius also testifies to the importance of learning; we see an emperor rewarding erudition and recognising the importance of learning, whilst also promoting the Eastern capital.²⁷ Constantius's appointment of Themistius as proconsul and his directive to enrol new members in the senate might similarly suggest that the emperor wished the senate to be filled with learned men.²⁸ Constantius's attempt to promote Libanius to official sophist at Constantinople also demonstrate his efforts on behalf of rhetoric. Libanius was ordered to return to Constantinople from Nicomedia by Constantius after the delivery of his panegyric in 348/9; he taught in the capital until he returned to Antioch in 354, despite the wishes of Constantius.²⁹ Further, while Constantius promoted notaries and shorthand writers, he also favoured men with literary qualifications: for example, the bilingual Strategius Musonianus was proconsul of Constantinople and Achaea prior to his elevation to Praetorian Prefect of the Orient (354-358), while Anatolius, praised by Eunapius, was promoted to Praetorian Prefect of Illyricum (357-360).³⁰

We thus have a more balanced picture of Constantius than that presented by Libanius. Constantius was not educated to the same extent as Julian, nor as famed for his

²⁵ Aur. Vict. *De Caes.* 42.23; Athanasius, *Apol. ad Const.* 18. Henck 2001, 173.

²⁶ Henck 2001, 174-175.

²⁷ *Demegoria Constantii* 23c-d. This is reminiscent of Constantius and Julian's joint edict of 360, *CTh.* 14.1.1, which praised learning and literature.

²⁸ Vanderspoel 1995, 163; Henck 2001, 176.

²⁹ *Lib. Or.* 59. Van Hoof 2013, 397-398. Libanius was ordered to return to Constantinople by an imperial summons (*βασιλείσις γράμμασιν*, *Or.* 1.74). Libanius claimed to have left Constantinople because he disliked the city and its culture (*Or.* 1.75-76), a marked change from his initial fondness for the city (*Or.* 1.30, 37). Eunapius suggests Libanius had left Constantinople in 342 following accusations of pederasty (*VS.* 521). Libanius himself alludes to a 'scandal' (*τὸ αἰσχρὸν*) and accusations of magic (*Or.* 1.79), and Socrates Scholasticus also states that Libanius was driven from Constantinople by the city's pedagogues (*HE.* 3.1.1). Van Hoof argues that these accusations followed Libanius to Nicaea, which led to his move to Nicomedia; following the imperial summons and his return to Constantinople, these old rumours resurfaced and Libanius returned to Antioch (2014, 30-33). Henck notes that in the late 340s it is likely that Libanius, Themistius, Himerius, Nicocles and Hecebolius were all teaching in Constantinople, suggesting a concerted effort by Constantius to foster an educational centre (2001, 177). Van Hoof argued there was likely a political motive to Constantius's efforts to promote Constantinople as a rival to Rome and thus his brother Constans (2014, 28). See also Constantius's founding of an imperial library and scriptorium: *Them. Or.* 4.59-61; Bouffartigue 1992, 606-607; Henck 2001, 178.

³⁰ Strategius Musonianus (PLRE I: 611-612). Amm. 15.13.2. Anatolius 3 (PLRE I: 59-60). Eunap. *VS.* 490-493. Brown 1992, 38; Henck 2001, 180-181. Anatolius had also studied at Berytus: *Lib. Ep.* B62, B55.

intellectual leanings, and it is true that there was favour shown to shorthand writers and students of Latin and law, but we do not see Constantius actively encouraging a decline in rhetorical studies. At the very least, he was more politically astute than that, and it is significant that Libanius, Themistius and Himerius delivered orations to Constantius, suggesting he was somewhat invested in and encouraging of rhetoric.³¹

We should not dismiss the opinion of Libanius out of hand, however. While his relationship with Constantius and experience of teaching in Constantinople may have coloured his opinion (his love of Julian is also a factor), as the official sophist of Antioch, a city with some educational prestige, who wrote extensively on education (more extensively than Themistius), Libanius was well placed to observe any developments in education and his judgements on the state of rhetoric in the fourth century necessarily carry weight. Similarly, while we might suspect Libanius of some sophistic exaggeration or a narrow focus on Antioch,³² it seems reasonable to suggest that the relative decline of rhetoric was a trend across Eastern rhetorical institutions. We might expect Athens to have remained immune, due to its historic fame, or indeed Constantinople as the capital, but places such as Caesarea, Nicaea and Nicomedia would likely have experiences similar to Antioch.

The decline of rhetoric is a topic that preoccupies Libanius. His assessment of education was bleak: he wrote in 382 that ‘as matters stand an inability to speak is an advantage and “rhetorical ability” dirty words.’³³ The teaching profession was ‘despised, dragged down deep, and without reputation, influence, or income’.³⁴ He was similarly bleak in his assessment of those public officials who did not follow a strictly rhetorical education. He was cutting when he said that money was a more important qualification than eloquence for a decurion in the late fourth century.³⁵ His opinion of governors was similar: while he agreed they required rhetoric, he argued that in the contemporary

³¹ Henck discusses the literary culture which blossomed under Constantius and compares him to Augustus (2001, 183-186).

³² Liebsechuetz argued that Libanius did not yet suffer from the rivalry in the mid-370s, though some private teachers in Antioch had retired due to the declining interest: *Lib. Or.* 1.214; Liebsechuetz 1972, 245.

³³ νῦν δὲ πλεονέκτημα μὲν τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι λέγειν, ἔγκλημα δὲ τὸ ῥητορεύειν ἰκανῶς, *Lib. Or.* 62.44.

³⁴ ὅτι τὸ πρᾶγμα δρῶντες καταπεφρονημένον καὶ κατορωρυγμένον καὶ μηδεμίαν ἔχον μὴ δόξαν, μὴ δύναμιν, μὴ πρόσοδον, *Lib. Or.* 62.32.

³⁵ *Lib. Or.* 62.39.

climate, holding such office was not proof positive of its attainment.³⁶ He wrote about this decline throughout his *Autobiography*: he noted his misfortune to be teaching rhetoric while it was ‘sick, disparaged and reviled and your hopes are pinned on other men’.³⁷ Libanius wrote his *Autobiography* in two stages, and while the later part reflects generally a changed, more negative attitude,³⁸ his attitude towards the state of rhetoric and teaching does not change dramatically. In the later part of his *Autobiography* he is more forthcoming about the decline of rhetoric, but this is something which he also discusses in a number of earlier speeches and letters.³⁹ He mentioned these ‘lean years of rhetoric’ and worried about the decline in the number of students enrolled in his school throughout his works.⁴⁰ He was particularly distressed by (we might even argue slightly obsessed with) the rise of Latin studies, and the linked rise of law studies.

4.2.1 Latin in the Greek East

We can tell from his letters that the rise of Latin studies was something Libanius was aware of from his early days as a teacher. Libanius himself did not know Latin,⁴¹ and almost immediately upon his return to Antioch in 354, Libanius wrote letters to Olympius, a doctor and ex-student of Libanius, in an attempt to persuade him to leave Rome in favour of teaching Latin in Antioch.⁴² In the first letter, dated to 356, Libanius appealed to Olympius to return to Antioch so the city could take advantage of his knowledge. With an edge of emotional blackmail, he wrote, ‘Let Rome be the capital city

³⁶ ἐγὼ δὲ δεῖν μὲν ῥητορικῆς τοῖς μέλλουσι καλῶς ἄρξεν ὁμολογῶ, οὐ μὴν τοῦ κεκτῆσθαι γε ῥητορικὴν ἀπόδειξιν εἶναι τὸ καὶ πόλεν ἀρχὰς λαβεῖν. ἔστι γὰρ λαβεῖν ἀρχὴν οὐκ ὄντα ῥητορα καὶ μὴ λαβεῖν ὄντα, *Lib. Or.* 62.50.

³⁷ Καὶ μὴν καὶ τότε δυστυχοῦς ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τε καὶ ἀτιμίᾳ καὶ προπηλακισμῶ τῶν λόγων λόγους διδάσκειν καθήμενον ἐτέρων ὄντων ἐν οἷς αἱ ἐλπίδες, *Lib. Or.* 1.154.

³⁸ Cribiore 2013, 40. The first part of the *Autobiography* dates to 374, while chapters 156-285 date to the last years of his life, between 380 and 393.

³⁹ Liebeschuetz 1972, 242.

⁴⁰ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ δὴ τῷ τῆς κακοπραγίας χρόνῳ διδάσκαλοι παρ’ ἡμῖν ῥητορικῆς ἐξετράφησαν, *Lib. Or.* 1.215.

⁴¹ Libanius needed to have letters from Symmachus and Postumianus translated (*Epp.* N177.4; N181.3). Fluency in Latin seems to have been limited in Antioch: Liebeschuetz 1972, 247-249. Themistius did not have any Latin (*Them. Or.* 6.71c-72a; Vanderspoel 1995, 157-158), and there is no evidence to suggest that Prohaeresius or Himerius did either. Gregory of Nazianzus’s relationship with Jerome might suggest some knowledge of Latin, though it seems unlikely (Cribiore 2007b, 208). Libanius praised Julian’s knowledge of Latin, but Ammianus remarked it was simply ‘sufficiens’ (*Lib. Or.* 12.92-94; *Amm.* 16.5.7). Constantius, meanwhile, was bilingual, as was Gallus, while Valens and Valentinian knew only Latin (*Them. Or.* 6.71c; *Amm.* 31.14.5). Ammianus likely knew Latin from his time in the army, though Matthews referred to Ammianus’s proficiency in Latin as a ‘product of the time’ (1994, 268).

⁴² Olympius 4 (PLRE I: 644-645).

of the world, but let this not make you forgetful of your friends and nation.’⁴³ Olympius declined the offer to teach with Libanius in Antioch, and in a letter dated 356/57 Libanius revealed not just his vulnerability, but also his desperation to add a Latin teacher to his school, demonstrating his awareness of the growing trend towards Latin studies and the need to offer this subject if his school were to prove successful and enduring.⁴⁴ Libanius wrote that there was a place for Olympius in Antioch, a ‘*choroi* of students, an honorific decree: everything is ready.’⁴⁵ Again, he attempted to persuade Olympius by appealing to his sense of loyalty to the East over Rome; he urged Olympius to ‘admire Rome but live in your country.’⁴⁶ Libanius asked Olympius to join him in much stronger terms than in the previous letter, and was more explicit about his needs. He wrote, ‘I have need of your language for what I do. If our students must be strong in court, and this is hard with the other tongue, how can you not be here and shepherd the flock with me?’⁴⁷ Olympius still did not take up the offer.

These letters are interesting for a number of reasons. They make it clear that Libanius was well aware of the rising popularity of Latin studies early in his career, and tried to profit from this growing trend, by catering for a larger group of students. This is in sharp contrast to his later comments on the popularity of Latin. In his speeches of the 380s and after, his tone is bitter and acrimonious.⁴⁸ In his *Autobiography*, he said that the rise of Latin was a ‘great shock’ to him and his profession, and that he saw a decline in the number of students as a result.⁴⁹

In 388, a Chair of Latin was established in Antioch, which Libanius felt was meant to deliberately harm him.⁵⁰ Libanius was unused to professional competition from anyone other than teachers of Greek rhetoric, let alone an officially appointed chair of a rival subject. In a speech intended to upbraid his students on their lack of discipline, with particular reference to the ‘carpeting’ of a pedagogue, he argued that this unnamed Latin

⁴³ Ῥώμη μὲν οὖν ἔστω τὸ κεφάλαιον τῶν ἐν τῇ γῆ, σὲ δὲ μὴ τοῦτο ποιεῖτω καὶ φίλων ἐπιλήσιμα καὶ γένους, Lib. *Ep.* C151.3. Libanius also referred to the prestige of Rome in *Or.* 40.5.

⁴⁴ Cribiore 2007b, 210.

⁴⁵ τόπος δὲ σοὶ καὶ χοροὶ νέων καὶ ψήφισμα τιμὰς ἔχον, πάντα εὐτρεπῆ, Lib. *Ep.* C152.1.

⁴⁶ Καὶ πρότερον ἐπέσειλά σοι παρακαλῶν σε μὴ τὴν πατρίδα ἀτιμάσαι καὶ νῦν ταῦτα παρακαλῶ Ῥωμῆν μὲν θαυμάζειν, οἰεῖν δὲ τὴν σαυτοῦ, Lib. *Ep.* C152.1.

⁴⁷ δεῖ δ’ ἐμοῦ τοῖς πράγμασι τῆς σῆς φωνῆς. εἰ γὰρ δεῖ τοὺς ἡμετέρους ἐταίρους ἐν δίκαις ἰσχύσαι, τοῦτο δὲ ἀμήχανον ὑπὸ τῆς ἐτέρας γλώττης, τῶς οὐ χρὴ παρόντα σὲ συνεφάπτεσθαι τοῦ ποιμνίου; Lib. *Ep.* C152.2.

⁴⁸ Cribiore 2007b, 210.

⁴⁹ σεισμὸν, Lib. *Or.* 1.214, 234. This part of the *Autobiography* was written between 380 and 393.

⁵⁰ Lib. *Or.* 1.255.

teacher had caused defection and encouraged ill-discipline in an effort to make Latin superior to Greek rhetoric in Antioch.⁵¹ Libanius expected his students to behave in such a way as to raise the profile of not only his school but rhetorical education as a whole, particularly in light of ‘the troubles which the eloquence of Greece finds itself faced with in these critical times’.⁵²

Sometime after this appointment, Libanius addressed a speech to his students in which he again mentioned the Latin Chair and referred to Latin as a second-rate subject. He even criticised his students for not engaging in physical fights in defence of him and his school, and their lack of loyalty to Libanius or rhetoric itself.⁵³ He argued:⁵⁴

you wrong me and support them with word and deed and favours of every kind: you thrust the second-rate forward to occupy pride of place, and you plume yourselves on the desertions you have caused among my students, and on the increased prestige of the man to whom you have attached yourselves – prestige won at the cost of damage to the rest.

Libanius was aggrieved at the rise of Latin studies, and particularly the effect the establishment of a Latin chair in Antioch had on his own school, without a Latin teacher because of the refusal of Olympius. This perceived decline is a constant theme in his speeches, particularly his later ones. While some have questioned or dismissed Libanius’s observations of desertion and decline,⁵⁵ it would be dangerous to dismiss Libanius’s comments on the rise of Latin as just the ranting of a paranoid and disillusioned old man, angry that the world was changing and leaving him behind: there was undoubtedly greater pressure in the 380s to be trained in Latin and law. There was a rise in the popularity of Latin studies in the fourth century; his letters and speeches attest to this, as students considered Latin a better route to success and security than the more traditional Greek

⁵¹ Lib. *Or.* 58.22.

⁵² καὶ ὑμᾶς τοῖνον ἄτοπον ἀφέντας ἀμύνειν τῷ σχήματι τῶνδε τῶν λόγων πονοῦντί τε καὶ πιεζομένῳ δι’ ὧν χεῖρον πράξουσιν ἐπεισάγειν, Lib. *Or.* 58.3.

⁵³ Lib. *Or.* 3.23-24.

⁵⁴ οἱ τὰ μὲν γνώμας ὑμῶν ἀπεσχίσασθε τοῦ σοφιστοῦ, μερισθέντες δὲ εἰς ἄλλους θρόνους καὶ προσηγορίας, μεταθέντες ἐκεῖσε τὰ χρέα τὸν μὲν ἀδικεῖτε, τῶν δὲ προβέβλησθε πάντα φθεγγόμενοι, πάντα ἐργαζόμενοι, πάντα χαριζόμενοι, τὰ δεύτερα πρότερα καταστήσαι βιαζόμενοι, μέγα ποιούμενοι τὰς δι’ ὑμῶν ἀποστάσεις τῶν νέων καὶ τὸ ὄψω συντέραχθε, τοῦτον αὐξήσαι ταῖς εἰς ἐτέρους βλάβαις, Lib. *Or.* 3.24. Norman’s translation.

⁵⁵ Cribiore argues that this became a ‘hobby-horse’ of Libanius, and that a dramatic decline is not ‘entirely justified by facts’. She suggests his older age at this time was a factor and that his later speeches present his ‘angry disillusionment’ at having failed to capitalise on the rise of Latin earlier by securing a teacher for his school (2007b, 210-211).

rhetorical education.⁵⁶ Whilst a vast rhetorical knowledge of Latin was likely not needed,⁵⁷ those who wished to enter the administration, an attractive proposition with the promise of rewards and exemptions, would need some proficiency in Latin. That is, a ‘vener’ of Latin may have been acceptable, which in practice would include grammar, reading proficiency, and some translation skills.⁵⁸ It is evident from Libanius’s continued concern that students were opting out of an extended course in Greek rhetoric in favour of Latin. It is likely they followed up with further education in law, which required some reading knowledge of Latin, rather than taking an extended rhetorical course.⁵⁹

4.2.2 Law studies in the Greek East

Bound up with the study of Latin was the appeal of law studies, which was the main alternative to rhetoric in this period and occupied an important place in the bureaucracy of the later Roman Empire.⁶⁰ As the fourth century continued, Roman law became a popular option for students after a short rhetorical education, as they could reap the benefits in the form of relatively secure job prospects. The popularity of Berytus and Constantinople in the late fourth century, as well as Rome, points to the popularity of legal training.

As with Latin, Libanius was very concerned with the increasing status of law studies. In 382, he observed that while previously the study of law was the preserve of lower status students, now ‘there is a mass stampede towards it’.⁶¹ In a later speech dated to 389-93, he told of students sailing to Rome and Berytus to study law.⁶² This appears to have been an empire-wide occurrence in the mid- to late-fourth century. Augustine studied with the intention to be a lawyer, before turning to philosophy instead.⁶³ Ammianus, in Rome, also mentioned the increased numbers of advocates, referring to them as ‘shameless, headstrong, and ignorant’. He said that they left rhetorical education too early, and were then ‘so totally uneducated that they cannot remember ever having

⁵⁶ Liebeschuetz 1972, 245-246.; Cribiore 2009, 236.

⁵⁷ Cribiore 2007b, 209.

⁵⁸ Cribiore 2007b, 209.

⁵⁹ Cribiore disputes the idea that law studies required one to be fluent in Latin, arguing it is not certain that classes in Berytus were taught entirely in Latin (Cribiore 2007b, 209; 2009, 237-238). Indeed, there were teachers of Greek grammar and rhetoric at Berytus. Nevertheless, some Latin was required.

⁶⁰ Cameron 1997, 682.

⁶¹ καὶ ἐδόκει τὸ δὲ μηδὲν προσδεῖσθαι τούτων τῆς ἀμείνονος εἶναι σημεῖον, ἀλλὰ νῦν πολλὸς πολλῶν ὁ δρόμος ἐπ’ ἐκεῖνο, Lib. *Or.* 62.21.

⁶² Lib. *Or.* 3.26.

⁶³ August. *Conf.* 3.3.6.

possessed a law book, and if the name of an early writer is mentioned in cultivated company they think it is a foreign name for a fish'.⁶⁴ In this he echoes the dismay and sense of decline we find in Libanius. Ammianus also observed that forensic oratory had been made 'hateful in the eyes of respectable people by the cunning of certain men in the East'; that previously forensic oratory was more refined in style as advocates had studied rhetoric. Now, however, they study law. He referred to the 'vileness' of law as a profession.⁶⁵ We have to give this claim some weight. Ammianus was not overly concerned with education, but it was enough of a trend and made such an impression that it warranted mention in his history. Ammianus, like Libanius, had noticed a change.

As for the reasons behind the newly prominent status of Roman law in the East, Libanius presents the same argument for the study of law as he did for Latin, though he does not blame Constantius as vehemently:⁶⁶ law provided benefits to those young men who wished to enter the administration. Thus, he says those who have studied some rhetoric hurry to Berytus 'with the idea of getting some advantage.'⁶⁷ He also argued that those who studied law were 'not enamoured of the subject itself but of the results it produces.'⁶⁸ In some of his letters he also mentioned these advantages. One of Libanius's students, Apringius, went to Berytus in 364 to study law in the belief that 'knowledge of the law is also necessary if one wants to be a good advocate.'⁶⁹ This is despite the fact that Apringius had been an advocate for nine years previously; there was an additional advantage to be gained from studying law at one of the esteemed centres. While previously advocates partnered with a legal expert who would complement their own rhetorical prowess, in the mid- to late-fourth century they needed their own knowledge of

⁶⁴ *e quibus ita sunt rudes non nulli ut nunquam se codices habuisse meminerint. Et si in circulo doctorum auctoris veteris inciderit nomen, piscis aut edulii peregrinum esse vocabulum arbitrantur: si vero advena quisquam inusitatum sibi antea Marcianum verbo tenus quaesierit oratorem, omnes confestim Marcianos appellari se fingunt*, Amm. 30.4.16-17. Ammianus had a particularly negative view of Roman aristocracy, and he resented that he was expelled from Rome during a famine while 3000 exotic dancers remained (14.6.19).

⁶⁵ *indignitate*, Amm. 30.4.4.

⁶⁶ However, fathers were again blamed: in a letter dated to 391, Libanius lamented the attitude of Letoius's father who wished him to study law; he had learned to sing the praises of Berytus (*Ep.* C129). Letoius eventually attended Libanius's school, for which his father received a particularly complimentary letter and he was praised for awakening a love of rhetoric in Pamphylia, presumably among the elites (*Ep.* C130; Cribiore 2007b, 71).

⁶⁷ καὶ νεανίσκοι λέγειν εἰδότες καὶ κινεῖν ἀκροατὴν ἔχοντες εἰς Βηρυτὸν θεόουσιν ὡς ἂν προσληγόμενοι τι, *Lib. Or.* 62.21.

⁶⁸ ὅστις οὖν ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους ἐπείγεται, [...] κέκραγεν οὗτος οὐκ αὐτῶν ἐκείνων ἐρᾶν, τῶν δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν φρομένων, *Lib. Or.* 48.23.

⁶⁹ ἡγεῖται γὰρ καὶ νόμων δεῖν τῷ γε μέλλοντι συναγορεύσειν καλῶς, *Lib. Ep.* C25.

the law to become successful and influential.⁷⁰ In a similar letter concerning Apringius, Libanius noted that it seemed an advocate was powerless unless he had studied at Berytus.⁷¹

There was evidently also a financial element to further legal training. Libanius mentioned in a letter of recommendation to Domnio, who taught in Berytus, that Apringius was still poor; his further education in Berytus was therefore meant to help him earn more money.⁷² Liebeschuetz also notes this, pointing to the examples of Severus and Mixidemus, who became rich through advocacy and then gained governorships.⁷³ One might also add that advocacy in this period came to carry *de facto* immunity from often expensive curial duties, discussed below, despite the laws to counteract it.⁷⁴ These advantages are also made clear in a letter dated to 365; Libanius discussed a student, Peregrinus, who was to study law in the hope of gaining wealth, offices, and power.⁷⁵ The expenses associated with this training were a small price to pay for its attendant advantages.⁷⁶

Libanius's early response to the shift towards legal studies was also similar to his response to Latin's popularity: he attempted to recruit a law teacher. Thus, Silanus, who taught law at Constantinople, received a number of letters between 355 and 357 inviting him to teach in Antioch.⁷⁷ Libanius argued that in Antioch there was not only more appreciation for his talents but also a post waiting for him; Libanius has prevented others from taking up the position of law teacher, and could assure Silanus the job.⁷⁸ Interestingly, Libanius sent these letters at the same time as he was trying to recruit Olympius to teach Latin.⁷⁹ As with that endeavour, Libanius failed in his attempts, and his attitude subsequently hardened towards both Latin and law as alternatives to extended rhetorical studies.

⁷⁰ Lib. *Ep.* C25.

⁷¹ Θαυμάζοιμ' ἄφ' εἰ μὴ καὶ αὐτὸς τῶν τρεχόντων εἰς Βηρυτὸν ἔσομαι· οὕτω καὶ παῖδες καὶ ἄνδρες καὶ γέροντες πλέουσι καὶ πεζεύουσι καὶ πέτονται δόξης τινός, οἶμαι, κεκρατηκυίας ἀσθενῆ συνήγορον εἶναι τὸν μὴ ἐκεῖθεν πίνοντα, Lib. *Ep.* B167.

⁷² Lib. *Ep.* C26.

⁷³ Liebeschuetz 1972, 50; Lib. *Or.* 39.12.

⁷⁴ *CTh.* 12.1.46, 87.

⁷⁵ Lib. *Ep.* C96.

⁷⁶ Lib. *Ep.* C96.

⁷⁷ Lib. *Ep.* B162. Silanus 1 (PLRE I: 840).

⁷⁸ Lib. *Ep.* B162.4.

⁷⁹ Libanius also attempted to recruit Themistius during this same period; evidently, he wished to build up a large school upon his return to Antioch: Cribiore 2007b, 64.

We do see, though, that Libanius modified his attitude towards legal studies somewhat in his letters.⁸⁰ It is difficult to see the same sense of anger and dismay present in his speeches; he does not rage against the dying of rhetoric so much in epistolary form. In fact, he praises knowledge of Latin and recommends students for Berytus. For example, in a letter of recommendation to Themistius in 364, his student Julianus's knowledge of Latin is mentioned not as something which was destroying rhetoric, but as a positive attribute.⁸¹ This same student was also praised as 'pre-eminent in the Greek tongue, but also in the tongue of the rulers, full of legal knowledge, a formidable orator'.⁸² Similarly, Apringius was commended for going to Berytus in order to be a better advocate because it was necessary for him.⁸³ Libanius also praised his students' knowledge of shorthand in letters. He praised his student Hierocles's abilities in both rhetoric and shorthand as 'equally sharp'.⁸⁴ We might infer from the last line of this letter ('I tell others about the former [rhetoric], but I hear from others about the latter [shorthand]')⁸⁵ that Libanius is not particularly proud of Hierocles's proficiency in shorthand, wishing instead to advertise rhetoric (and his own teaching of it), but it is important that the ability of Hierocles in both subjects is mentioned favourably.

The genre, then, affected how Libanius presented his opinions on the state of education.⁸⁶ In his speeches, he was angry and disappointed, while in his letters, he was more resigned and less negative about the prominence of shorthand, Latin, and law. The purpose of these letters, though, was to advertise himself and his school, as well as to further the careers of his students, and as such, his presentation in the letters was well thought out; they were meant to promote not only his school as a worthy place to send the sons of prominent families, but also to show that his recommendations carried weight and could help students find employment and patronage. Libanius could not be dismissive

⁸⁰ Cribiore 2007b, 206, 212.

⁸¹ Lib. *Ep.* C118. Julianus 15 (PLRE I: 472).

⁸² Σοὶ κτῆμα πρέπον Ἰουλιανὸς οὐτοσί, πρῶτος μὲν ἐν Ἑλλάδι φωνῆ, πρῶτος δὲ ἐν τῇ τῶν κρατούντων, πλήρης νόμων, δεινὸς εἰπεῖν, φίλος ἄδολος, εἰδὼς καὶ τρωθῆναι φίλῳ βοηθῶν, Lib. *Ep.* B79. Julianus became *comes Orientis*: Lib. *Ep.* C119; Cribiore 2009, 233-234.

⁸³ καὶ ἐπαινῶ τοῖνυν τὸν Ἀπρίγγιον καὶ μακαρίζω· ἐπαινῶ μὲν οἷ χρη δραμόντα, μαχαρίζω δὲ νῦν ἐπιβαίνοντα Φοινίκης, ἣν καλὴν οὖσαν καλλίῳ πεποίηκας, Lib. *Ep.* C25.2.

⁸⁴ καίτοι σχίζεται γέ ἡ σπουδὴ τῶ νέῳ περὶ τε τὴν γλῶτταν καὶ τὸ τῆς χειρὸς ἔργον, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐστὶν ἀμφοτέρω, Lib. *Ep.* C97.2. Hierocles 1 (PLRE I: 431).

⁸⁵ ὧν τὸ ἄλλοις ἐγὼ λέγω, τὸ δὲ παρ' ἄλλων ἀκούω, Lib. *Ep.* C97.2. Libanius reported that a student of his was praised for his combination of rhetoric and shorthand: *Ep.* C103.

⁸⁶ Cribiore notes that in the speeches, Libanius demonstrates an 'obsessive pessimism', attributable to 'old age, lingering depression, life circumstances, personal losses, lack of resilience, and inability to adapt to a changing social climate', which is not seen so much in the letters (2009, 237).

about students continuing onto Berytus, Rome or Constantinople in the same way he could in his speeches; he could not fully express his dislike for Latin and law studies in letters because they had a very different purpose and audience: letters were meant to foster relationships, often with important families, who could potentially wield power and influence. We might also suggest that some of these letters should be viewed as courtesy letters of recommendation, letters which Libanius felt obliged to write.

Letters were an important part of student life, as there was continuing correspondence between student and family concerning financial support, practicalities of study or the need for students to return home. They took on even more importance after school: there was ‘another level of epistolary skill that cultivated people needed when they aspired to high office or wished to correspond with a measure of sophistication.’⁸⁷ Letter writing was treated as a skill, one which needed to be practiced and perfected as much as rhetoric, and one which could be of equal benefit too.⁸⁸ Libanius appreciated competent letters, and considered skilful writing as part of the art of rhetoric.⁸⁹ It is unclear from our evidence whether epistolary training was part of the rhetorical curriculum, whether it was peripheral or more central,⁹⁰ though Libanius imparted, or at least encouraged epistolary training. He wrote exhorting a student to read the letters of the canonical writers and to learn from these.⁹¹ Libanius took these skills seriously, and commented on the style of letters he receives from ex-students; for example, he remarked that the charm of a letter from Julianus proves he is the ‘father of a good child’ – that is, he is the teacher of a good student.⁹² Libanius took pride in the skills of his students, so it naturally follows that he himself would lead by example, and compose elegant letters well-suited to the purpose and audience, much as he would do when composing a speech.

Libanius then, quite naturally, would alter the tone and content of his letters from his speeches, as he could not afford to alienate himself from potential alliances or business. More significantly, he could not afford to write letters to potential or former clients in the same tone as his speeches. He could not bemoan the decline of rhetoric and

⁸⁷ Criboire 2007b, 170.

⁸⁸ Criboire 2007b, 170. For the importance of letters and friendship in public life, see chapter 6.

⁸⁹ Lib. *Ep.* N189.

⁹⁰ Criboire argues it was more central than fringe, pointing to the similarities and regularity with which advice for proper epistolary composition is found (2007b, 170-172).

⁹¹ Lib. *Ep.* C134. This is similar to rhetorical training: imitation and practice developed skills (Criboire 2007b, 172).

⁹² πρὸς γὰρ αὐτῶν τοῖς ἔργοις τό τε μήκος τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἢ τε διὰ πάσης χάρις ἐδείκνυεν ὡς ἀγαθοῦ παιδὸς εἶην πατήρ, Lib. *Ep.* C121.4.

denounce Latin in his letters, as this could harm his reputation, which was such an important factor, if not the most important factor, in enabling him to maintain his school, particularly when he was struggling to lure students away from more attractive subjects and had lost imperial favour. Further, well-placed and connected families and correspondents could recommend or introduce Libanius to other significant people, enhancing his social network, with potential positive ramifications on his school and its student intake. This is canny behaviour from someone who has to run a school and needs students; it is also polite behaviour, though perhaps edging into hypocrisy.

It is evident from Libanius that more students were opting to study Latin and law over the more traditional Greek rhetoric. The evidence of Libanius and Ammianus provide us with a good understanding of this (we might add that the efforts of Julian, discussed below, also contribute to picture of rhetoric in decline), as does the primacy of educational centres such as Berytus, which under Justinian I was given special privileges and referred to as the ‘most excellent *civitas* [...] the nurse of the law’.⁹³ We can attribute this to the professional trends in the fourth century, namely the enlarged bureaucracy which opened up careers in the administration, and the decline of the civic councils, a development which was somewhat linked to the former.⁹⁴

It is a safe assumption that many were studying Latin in order to study Roman law, as some knowledge of Latin was needed, perhaps with a view to a career as an advocate. While only a relatively superficial knowledge of Latin was required, the evidence suggests that more students were turning their attentions to the study of Latin and law, either of their own volition or due to parental pressure, because of the benefits which came with this knowledge within the context of the fourth century. It is the wider reasons behind the decision to study Latin and law and the benefits this brought, to which we now turn.

⁹³ *Haec autem tria uolumina a nobis composita tradi eis tam in regiis urbibus quam in Berytiensium pulcherrima ciuitate, quam et legum nutricem bene quis appellet, Justinian, Digest, 7.* Alexandria and Caesarea were singled out as areas where unqualified teachers taught unauthorised law courses; students were warned against this practice and such teachers threatened with a fine of ten pounds of gold.

⁹⁴ Liebeschuetz 1972, 245-246.

4.3 Bureaucratic developments

One of the major changes to affect the purpose of and hence the practice and scope of education was the enlargement of the bureaucracy, initiated by Diocletian and later continued by Constantine. It was because of the changes Diocletian made that Jones could confidently write that ‘the later Roman empire was before all things a bureaucratic state’ and argue for the vital positions its civil servants held, without whom ‘the whole complicated machine of government which held the vast empire together would have collapsed.’⁹⁵

Diocletian pursued a ‘drastic policy of subdivision’.⁹⁶ He subdivided many of the provinces into ones of more manageable size and clarified the chain of command. He divided over twenty provinces ‘of medium size’ and split the existing Narbonensis, Africa, Cappadocia and Egypt into three provinces each, Thrace into four and Asia into seven. Italy was divided into eight ‘districts which were provinces in all but name’ (though possibly more).⁹⁷ Diocletian created about 100 new provinces, and this number only continued to increase: by Justinian’s reign there were sixty-two in the East alone.⁹⁸ As well as dividing the provinces, Diocletian grouped them into larger dioceses, under the change of a *vicarius*, deputy to the praetorian prefect. In the West, there were six dioceses, three in the East, while Illyricum was split into three.⁹⁹ As a result, the responsibilities of the existing positions changed and a number of new positions were created in the pursuit of a tighter and more efficient administration – at least theoretically. In practice, there was not always greater efficiency, as is often the way, due to the quick turnover of men in office: governors served for a year and praetorian prefects for three or four, on average.¹⁰⁰ However, without an enlarged bureaucracy, the later Roman Empire would have been ‘significantly less effective’.¹⁰¹

Diocletian also separated civil from military functions, so that the majority of the new administrative posts needed civilian rather than military talents. Governors now only had civil functions in the majority of provinces, and became responsible for judicial

⁹⁵ Jones 1964, I.563.

⁹⁶ Jones 1964, I.43.

⁹⁷ Jones 1964, I.43.

⁹⁸ Jones 1964, I.379.

⁹⁹ Jones 1964, I.47.

¹⁰⁰ Jones 1964, I.383; Kelly 1997, 153.

¹⁰¹ Kelly 1997, 163.

decisions as well as finance.¹⁰² Governors were also responsible for all administrative work in, as well as the monitoring of the city councils. As the nature of these positions changed, so too did the skills required so that a ‘capacity to deal with papers, accountancy, and above all some knowledge of the law’ was preferred, if not required.¹⁰³ Precisely the types of men Libanius taught or wished to teach were the same men who were in the fourth century studying Latin and Roman law in order to fulfil these criteria.

In terms of the central administration, Diocletian’s main contribution was to dramatically increase its size in order to serve the tetrarchy – that is, each Augustus and Caesar had his own administration, which travelled with him.¹⁰⁴ While estimates put the number of salaried civil servants at 300 in the mid-third century, working with a maximum of 10,000 slaves and freedmen, it is thought that by the mid- to late-fourth century the size of the bureaucracy was 35,000, with perhaps 6,000 holding posts which involved senatorial rank.¹⁰⁵ Indeed, the number of senators increased from 600 at the start of the fourth century, to a ‘fair guess’ of 4,000 by the end, with 2,000 alone being enrolled in the New Senate at Constantinople by 380.¹⁰⁶ That is an estimated increase of three to four times as many posts overall.¹⁰⁷ The ministers of the migratory administration (the *comitatus*) were quadrupled in number; the number of provincial governors was doubled, while the creation of dioceses added between forty and fifty officials.¹⁰⁸ Added to this was the staff of clerks and orderlies each new officer had, which by the end of the fourth century was also considerable: three hundred was standard for a vicar, and a hundred for a *praeses*, a class of governor.¹⁰⁹ By 400, there were approximately 3,000

¹⁰² Jones 1964, I.44.

¹⁰³ Jones 1964, I.49.

¹⁰⁴ This is the ‘boom in the number of administrative offices which Smith talks of (2011a, 135).

¹⁰⁵ Heather 1997, 189; Smith 2011a, 136.

¹⁰⁶ Heather 1997, 184; Smith 2011a, 134. The senatorial order was transformed during the fourth century with the advent of the Constantinopolitan senate and the granting of more honorific senatorial posts upon joining the administration or completing military service. There was a difference between a ‘nominal’ senator and a ‘real’ senator. The three ranks of senator reflected this, confirmed in a series of legislation by Valentinian I in 372: *CTh.* 6.7.1; 6.9.1; 6.11.1; 6.14.1; 6.22.4. In ascending order: *clarissimi* (consular governors and some junior bureaucrats); *spectabiles* (proconsular governors, the four *comites consistoriani* and *duces*, high military offices); and, *illustres* (praetorian prefects, urban prefects, consuls, *magistri militum*, top generals). See Jones 1964, 143-144; Heather 1997, 190.

¹⁰⁷ Smith 2011a, 136.

¹⁰⁸ Jones 1964, I.51.

¹⁰⁹ Jones 1964, I.52.

jobs in each half of the empire which put one on the path to achieving senatorial status, a huge transformation from the mid-third century.¹¹⁰

4.3.1 *Opportunities for advancement*

This opened up a number of new opportunities for young men across the empire, as so many posts had been created while existing posts had in many cases more than doubled in number: Heather estimated that the new ‘imperial’ jobs attractive to the *curiales* was perhaps as high 10,000 per generation in each half of the empire.¹¹¹ There were also opportunities for those without a high level of education to climb the *cursus honorum*; notaries, for example, though despised by Libanius as glorified clerks whose only skill was shorthand, could rise to considerable power, even the position of praetorian prefect, as noted previously.¹¹² Diocletian’s reforms also presented attractive opportunities to those *curiales* who wished to avoid service on the civic councils, especially as posts within the civil service brought lifelong immunity from civic burdens.¹¹³ The government could not bar *curiales* from these posts because they needed educated men, largely from ranks of the curial class.¹¹⁴

Along with immunity from curial duties, administrative posts could be lucrative and brought with them a rank in the ‘official hierarchy of the aristocracy’.¹¹⁵ As Jones explained, ‘rank was a set of immeasurable importance, not only conveying legal privileges but giving many imponderable but nevertheless valuable advantages.’¹¹⁶ Rank, though somewhat nebulous, should not be underestimated. It explains why offices were primarily a *dignitas* or honour, a prize to be given and competed for.¹¹⁷ These were the

¹¹⁰ For example, there were 520 notaries in the east in 381 and they all had senatorial status (*CTh.* 6.10.2-3), while the senior members of the 1174 Eastern *agentes in rebus* had senatorial status: Heather 1997, 189-190.

¹¹¹ Heather 1997, 205.

¹¹² Jones 1964, I.572; *Lib. Or.* 11.44, 46, 58; Liebeschuetz 1972, 243.

¹¹³ *Lib. Or.* 48.22. Libanius observed (in 384/5, likely) that each spring, sons of *curiales* sailed to Berytus or Rome to gain proficiency in Latin and law. He saw in this their means of evading curial duties, and criticised the council for allowing it.

¹¹⁴ Jones 1964, I.70. This is reminiscent of Bourdieu’s capital theory, which is discussed and used in chapter six.

¹¹⁵ Jones 1964, I.384; Liebeschuetz 1972, 50.

¹¹⁶ Jones 1964, I.384.

¹¹⁷ Jones 1964, I.383.

benefits that studying Latin and law brought, benefits which Libanius realised and which attracted his (potential) students.

However, the rhetorical training advocated by Libanius was theoretically enough to obtain a position in the enlarged administration.¹¹⁸ Undoubtedly this was a path many would take: Libanius still managed to attract students from across the empire, and places such as Athens maintained their position in fourth century without focusing particularly on Latin or law studies, suggesting there was not a massive shift or exodus whereby all students abandoned rhetorical training for Latin or law studies. However, there was a discernible move towards this additional training, as some offices were more specialised.¹¹⁹ For example, those with legal training as well as a rhetorical education were more likely to be appointed to the quaestorship or the *magistri scrinorum*, in charge of legal and imperial correspondence. Those with legal training were also potential provincial governors, who were increasingly responsible for judicial matters. As those who held the governorship might rise to vicariates and then to praetorian prefect (the most powerful civil official in the later Roman government), legal training became a qualification for a career high in the administration, particularly for those offices which involved judicial duties. *Agentes in rebus*¹²⁰ (and occasionally notaries) in the East could expect their career to be crowned with a provincial governorship.¹²¹ This suggests that while theoretically rhetorical training was enough, in reality legal training and the Latin studies that went with it, were in the fourth century a requirement for office, *de facto* rather than *de jure*, as emperors routinely showed their preference for those with such training. This is not to argue that rhetorical ability was ignored completely: the ability to compose speeches and letters in a suitable style (cultured and Atticising) was still desired, as seen in the inscription honouring provincial governor Oecumenius.¹²² Quaestors, for example, needed to draft and dictate laws and imperial letters, skills which could not be learned from legal studies or training with a grammarian alone.¹²³ Rhetorical education

¹¹⁸ Jones 1964, I.386.

¹¹⁹ Jones 1964, I.387.

¹²⁰ Meaning 'those active in affairs', *agentes* were the courier service which replaced the *frumentarii*, agents who had been disliked.

¹²¹ Jones 1964, I.387.

¹²² Smith 2002, 144. This verse epigram and its significance is discussed more fully in chapter six.

¹²³ For example, the poet and rhetor Ausonius was well-educated and served as imperial quaestor under Valentinian I, 375-7. Salutius, too, was well-educated and had an interest in history and rhetoric, which helped his relationship with Julian as quaestor (Jul. *Ep. Ad SPQ Ath.* 281c). On the importance of the quaestor in the framing and transmission of laws, and their stylistic contributions, see Harries 1988. Harries stressed the primary importance of eloquence, rather than legal expertise, for quaestors (1988, 158).

was still desirable, not least for men of higher social standing. It would have been unseemly and unthinkable not to attend rhetorical studies for a short period of time. At least a veneer of traditional rhetoric was needed before one could contemplate further studies, which might open up careers in the administration. It is a fine balance: despite Libanius's talk of decline and the abandonment of his type of learning, rhetorical education continued to be pursued and continued to be valued as an important asset, if not as a requirement, into the sixth century.¹²⁴ However, we cannot ignore the clear move towards other subjects and qualifications in this period. The preference for those with knowledge of Roman law or some level of Latin was a development of the fourth century.

Emperors were more likely to pay attention to social standing (which includes birth, wealth and education) than just professional qualifications.¹²⁵ This is reminiscent of Libanius's own guide for accepting students to his school: ability or talent rarely entered the equation; birth and class were more important.¹²⁶ Thus, being part of the curial class, which was populated mainly by old families with property and education, was important, and it was from these ranks that emperors formed the administration.¹²⁷

The fact that Latin and law were never explicit requirements for many of the administrative positions, rather seen as valuable assets, could be why a number of young men (and their fathers) felt the need to further their education in, say, Berytus. In a competitive environment in which the majority, if not all, candidates would have very similar backgrounds and education, and no formal examination or marking scheme to objectively rank them, further study in law or extra knowledge of Latin or shorthand might set you apart, even if by a small margin. At the very least, the social connections made in Rome or Berytus would be worthwhile.

It was possible to succeed or advance in the administration with only the rhetorical education advocated by Libanius. Law and Latin had not necessarily superseded rhetoric, despite the impression we get from Libanius; rather, they added to

¹²⁴ Criboire 2009, 236.

¹²⁵ Jones 1964, I.388. Marcone has shown that despite its verticality, there was a degree of social mobility within the later Roman empire, through the administration or military service (1997, 338, 363-365). Stilicho is good example of this.

¹²⁶ Too 2001, 13. Libanius likely did not consider wealth a major part of 'social standing' as he often mentioned students who could not afford their fees because their family, of good standing and name, had fallen on hard times.

¹²⁷ The use of the term 'curial class' is not without issue, though it is justified here: we are referring to the curial landowning elite, 'representatives of a socially and politically intermediate class', without strictly economic or Marxist connotations (Marcone 1997, 339).

one's professional capabilities. These additional subjects gave a more rounded education, added more strings to one's bow, which was an advantage in the competitive fourth century, one worth the extra time and money spent.

4.4 Decurions and the city councils

One of the main reasons Latin but particularly law (and earlier shorthand) became attractive within the elite was, as we have seen, to pursue careers in the administration and gain a position on the senatorial career ladder, which could lead to a governorship or praetorian prefecture. This also meant they could avoid curial duties, a main reason to choose additional legal training and join the administration. The city council was a co-optive body in which its members (decurions) sat for life and formed a kind of local aristocracy.¹²⁸ They were the local notables of good social standing, background and education – exactly the type of men Libanius would wish to teach and which the administration would wish to employ. The main qualification for membership was property, mainly landed.¹²⁹ Thus, *curiales* varied socially and economically as a decurion could have the sufficient amount of land but be cash-poor, while another decurion could be both land and fiscally prosperous.¹³⁰ Membership of the council was by the third century compulsory for those who qualified, and was also hereditary:¹³¹ we see in the letters of Libanius sons of age leaving education to replace their fathers on the council, something which he lamented (though not as much as he lamented those who left for rival studies).¹³²

Decurions were in charge of the public life of their community, its administration, finances and voting on honorary statues and decrees. They were in charge of public entertainments, heating baths, inspecting the market, providing labour for road building, providing animals and supplies for the public post:¹³³ the myriad duties which Jones calls 'exacting and tedious', but which Libanius was proud of.¹³⁴ They also sent embassies or

¹²⁸ Jones 1964, I.724. Jones argued these highly respected men 'might feel with some justification that they were the successors of the Athenian statesmen of classical literature' (I.724-725).

¹²⁹ Jones 1964, I.738.

¹³⁰ Jones 1964, I.737.

¹³¹ Jones 1964, I.739.

¹³² Lib. *Ep.* C29.

¹³³ Lib. *Or.* 49.10; *Or.* 11.134.

¹³⁴ Jones 1979, 206; Lib. *Or.* 49.8. Libanius discussed the declining councils and numbers of sitting *curiales* in 391, and lamented the lower status of those left behind to deal with important duties.

petitions to the governor or emperor, and elected magistrates. Crucially, they were also in charge of collecting taxes from their area, and Liebeschuetz argues that it is this duty which left them with little to spend on the cities: ‘they were required both as taxpayers and as tax collectors to make a greater contribution to the empire.’¹³⁵ The governor would pass on from the emperor a figure, and the members of the council would be responsible for raising the sum. They were also personally responsible for any shortfall, a particular burden on those members who may have been of good standing but were actually fiscally challenged. Other *munera* such as the organisation and funding of festivals and public maintenance fell to them also. Thus, it is understandable why the imperial government went to great pains in its attempts to revive or restore the councils.

Although decurions were legally exempt from punishments such as public flogging, this privilege could be ignored, and this maltreatment contributed to the numbers of decurions leaving their cities.¹³⁶ Augustine reports the flogging of a notable, who then sought reparation from Pope Celestine.¹³⁷ Note also the actions of Gallus, when as Caesar he imprisoned councillors under threat of execution.¹³⁸ The frequent occurrence in this period of flogging decurions (and often minor notables who could not leave as easily as those with more money and a legal education) was in part due to the fact that they were increasingly held responsible for tax arrears which had accumulated in the hope that they would eventually be written off by a new emperor, such as Julian.¹³⁹

In the Antonine age, the empire was what Brown calls a ‘commonwealth of cities’, with relatively autonomous and independent councils and influential local leaders who financed ‘thriving’ public events and public works.¹⁴⁰ The city came first at this time. Libanius, too, looked back to time when the councils flourished.¹⁴¹ By the fourth century this had changed, and the city councils were suffering continual leakage and were

¹³⁵ Liebeschuetz 1972, 161.

¹³⁶ *Lib. Or.* 27.18, 42; 28.4; 48.9; Jones 1964, I.750.

¹³⁷ *August. Ep.* 9*.1-2 as cited in Brown 1992, 52.

¹³⁸ *Amm.* 14.7.2. Gallus was promoted to Caesar in 351 but had a particularly difficult relationship with the *curiales* of Antioch, and the pressure of a grain shortage and fear of famine only worsened this relationship. He was executed in 354 by a suspicious Constantius. Elm 2012, 29-31. This is discussed more fully in chapter 6. Ammianus’s account of this demonstrates his sympathy for the *curiales*, also shown in his assessment of Julian’s laws on the councils, discussed below.

¹³⁹ Bowersock 1978, 76; Brown 1992, 28-29.

¹⁴⁰ This was time when the ‘status gained in the wider world of imperial service supplemented and did not as yet eclipse the status conferred by the local community’ (Brown 1992, 17).

¹⁴¹ *Lib. Or.* 49.2.

below strength.¹⁴² The size of the council varied from city to city, though in the East they were generally much larger: Libanius stated that 600 was the standard number in Syrian cities, while Antioch was claimed to have 1,200 members.¹⁴³ In the West, 100 seems to have been the average.¹⁴⁴ However, these numbers continued to decline in the fourth century. Further, the financial status of the cities worsened in the late third century, with the depreciation of the currency following the closure of the civic mints in 275, and Constantine's confiscation of pagan sacred lands and closure of temples, which severely affected the cultural autonomy of the cities.¹⁴⁵ The prominence of Constantinople meant cities also had to compete for prestige and status. It has been argued that the imperial government could have stopped leakage and bolstered the city councils.¹⁴⁶ Indeed, it was not for lack of trying. There were a number of attempts to revive the councils, notably by Julian.

4.4.1 Attempts to revive the councils

Julian tried to reinvigorate the councils from early in his reign; he had a clear vision. After just three months in Constantinople, he had issued six laws focusing on the councils and their health, and was publicly praised by Mamertinus for doing so.¹⁴⁷ He ordered that land 'usurped by the Church or the State' be 'restored to the municipalities, so that they may be leased at fair rates'.¹⁴⁸ This was to help with the reconstruction (*reparatio*) of the municipalities. He explicitly meant to restore the cities and their councils to their former glory (looking back to the second century and earlier). Julian also exempted *curiales* from an 'odious tax' payable in gold or silver, the *collatio lustralis*, unless a 'decurion is engaged in merchandising to any extent'.¹⁴⁹ This same law summoned clerics back to the councils and fined those decurions who had fled, as well as their protectors. He confirmed that tax collection was the duty of the lower class of decurions, not of senators, and

¹⁴² Jones 1964, I.725.

¹⁴³ Lib. *Or.* 11.33, 49.8. Libanius blamed the fall in Antiochene members on Constantius (*Or.* 48.3), a situation which worsened each year as more *curiales* left and those who remained became weaker.

¹⁴⁴ Jones 1964, I.724.

¹⁴⁵ Brown 1992, 17; Jones 1979, 251.

¹⁴⁶ Jones 1964, I.740.

¹⁴⁷ Mamertinus, *Pan. Lat.* 3[11].9.4. Note, however, that this was a standard point of praise.

¹⁴⁸ *possessiones publicas civitatibus iubemus restitui ita, ut iustis aestimationibus locentur, quo cunctarum possit civitatum reparatio procurari, CTh.* 10.3.1; Athanassiadi 1992, 103.

¹⁴⁹ *Et ab auri atque argenti praestatione, quod negotiatoribus indicitur, curiae immunes sint, nisi forte decurionem aliquid mercari constiterit, ita ut ordines civitatum ex huiusmodi reliquis sarcinarum, ut iam diximus, amoveantur, CTh.* 12.1.50; Athanassiadi 1992, 104.

reminded decurions that their duties should be fulfilled by themselves only.¹⁵⁰ He later restated that the *aurum coronarium* was a voluntary contribution of a fixed amount, rather than the forced tax levied on senators and decurions that it had become, and cancelled the longstanding debts of the councils, as well as tax arrears.¹⁵¹ Julian continued this programme throughout his time as emperor, and tried to boost membership of the councils by extending it to those who met the property qualification ('those rich enough to bear the expense'), irrespective of class.¹⁵² Thus, plebeians could be decurions, as could those who could claim eligibility through the maternal line.¹⁵³

How successful Julian was in his attempts is debated. Millar claims Julian's efforts were 'modest and conservative', arguing that any steps taken by an emperor could only be 'limited'.¹⁵⁴ While Browning argued that Julian was attempting to rationalise the centralised bureaucracy, and make it more just, Bowersock thought his aim a 'naive expectation' which did not work.¹⁵⁵ Bowersock argues this was because those who were trying to evade council duties were, mainly, affluent and therefore more successful in their evasion.¹⁵⁶ Further, poor and unqualified candidates were being nominated, frustrating the system, which Ammianus also noted.¹⁵⁷ Bowersock also points to the burning of the temple of Apollo in Antioch and subsequent punishment as evidence of Julian's difficulties in restoring the council.¹⁵⁸ For sure, the failure of the Antiochene council to deal with food shortage and to adequately prepare for pagan sacrifices and Julian's fierce reaction to his stay, as recorded in his *Misopogon*, might be explained by disappointment that his efforts regarding the councils were not proceeding as they should, with Athanassiadi remarking Julian was guided by 'abstract principle', giving little thought to nuance and acting impatiently.¹⁵⁹ Evasion was still rife, as we know from both

¹⁵⁰ *omnia igitur, quae consuetudo vel dispositio nostra amplectitur, hoc est cursum publicum, translationes, itinerum sollicitudines ceteraque similia cuncti possessores implere pariter compellantur*, *CTh.* 11.16.10; 11.23.2.

¹⁵¹ *CTh.* 12.13.1; 11.12.2; 11.28.1; Athanassiadi 1992, 105; *Lib. Or.* 18.193.

¹⁵² *Placuit etiam designare, quae corpora sint, in quibus nominationis iuste sollemnitas exercetur. decurionum enim filios necdum curiae mancipatos et plebeios eiusdem oppidi cives, quos ad decurionum subeunda munera splendidior fortuna subvexit, licet nominare sollemniter*, *CTh.* 12.1.53; Athanassiadi 1992, 106.

¹⁵³ *CTh.* 12.1.51.

¹⁵⁴ Millar 1977, 133; Bowersock 1978, 98.

¹⁵⁵ Browning 1975, 133; Bowersock 1978, 98.

¹⁵⁶ Bowersock 1978, 98.

¹⁵⁷ Ammianus reports that there were many in Ancyra who were unhappy and felt they had been unfairly conscripted to the councils (22.9.8).

¹⁵⁸ Bowersock 1978, 99-100.

¹⁵⁹ Athanassiadi 1992, 106.

Libanius and Ammianus.¹⁶⁰ Indeed, Ammianus was not wholly in favour of Julian's measures (perhaps due to his own experience¹⁶¹). While Libanius praised Julian's attempts, Ammianus wrote it was 'harsh and reprehensible that in Julian's time anybody whom a town council wished to co-opt could hardly obtain fair treatment, even if he was entitled to exemption.'¹⁶² He repeated this criticism in his eulogy for Julian, in a style reminiscent of his comments about the rescript on Christian teachers.¹⁶³ After Julian's death, emperors continued to try and revive the councils through a number of laws, though arguably not with the same energy or vision as Julian; indeed, Libanius argued the state of the councils only worsened after Julian's death.¹⁶⁴

The Theodosian Code contains 192 laws concerning decurions alone, posted between 312 and 438. Laws were continually issued in order to prevent decurions from gaining senatorial status, which carried with it hereditary immunity from curial duties, particularly dangerous for the health of the cities, as it denied them the next generations of *curiales*.¹⁶⁵ The laws displayed various compromises; from decurions being able to enter the municipal senate after certain civic duties had been completed, to a complete ban on decurions entering the administration. For example, Constantine in 325 ordered those decurions who had deserted the councils for imperial service to return, something which was repeated throughout the fourth and fifth centuries.¹⁶⁶ In 326, he again ruled on the 'desolate' councils, stating they should 'drag' those who had left back to their cities.¹⁶⁷ Only a few months later he forbade access to the senate for decurions, whilst confirming the status of those who had already left councils, as long as they had heirs to fill the council in their wake.¹⁶⁸ In 336, Constantine repeated that those who had

¹⁶⁰ Lib. *Or.* 48.17; *Or.* 49.3. Libanius complained that many who should have been enrolled in the council avoided such duties, a situation which only worsened upon the death of Julian, while Ammianus claims that many took to bribery in order to avoid council duty under Julian (22.9.12).

¹⁶¹ Barnes 1998, 58-59.

¹⁶² *Sed ut haec laudanda et bonis moderatoribus aemulanda, ita illud amarum et notabile fuit, quod aegre sub eo a curialibus quisquam appetitus, licet privilegiis et stipendiorum numero et originis penitus alienae firmitudine communitus, ius obtinebat aequissimum, adeo ut plerique territi emergarentur molestias pretiis clandestinis et magnis*, Amm. 22.9.12. Lib. *Or.* 18.146-148.

¹⁶³ Amm. 25.4.21.

¹⁶⁴ Lib. *Or.* 49.3.

¹⁶⁵ Jones 1979, 193.

¹⁶⁶ *CTh.* 12.1.11.

¹⁶⁷ *quoniam curias desolari cognovimus his, qui per originem obnoxii sunt, militiam sibi per supplicationem poscentibus et ad legiones vel diversa officia currentibus, iubemus omnes curias admoneri, ut, quos intra xx stipendia in officiis deprehenderit vel originem defugisse vel sprete nominatione militiae se inseruisse, hos ad curiam retrahant et de cetero sciant esse servandum, ut qui derelicta curia militaverit, revocetur ad curiam, non solum si originalis sit, sed et si substantiam muneribus aptam possidens ad militiam confugerit vel beneficio nostro fuerit liberates*, *CTh.* 12.1.13.

¹⁶⁸ *CTh.* 12.1.14.

abandoned the council be removed from imperial service and restored to their cities.¹⁶⁹ In 340, Constantius (whom Libanius blamed for the decline of the councils)¹⁷⁰ compromised somewhat, stating that ‘no man who had deserted his municipal councils shall come into the Senatorial order before he has performed all compulsory services by his municipal offices.’¹⁷¹ In 361, he ordered that those in the senate who had failed to fulfil their compulsory service return to the councils and barred future decurions from obtaining senatorial status.¹⁷² We have already mentioned Julian’s efforts. Following his death, Valentinian and Valens compromised and allowed decurions to enter the senatorial order upon completion of compulsory public services.¹⁷³ This vacillating continued well in to the fifth century, as Valentinian and Valens permitted only those with a legitimate son to take over curial duties to enter the senate, and, later, Theodosius barred all decurions from the senate.¹⁷⁴

The sheer volume of laws suggests that this was a difficult and unrewarding venture, but also that the imperial government was concerned about the maintenance of the city councils, if inconsistent in pursuing any one policy. It also suggests that decurions could and did find their way around such strictures, resulting in the need for constant retrospective punishment. As Jones stated, ‘ambition and wealth could defy every law.’¹⁷⁵ However, it was in no one’s best interest to enforce these laws and deprive the administration and senate of the best men.¹⁷⁶ Thus, the leakage continued and the cities suffered, so that in the sixth century Justinian could despair of the very small and poor councils.¹⁷⁷

¹⁶⁹ *CTh.* 12.1.22.

¹⁷⁰ *Lib. Or.* 48.3. That he also blamed Constantius for the decline of rhetorical education suggests that, for Libanius at least, there was a clear link between education and the health of the cities.

¹⁷¹ *CTh.* 12.1.29.

¹⁷² *CTh.* 12.1.48.

¹⁷³ *CTh.* 12.1.57.

¹⁷⁴ *CTh.* 12.1.74; 12.1.129.

¹⁷⁵ Jones 1979, 192.

¹⁷⁶ Jones 1964, I.409.

¹⁷⁷ Justinian, *Nov.* 38 proem, as cited by Jones 1979, 200.

4.4.2 *The undesirability of the councils*

We now turn to the question of why decurions would wish to leave the city councils.¹⁷⁸

We have already seen that curial status came with a large amount of responsibility, but it also came with privileges. There were legal privileges such as the exemption from public flogging, which could in reality be a death sentence with the use of lashes weighted with lead (though this was increasingly ignored and was a theoretical privilege only at this time),¹⁷⁹ as well as the more abstract and symbolic privilege of being seen as the ‘best men’. The main advantage though, as Brown sees it, was to meet arriving governors as equals. Governors, whom Brown describes as ‘notoriously wary’ and anxious for allies among the *curiales*,¹⁸⁰ held office for short periods of time only (usually a year on average) and so enjoyed ‘relatively little prestige and could show little initiative’.¹⁸¹ This is to be compared with the city councillors who sat for life and could, as Brown demonstrated, make things difficult for a new governor by withdrawing their support, effectively preventing a governor from achieving anything and thereby damaging his reputation and career: a governor would find it particularly difficult to achieve their aims without the support of the council and its members.¹⁸² This picture is in contrast to Jones, who presents *curiales* as men desperate to leave and who were glorified caretakers, in charge of public maintenance and tax collection, at the governor’s behest. Governors might hold more power according to the law and the hierarchy of administration, but they needed the co-operation of the local notables, the *curiales*, in order to wield that power effectively. ‘In the fourth century, courtesy was still necessary’, and this was especially true of the provincial governors.¹⁸³

This need for co-operation (or ‘intimate dependence’)¹⁸⁴ was seen particularly in the collection of taxes, which the governor and the emperor relied on the decurions to collect and transport to the imperial capital. The emperor decided the required amount

¹⁷⁸ This section focuses on the Eastern councils, though the Western councils faced much the same issues, as the proliferation of empire-wide edicts to prevent evasion shows. Heather discusses the decline of city councils in the west from the third century onwards (2000, 438-439). Ward-Perkins noted the declining aristocratic civic expenditure at Rome in the fourth century as imperial service became more attractive (1997, 378, 381), and pointed to the evasion of curial duties in North Africa; Augustine, for example, helped two friends enter imperial service and thus evade curial duties (1997, 384). See also Matthews 1975, 41-44, 77.

¹⁷⁹ Flogging and violence is discussed more fully in chapter six.

¹⁸⁰ Brown 1992, 15.

¹⁸¹ Brown 1992, 22.

¹⁸² Brown 1992, 23-4.

¹⁸³ Brown 1992, 25.

¹⁸⁴ Brown 1992, 26.

which was passed down to the governor, who then informed the various city councillors of the demands, which could include money, grain, clothing, horses, fodder and army recruits. The decurions were not only responsible for collecting a specific amount; they were also ‘surety for any shortfall.’¹⁸⁵ This was a reason for the preferment of a career elsewhere, and one of the main burdens decurions wished to avoid. However, while they may have to account for any deficit, they held such power and status locally that they could ensure through fear, threats and manipulation that they did not in fact have to pay the shortfall, and so could use tax collection as a source of profit and a basis of their power.¹⁸⁶ Thus, Libanius talked of how the poor of the countryside had learned to ‘cringe at the sight of the tax collector’s uniform’, and Salvian of Marseilles described in the fifth century the *curiales* as ‘tyrants’ and referred to widows and orphans as their victims.¹⁸⁷ Decurions could be ruthless in their collection of taxes, ensuring others (those in the countryside or simply their poorer colleagues) made up the majority of any shortfall, while they had come to expect their arrears to be cancelled. This was in part because they had to be ruthless: the political climate of the later empire, the frequent wars and state of the treasury meant that decurions needed to provide the taxes, by any means at their disposal.

While there were surely positive aspects to being part of the curial class, we have also seen that many turned their back on the city councils and sought a life elsewhere with different responsibilities and other, senatorial privileges, even selling their property to avoid membership of the council.¹⁸⁸ It could be reasonably inferred that curial duties were considered a burden to be shrugged off as quickly as possible, particularly as they could be expensive: maintaining the city involved heating the public baths, maintaining aqueducts and repairing public monuments, putting on entertainments, and maintaining the city walls, especially important in the later empire. This could cause huge financial strain, even for the richer members. For the richest members, though, money was not always a main motivator in leaving their curial responsibilities: while they ‘no doubt resented their curial charges’ and the ‘supertax’ they had to pay, admittance to the

¹⁸⁵ Brown 1992, 25.

¹⁸⁶ Brown 1992, 26.

¹⁸⁷ πιστεύεις οὐν ὡς οἱ μηδὲ τὴν τοῦ πράκτορος χλαμύδα φέροντες οὗτοι βασιλείας ἂν κατεφρόνουν; Lib. Or. 30.15; *Quae enim sunt non modo urbes, sed etiam municipia atque vici, ubi non quot curiales fuerint, tot tyrann sint? [...] Quis ergo, ut dixi, locus est ubi non a principalibus civitatum viduarum et pupillorum viscera devorentur, et cum his ferme sanctorum omnium?* Salvian, *Dei gubernat. Dei.* 5.4.

¹⁸⁸ Liebeschuetz 1972, 182; Lib. Or. 18.288-9.

senatorial rank also brought financial burdens in the heavy *suffragia* and the senatorial surtax, the *follis*, and with the praetorship ‘a more expensive charge than any curial *munus*’.¹⁸⁹ Moreover, the financial burdens of the councils were not outside the means of the senior members, who could delegate unwanted responsibilities to their more junior and usually poorer colleagues. As administrative posts could be made to be financially rewarding, this was the most significant factor for opting out of curial duties. As Brown has shown, the financial burdens of the council could be manipulated in such a way as to have little impact. Rather, more pressing were considerations of the prestige and security a senatorial rank brought both themselves and their sons. Jones points, too, to the desire for escape from the ‘dreary round of personal duties which fell to a decurion’, echoed by Brown: with the social dominance of Constantinople and the court, success now meant ‘escape from the demands of one’s hometown.’¹⁹⁰ The court, the heart of the administration, was the place where ‘the highest honors and the richest profits could be sought’.¹⁹¹ It was the ideal place for ambitious men of standing and education.

These were the same motives which drove lower status decurions to either enlist in the army or apply for a career in the administration, perhaps with an eye to the palatine ministries, which included positions such as notaries, *scrinia* and *agentes in rebus* and could be lucrative and privileged. However, financial concerns were more pressing for those of lower status, especially considering curial charges were not necessarily adjusted according to the amount of property one possessed.¹⁹² This could be a crushing burden for those whose family had a good name but little else. It was also particularly difficult for these men to leave their cities, while those with money and more property could take advantage of their position through *suffragia*, which by the late fourth century had come to mean the buying and selling of offices, rather than the process of recommendation and competition through connections. Indeed, *suffragia* became common practice, even ‘integral’ in gaining promotion.¹⁹³

¹⁸⁹ Jones 1964, I.749.

¹⁹⁰ Jones 1964, I.749; Brown 1992, 20.

¹⁹¹ Smith 2011a, 143.

¹⁹² Jones 1964, I.751.

¹⁹³ Kelly 1997, 180. Jones also pointed to the use of *suffragia*, the use of influence, connections and money, as particular aids for escape by the richer *curiales* (1964, I.749).

4.5 Conclusion

One never hears of a contented decurion, as Jones noted, and we have a distinct lack of knowledge concerning the day-to-day problems of those in the administration: those who held power are ‘virtually silent’.¹⁹⁴ While we should be aware of source biases and tropes, this chapter has demonstrated that for many the council had become too much of a burden to bear. Libanius’s speeches and letters bear witness to a generation of students concerned to leave the councils for posts in the administration, and the sheer number of laws issued by succeeding emperors point to an issue with the councils, particularly to enrolment: the men simply were not there. *Curiales* were dissatisfied and if they could, they left.¹⁹⁵ The privileges and status offered by roles in the enlarged bureaucracy were more desirable than anything the councils could offer. Staying in the city meant balancing the burdens of local government with its relative status and power; the opportunity to make money from tax collection with the fear of ruination and public flogging. From the fourth century, the aim of many of those who made up the curial class was to abandon the civic council for a career in the administration or army. Latin and law studies were a means to this end. As Jones argued, ‘Latin and law were of little use to an Antiochene decurion, but indispensable for an ambitious barrister who aspired to a governorship.’¹⁹⁶ The status of Latin and law, and, for a time, shorthand, increased and offered an alternative route for the elite. Greek rhetoric was thus not the only option or experience, which caused teachers of rhetoric such as Libanius concern for their livelihood (and their way of life). Libanius watched as his students sailed to Berytus, some even carrying his recommendation, and aspire to careers in the senate. His school survived until his death in the last decade of the fourth century, however, well after he had first argued for a decline in rhetorical studies thanks to Constantius. Greek rhetoric never truly lost its primacy, but the threat was real as political changes affected the educational landscape of the fourth century.

¹⁹⁴ Jones 1964, I.755, Brown 1992, 13.

¹⁹⁵ The problems faced by the councils do not necessarily correspond to a crisis with the curial class, but they are connected: Heather 1997, 205-206.

¹⁹⁶ Jones 1964, I.753.

Chapter five: Julian and education

“For the laws which he [Julian] enacted were not oppressive, but stated exactly what was to be done or left undone, with a few exceptions. For example, it was a harsh law that forbade Christian rhetoricians and grammarians to teach, unless they consented to worship the pagan deities.” – Ammianus¹

“Also, considering learning and religion to be akin, and seeing the one nearly ruined, the other totally so, he [Julian] directed his actions to the complete restoration of learning to its position and its renewal in men’s regard, first by honouring its exponents, and again, by personally composing discourses.” - Libanius²

5.1 Introduction

Thus far, we have surveyed the procedures and institutional constructs of rhetorical education in the fourth century. We have discussed its consistency in both methods and content, and the experience of the elite – ‘culture hero’ and more typical student. The norms of traditional education have been discussed, but we have also discussed two debates or developments which ran alongside this rather consistent experience: the Christian debate and the rise of Latin and law. While neither of these ended the practice of rhetorical education, they demonstrate that in the fourth century education was not static and was influenced by outside religious and political factors as much as any other aspect of late antique society. However, one cannot consider education in the fourth century, or even late antiquity, without discussion of Julian and his education edict and rescript, the focus of this chapter.

Previous chapters have utilised the work of Libanius, Basil and Gregory, as well as Julian, as ‘culture heroes’ well placed to comment on education in the fourth century and its developments. This chapter, however, will narrow the focus and discuss two documents written in 362 by Julian, the famous education edict and the rescript. These documents have done much to shape Julian’s reputation as an anti-Christian threat, not least because of the efforts of Christian writers (chief among them Gregory of

¹ *Namque et iura condidit non molesta, absolute quaedam iubentia fieri vel arcentia, praeter pauca. Inter quae erat illud inclemens quod docere vetuit magistros rhetoricos et grammaticos Christianos, ni transissent ad numinum cultum*, Amm. 25.4.20.

² Ὁ δὲ νομίζων ἀδελφὰ λόγους τε καὶ θεῶν ἱερά καὶ τὸ μὲν ὄλως ἀνηρημένον ὀρῶν, τοῦ δὲ τὸ πλεόν, ὅπως τελέως καὶ τὸ τούτων ἔχοι καὶ πάλιν ἐρασθεῖεν ἄνθρωποι λόγων ἔπραττε, τοῦτο μὲν παῖς τῶν ἐπισταμένων τιμαῖς, τοῦτο δὲ τῷ λόγους αὐτὸς ποιεῖν, Lib. Or. 18.157.

Nazianzus). As interpreted by them (and many moderns), they contribute to his image as a persecutor. Whether this is a reasonable conclusion will be discussed in what follows, but suffice it to say for now that the edict and rescript are crucial to the understanding of both education in late antiquity and Julian's rule, and represent significant imperial involvement in education.

The first half of this chapter will discuss the edict and rescript in detail, taking each separately, before considering the larger debates and topics surrounding them. We shall consider their contents, date and place of delivery, promulgation, and the nature of each text – that is, the legal standing, genre and pitch – a question particularly important in considering the rescript (5.2). We will also explore the relationship between the two documents, whether they should be read as a single entity, and consider the possibility of a lost edict, which the rescript referred to instead (5.2.1). The direct and wider audience of both documents will be considered: if the audience was primarily Christian, this will help determine whether the edict and rescript were inherently anti-Christian, and whether Julian can be considered to have intended a persecution against (elite) Christians (5.2.2).

The second half of this chapter will then move to include other sources, including Julian's other measures and literary works, and will explore the arguments and motives of both the edict and the rescript. Julian touched on the moral purpose of education, an idea shared by many in antiquity (5.3). Whether Julian was acting as a persecutor towards Christians with these official acts will be explored, as will his ideas on the religious element of education, based on the inherent religiosity of the pagan texts (5.4 and 5.4.1). The chapter will end with a discussion of Hellenism: how Julian's edict and rescript on education interacted with this concept, and how Julian's view of Hellenism and the Hellenes was different from (and clashed with) other contemporary views on the issue (5.5).

5.1.1 *Imperial precedents*

The involvement of the imperial government with teachers and education was not new.³ Emperors had long funded chairs of rhetoric and there are a number of recorded edicts on this topic. However, the majority of these were concerned with exemptions from public

³ Browning 1975, 169.

service and taxation, rather than the social standing or moral quality of teachers. For example, Constantine in 321 commanded that all teachers,⁴ grammarians and rhetoricians alike, as well as physicians, were exempt from public obligations and would hold honourable offices.⁵ In 333, these exemptions were confirmed and extended to wives and sons (*fili*). Constantine also exempted them from military service, the need to serve or furnish soldiers.⁶ Julian confirmed these exemptions, and stated that while military service was of primary importance to the state, literature was secondary and thus anyone who had worked for fifteen years in the administration would be exempt from council duties, even if they were descended from decurions.⁷ After Julian, Valentinian and Valens were to give exemptions to the teachers and physicians of Rome: they were free from military duty and also, along with their wives, free from public burdens.⁸ The exemptions given to teachers and physicians were confirmed again by Valentinian, Theodosius and Arcadius in 387, and were to ‘remain established in perpetuity’.⁹ This indicates the level of imperial esteem for teachers and physicians. Education was important. Teachers were repeatedly exempted from often onerous public duties, despite the decline in the city councils and the constant need for decurions, discussed in chapter 4.4. The contribution of teachers to the public good was deemed too valuable to be risked by enforcing these public duties.¹⁰

Constantius issued an edict in 360 which confirmed that education and eloquence were held in high esteem by the empire.¹¹ It stated that none of those in the order of the decuries (a guild of clerical workers) would be promoted to the first order, unless he excelled in the ‘practice and training of the liberal studies’, so that ‘words proceed from

⁴ Kaster 1988, 217 argued that private teachers were outside of the state’s concern, and not the focus of these edicts, which were rather applied only to favoured teachers chosen by the cities (223-225). Bowersock 1969 argued that in the second and early third centuries immunities were limited to a maximum ten doctors, five rhetors and five grammarians in the biggest cities, to be determined by the council (34). Nutton argued that sophists and doctors could only benefit from immunities if they had been enrolled as a ‘civically approved practitioner’ or extremely learned (1971, 56). However, it is largely accepted that these edicts, and the immunities and exemptions they conferred, were applied to both public and private teachers: Marrou 1956, 301-302; Watts 2006, 69; 44 n.171; Elm 2012, 140. Whether they accepted and claimed these immunities is another question.

⁵ *CTh.* 13.3.1. This has also been dated to 324.

⁶ *CTh.* 13.3.3.

⁷ *CTh.* 13.3.4; 6.26.1.

⁸ *CTh.* 13.3.10.

⁹ *CTh.* 13.3.14. In 382, Gratian, Valentinian II and Theodosius had also confirmed these exemptions in an edict addressed to the Praetorian Prefect Hypatius, *CTh.* 11.16.15.

¹⁰ Kaster 1988, 225.

¹¹ *CTh.* 14.1.1. Elm 2012, 379. This edict also ties in with the praise of Themistius, discussed in chapter 4.2: Constantius was not quite the uneducated and ignorant boor presented by Libanius; he did demonstrate concern for rhetorical education and eloquence.

him without the offense of imperfections’ – that is, unless he was educated to a high level. The edict went on to claim that language and learning (*litteraturae*) was the greatest of all virtues. As Caesar, Julian likely did not have much control over the issuing of edicts; he was also campaigning in Gaul at the time. However, the edict demonstrates that education and eloquence was at this point in the fourth century important, particularly for progression in one’s administrative career. It can also provide a link to Julian’s edict and rescript, in which he discussed eloquence and its role for teachers.

It is clear that, while it was not unusual for emperors to issue edicts concerned with education and teachers, prior to Julian (and, indeed, after Julian), these edicts were primarily focused on the issue of exemptions and immunities, rather than with the regulation of teachers. That was a matter for the city councils and for parents to judge. Julian’s measures were unprecedented in that sense.¹²

5.2 The edict and the rescript

Julian’s edict and rescript (often taken together and rebranded as his ‘school laws’) are intriguing documents which have attracted much comment and discussion and are arguably the most significant documents relating to education in the fourth century. This first section will examine the edict and rescript in detail: what they decreed or advised; when they were written and how they were circulated; whether they can be seen to be edited or incomplete in their surviving form; and, whether the rescript had the force of law or was performative in nature. We then will discuss the relationship between the edict and rescript, how closely they should be linked (if at all), and weigh up the possibility of a missing edict (5.2.1). Lastly, we will consider the intended audience, whether they were aimed at both public and private teachers, or only those holding a public chair (5.2.2). Crucially, we will discuss whether the two documents were aimed primarily or solely at the Christian community, or if there was a wider intended audience.

Julian’s edict was issued on June 17 362, and was received by a governor in Spolegium in Italy, never visited by Julian, on July 29 362.¹³ While there is no recorded

¹² Browning 1975, 169; Kaster 1988, 216.

¹³ *CTh*. 13.3.5. This is according to the information preserved in the Theodosian Code, at the end of the edict. It is striking that the edict was circulated so quickly over a wide area. We can presume that other *propraetors* of dioceses also received copies of the edict: Bidez stated that the edict was promulgated in all towns (1930, 263).

place of pronouncement, it is thought most likely that this edict was produced while Julian was at Ancyra, on his way from Constantinople to Antioch.¹⁴ This is inferred from the account of Ammianus, who narrated Julian's journey in chronological order and has Julian visit Pessinus before going to Ancyra, where he listened to many complaints from the people.¹⁵ According to Ammianus, Ancyra was his last major stop before Antioch and McLynn estimates at least a twenty day journey to the latter; Ancyra seems therefore the likely place where the edict was delivered.¹⁶

As it has been preserved in the *Codex Theodosianus*, it was relatively short and makes no mention of Christians, or, indeed, any religion.¹⁷ Rather, the edict pronounced that teachers must excel 'first in character, then in eloquence'. Further, a teacher must be approved by the city council, before then being approved and confirmed by the emperor himself. It is worth quoting the edict in full:¹⁸

Masters of studies and teachers must excel first in character, then in eloquence. But since I cannot be present in person in all the municipalities, I command that if any man should wish to teach, he shall not leap forth suddenly and rashly to this task, but he shall be approved by the judgement of the municipal senate and shall obtain the decree of the decurions with the consent and agreement of the best citizens. For this decree shall be referred to Me for consideration, in order that such teachers may enter upon their pursuits in the municipalities with a certain higher honour because of Our judgement.

As has been noted, this is an intriguing document, one which leaves much unsaid.¹⁹ We might describe it as a non-specific educational measure. Upon first reading, it appears to say little of real significance: the first sentence simply reinforces a sentiment which was already prevalent, namely that morals (*mores*) were the most important quality for a

¹⁴ Julian had issued a law from Constantinople on 12 May (*CTh.* 13.3.4), and arrived in Antioch by late-July (*Amm.* 22.9.15), Matthews 2001, 275; McLynn 2014, 124; Teitler 2017, 65.

¹⁵ *Amm.* 22.9.8-12.

¹⁶ McLynn 2014, 124. Germino doubts the narrative of Ammianus, arguing that it is insufficient, and simply argues that the edict was issued 'forse a Constantinopoli, più probabilmente in una località della Cappadocia o della Siria' (2004, 30, 32-34, 42-43).

¹⁷ That the edict is 'innocuous' in this respect has been noted by the majority of scholars: Bidez 1930, 263; Smith 1995, 212; Bowersock 1978, 83; Bouffartigue 2002, 600; Germino 2004, 45; Watts 2006, 69; Elm 2012, 140; Cribiore 2013, 230; Teitler 2017, 66.

¹⁸ *Magistros studiorum doctoresque excellere oportet moribus primum, deinde facundia. Sed quia singulis civitatibus adesse ipse non possum, iubeo, quisque docere vult, non repente nec temere prosiliat ad hoc munus, sed iudicio ordinis probatus decretum curialium mereatur optimorum conspirante consensu. Hoc enim decretum ad me tractandum referetur, ut altiore quodam honore nostro iudicio studiis civitatum accedant, CTh.* 13.3.5. (Trans. Pharr).

¹⁹ Browning 1975, 170; Smith 1995, 213.

teacher.²⁰ After this sentence, there is an abrupt change of topic,²¹ and it is this second issue that immediately strikes one as innovative and unusual. The decision to have teachers approved first by city councils and then by the emperor, is unprecedented: this is not just an extension of the power of the councils in regard to education, but also most obviously in the declaration that the emperor must endorse teachers, something which surely would have added a certain cachet to those teachers thus honoured.²² Thus, it is supposed that the emperor would be best placed to judge character. There is no detail on how this edict was to be enforced or how an imperial confirmation might work in practical terms, and no description of what excellence in character might mean in this context; perhaps it was obvious to contemporaries. Or, indeed the use of the subjective term ‘character’ may have been intended to extend the remit of imperial discretion. Undoubtedly, had the measure stood for longer and been successfully enforced, it would have meant more work for both the city councils and the imperial administration.

The edict itself is often overlooked somewhat in discussion of Julian’s intervention in education, in favour of the rescript (its more boisterous and showy relative), mainly because it says so little that can be seen to be revolutionary or potentially offensive. It is also not uncommon to find that the contents of the edict and rescript become confused, even in modern scholarship, and the edict is then said to have banned Christians from teaching. This stems largely from the interpretation of Ammianus, who criticised Julian’s ‘harsh’ law which ‘forbade’ Christians to teach.²³ Thus, Ammianus alludes to a law, but the only preserved law we have on education by Julian mentions nothing of Christians or religion. It is concerned rather with the approval of teachers, the role of the councils in this, and the employment of teachers of good character. Taken on its own, the edict does not ban or forbid Christians from doing anything. One might argue that it is banning teachers of poor character, and extrapolate from there that Julian is obliquely referring to Christians as men of bad character. However, any extrapolation such as this is not explicit, and historians sometimes mistakenly tend to follow Ammianus and conflate the edict and rescript.

²⁰ This emphasis on moral character will be discussed further below, at chapter 5.3. Kaster 1988, 66.

²¹ Perhaps evidence of some editing, possibly by Christian compilers of the *Code*: Browning 1975, 169, 170; McLynn 2014, 123; Teitler 2017, 65. I remain unconvinced.

²² This depends on whether the edict is deemed to be aimed at both public and private teachers, an issue discussed further below. Kaster 1988, 216.

²³ *Illud autem erat inclemens, obruendum perenni silentio, quod arcebat docere magistros rhetoricos et grammaticos ritus christiani cultores*, Amm. 22.10.7. Note, however, that the Latin does not refer to a law.

While the edict is certainly intriguing, its content is not particularly offensive or even unique; it really does read as quite innocuous. The rescript, however, is not, and it is this document which has garnered the most comment, and it is likely this which Ammianus referred to when he criticised Julian. Even though Ammianus refers to a law, the content which he alludes to suggests he knew of the rescript.²⁴ This rescript, written in Greek rather than Latin like the edict,²⁵ was not preserved in the *Codex*, but is rather known to us from a fifteenth century manuscript containing a number of imperial letters and from excerpts in the *Suda*; it is included in the Loeb volume as a letter also.²⁶ It has survived undated (and unaddressed), and as such it is difficult to date it with any security. Wright, in the Loeb edition, dates it to ‘after June 17th’ 362; so, we see the continuing trend to tie the edict and the rescript together. Browning, too, stated that it was published ‘soon after’ the edict, while Saracino stated it was contemporary.²⁷ Banchich suggests a date between 18 July and mid-September. This is based on his estimate that the sophist Prohaeresius resigned his post in late September due to the measures of Julian, and a comment of Libanius in a speech dated to after Julian’s departure from Antioch in which he criticised Christians for employing others to teach epic poetry.²⁸ This dating has largely been followed, with Elm arguing the rescript was written ‘shortly after arriving in Antioch’ in mid-July, and Watts too follows Banchich’s dating, favouring late summer.²⁹ Dating the rescript to summer 362 is persuasive, and allows for a place of publication also: Antioch. This is the traditional argument; Wright offered Antioch as the place of composition in the Loeb volume, which fits neatly with the idea that Julian’s policies became more extreme and divisive, with his stay at Antioch and the *Misopogon* marking something of a nadir.³⁰ Dating the rescript to Julian’s early days in Antioch also allows us to take seriously the narrative and chronology of Ammianus: his reference to a ‘harsh’ law aimed at Christian teachers comes after his description of Julian’s departure from

²⁴ Amm. 25.4.20.

²⁵ The difference in languages raises the possibility that the edict was written by a quaestor from a Greek text written by Julian. We might then infer that the rescript, in Greek, is more authentically Julian and more direct.

²⁶ Banchich 1993, 9; McLynn 2014, 122. The rescript is transmitted via the 15th century manuscript ‘Parisinus 2755’, which often copies closely from Vossius, a 13th century manuscript (Bidez-Cumont 1922, xi-xii).

²⁷ Browning 1975, 169; Saracino 2002, 131.

²⁸ This in turn is based on Eunapius *VS* 493; Banchich argues that Eunapius arrived in Athens in September 362 and that Prohaeresius left his position at this time, Banchich 1993, 10-13; Lib. *Or.* 16.47.

²⁹ Watts 2006, 70; Elm 2012, 141. Cribiore 2013, 24 states simply that the rescript was subsequent to the edict.

³⁰ Bowersock 1978, 91.

Ancyra, during a discussion of his stay in Antioch during the winter of 362. While Ammianus may not be referring to the rescript specifically, in the absence of a secure provenance, the argument to date the rescript to late summer 362, after the edict and his arrival in Antioch, is certainly persuasive.

The content of the rescript is particularly infamous, and has earned Julian the reputation of anti-Christian emperor and persecutor.³¹ Compared to the edict, it is a much longer document (over three pages in the Loeb), and is more sprawling in its content. It discussed the morality and character of teachers, and argued that proper education or ‘correct *paideia*’³² meant holding ‘true opinions’³³. From the beginning, Julian made it clear that he was less interested in the ‘correct’ way of speaking or Attic phrasing, but rather with the ‘proper’ understanding of texts and the world; with the moral outcomes of education. For him, education (and the rescript) was about right thinking, not right speaking.

Julian stated that teachers must believe what they teach in order to educate their students in the right way. If a man ‘thinks one thing and teaches another’, he is not just a dishonest man, but also a bad teacher. Julian wanted no hypocrisy or dishonesty to come between what teachers publicly taught and what they privately believed, because these were ‘matters of greatest importance’: while he might tolerate small differences between opinions and teaching, he would not in matters such as this.³⁴ Julian argued that this type of disparity was the behaviour of ‘hucksters’ and was dishonest and dissolute.³⁵ Again, Julian focused on moral standing and emphasised the need for teachers to be of upright and sound character, and stated as much, even repeating that teachers ought to be men of upright character.³⁶ He stated that as such they should not believe anything counter to what they teach, criticising sophists especially as they teach the use of words, but also ‘morals’.³⁷ This is the crux of his argument in the rescript. What followed was an elaboration on this core precept.

³¹ Hardy 1968, 133-135 gives a good overview of Julian’s reputation among historians, with particular focus on the rescript.

³² παιδείαν ὀρθήν, Jul. *Ep.* 36.422a. Note that he does not use the more usual ‘*enkyklios paideia*’, meaning a rounded, full or common education; a significant contrast.

³³ ἀληθείς δόξα, Jul. *Ep.* 36.422a.

³⁴ Julian remarked that he still considered it wrong to hold even small differences in opinions and teaching, without giving any examples of such trivial differences: *Ep.* 36.422b.

³⁵ καπήλων, Jul. *Ep.* 36.422b.

³⁶ τὸν τρόπον ἐπαικεῖς and later, εἶναι τοιούτους ὄσοι, Jul. *Ep.* 36.422c.

³⁷ ἡθῶν. The audience of both documents will be discussed below.

In his elaboration and explanation, Julian also brought in religion and the role of the gods in education, and argued that the gods themselves revealed their learning to Homer, Hesiod, Demosthenes, Thucydides, Isocrates and Lysias. They were therefore revealed texts, consecrated, holy, and those teachers of unsound character and dishonest bearing were not only cheating their students but also dishonouring the gods when they taught the same texts without believing what the authors had believed.³⁸ Thus, Julian gave these men a choice: he did not want them to simply change their opinions and continue teaching, but instead to choose whether to stop teaching what they did not think admirable, or persuade their pupils that Homer, Hesiod and the rest of the canon of authors are truly guilty of ‘impiety, folly and error’ in regard to the gods.³⁹ These insincere teachers would then have to admit what Julian saw as their greediness in accepting money for teaching what they did not believe.

At this point, Julian made the first explicit reference to organised religion with his mention of the temples.⁴⁰ He argued that, while previously there had been fear surrounding the open practise of paganism, which had led to concealed and secret belief in the gods for some,⁴¹ now this unease had dissipated because of his declaration of religious toleration and his pro-pagan measures, many of which countered the work of his predecessors; thus, there should be little reason for men to teach what they do not believe. There should be no reason for religious insincerity. Therefore, if teachers believed in the gods of Homer and Hesiod, they should emulate their piety. If, however, they thought that Homer was wrong about the gods, they should instead go to the churches and ‘expound Matthew and Luke’.⁴² While Julian stated he wished they would believe what the poets had said in regard to the gods,⁴³ he indicated that the choice was theirs, and revolved around their sincerity of belief and expression. Julian envisioned teachers who taught only what they truly believed, so they should either not teach what they despise, or convince students of the implausibility of the pagan texts. These men should stick to Scripture. If they did believe in the gods of Homer and Hesiod, they should then speak

³⁸ Jul. *Ep.* 36.423a.

³⁹ Jul. *Ep.* 36.423b.

⁴⁰ Jul. *Ep.* 36.423bc.

⁴¹ He is referring here to the anti-pagan measures (or pro-Christian measures) undertaken by Constantine and Constantius, which included the closure of temples and the ban on blood sacrifice, as well as, we might venture, a number of insincere conversions to Christianity.

⁴² This is the first mention of Christianity or Christians (‘Galileans’), two thirds of the way through the rescript. His use of the term ‘Galileans’ is certainly provocative, and Wright’s translation of ‘you Galileans’ for ὑμεῖς (*Ep.* 36.423d) makes it more so.

⁴³ Somewhat undermining his earlier statement that he did not want them to simply change their opinions.

out, and be openly sincere and honest about this. The rescript then abruptly shifts focus and ends with what reads as a coda about students:⁴⁴ Julian stated that what had preceded was to be a general law (*koinos nomos*), but that any child who wished to attend classes would be able to do so. There was to be no exclusion or forced conversion.⁴⁵ Julian hoped to cure Christian children of a disease, but he wished to ‘teach, not punish, the demented.’⁴⁶

The choice Julian offered in the rescript has been interpreted as a choice between religion and profession,⁴⁷ and in many ways, speaks to the purpose and meaning behind these documents, and how one views the reasons motivating Julian’s actions. These are significant questions, ones which will be discussed below. First, though, we need to discuss the nature of the rescript and determine its relationship to the edict.

5.2.1 *The relationship between the edict and rescript; the nature of the rescript*

Although it was included in collections of Julian’s letters, there is an argument about the nature of this document, commonly referred to as a rescript, implying something more authoritative and legal than simple correspondence. Hence, there is also an argument surrounding whether the rescript was a law or had the force of law; whether it was a letter or was something more performative, like the *Misopogon* and *Letter to the Athenians*. In part, one’s view of these questions depends on how one makes sense of the relationship between the two texts.

Traditionally, the edict and rescript have been directly linked, with the rescript being viewed as an explanatory accompaniment to the edict, a document which elaborated and expanded on the contents of the edict.⁴⁸ On this view, the rescript is an

⁴⁴ There is a suggestion that this is the result of editing or a lacuna. Certainly, it is thought that the rescript is incomplete, though I remain unconvinced: Wright 1923, 117n.2; Browning 1975, 169; Elm 2012, 141; McLynn 2014, 122.

⁴⁵ Julian repeated that he had not and would not force anyone to worship the pagan gods, *Ep.* 41.436c.

⁴⁶ καὶ γὰρ, οἶμαι, διδάσκειν, ἀλλ’ οὐχὶ κολάζειν χρή τοὺς ἀνοήτους. It has been assumed that here Julian is referring to Christianity. *Jul. Ep.* 36.423d-424a. Julian also referred to curing the disease of Christianity in *Ep.* 41.438c-d and *Fragment of a Letter to a Priest*, 305b.

⁴⁷ For example, Matthews 2001, 276; Watts 2006, 70. Some view it as simply banning Christians from teaching, based on the idea that no Christian could entertain such a choice: Bowersock 1978, 76; Elm 2001, 80; Germino 2004, 139-140, 165.

⁴⁸ This view is shared by Bidez 1930, 263; Browning 1975, 169; Kaster 1988, 66 n.138; Athanassiadi 1992, 189; Smith 1995, 213; Bowersock 1978, 84; Saracino 2002, 123, 132; Teitler 2017, 66. Zoltán 2005, 188 remarks that the edict itself is not anti-Christian, but that the rescript should be read as an interpretation which made Julian’s aim clear.

official response to a request for guidance on the edict, perhaps from a governor.⁴⁹ It is also traditional to view the rescript as having had the force of law, construing it as a legal pronouncement, complementary to the edict.⁵⁰ It was not uncommon for imperial rescripts to carry legal weight, so this is not unlikely.⁵¹ However, some view the nature of the rescript differently, whilst still seeing a close relationship between the edict and rescript. Criboire, for example, has argued for a link between them, though does not think it likely that the rescript had the force of law, and proposes that it may have been more private or have a more limited readership (a letter to a bishop, for example) than the official circular that Browning envisioned.⁵²

Due to the perceived link between them, there has been a tendency to conflate the contents of the edict and the rescript, to discuss them as a single, composite text. However, it is important not to assume that they must have been inextricably linked; one must take them separately. This is especially important because they state such different things, as discussed above. The rescript may well be linked to the edict and be seen as an explanation of ‘good character’, but it needs to be noted that we cannot talk of Julian’s ban on Christian teachers and only point to the edict. Indeed, one might argue we cannot point to the edict at all, on that score, since it contains no mention of Christians or religion.

More recently, a number of different arguments about the nature of the rescript and its relationship to the edict have been proposed, some of which are variations on the traditional reading. One of the more pervasive arguments is that there were in fact two edicts, one lost, and that the rescript is an explanation of this lost edict rather than *CTh.13.3.5*. This is based on the fact that, taken on its own, the edict makes no mention of Christians or of the prohibition of teaching, which is the main thrust of the rescript. For Watts, *CTh.13.3.5* was a way of ensuring the creation of a central directory of teachers, a checklist, in line with the increasing administrative centralisation of the fourth century. This would lay the groundwork for Julian’s subsequent measures and, further, ensure his actions would be comprehensive. These subsequent measures were another edict on

⁴⁹ Browning 1975, 169; Smith 1995, 213. Germino considers the rescript a reply to an anonymous correspondent asking for an explanation on *CTh. 13.3.5* (2004, 164).

⁵⁰ Both Browning 1975 and Bowersock 1978 imply this. Elm 2012, 141 views the rescript in this way.

⁵¹ Millar 1977, 252-253.

⁵² Browning 1975, 169; Criboire 2013, 231. Germino argued that the rescript was a more private letter to an anonymous correspondent, which was then diffused in intellectual circles, pagan and Christian (2004, 164-165).

teaching, published in late summer. Watts views the rescript as an explanation of the ‘intent and general workings’ of this lost legislation.⁵³ Elm considered this, and argued the ‘law’ mentioned by Ammianus, and the ‘*koinos nomos*’ of Julian’s rescript was not to be traced to *CTh*.13.3.5, but rather to another edict excluded from the *Code*. However, she also put forward the idea that the surviving edict may only represent a portion of this general law on Christian teachers.⁵⁴ Matthews also seems to view the rescript as linked to a different piece of legislation than the June 17 edict, arguing that it is ‘misleading’ to view the rescript as an explanation of the surviving edict. Rather, he thinks it clear that the rescript was an ‘authoritative pronouncement’ which was ‘in substance if not in form’ the law referenced by Ammianus.⁵⁵ This is an argument which again rests on the idea of a lost law.

While these views are a variation of the traditional interpretation, they still largely accept that the rescript is linked to the Spoletium edict, in that it explains a piece of lost legislation which is considered a continuation of Julian’s policy begun in *CTh*.13.3.5. Banchich, however, has argued that the edict and rescript are not linked, and that they should rather be viewed as ‘discrete elements within Julian’s legislation on education’.⁵⁶ His arguments are similar to those for a lost edict: there is little in content which could connect the rescript with the Spoletium law, except for what he views as a ‘superficial resemblance of their openings’ on moral character. Banchich, though, does not argue for a lost edict. Instead, he argues that we should accept the rescript as a law in itself, a slight variation on the traditional view.⁵⁷ Kaldellis, meanwhile, has suggested that the rescript, particularly the coda on the attendance of Christian children, might be considered as a theoretical argument with a polemical, rather than legal, intention; on this view, the rescript is much more performative in nature.⁵⁸

McLynn all but rejects wholesale the traditional take on the edict and the rescript, and argues against the idea that the edict was explained by the rescript, which in turn should be viewed as a legal document in its own right. McLynn argues for a more local

⁵³ Watts 2006, 68-70.

⁵⁴ Elm 2012, 140-141. Teitler also considered the possibility of two edicts, one having been lost, but does not offer a firm opinion on the matter (2017, 65, 66).

⁵⁵ Matthews 2001, 276.

⁵⁶ Banchich 1993, 10.

⁵⁷ Banchich 1993, 14.

⁵⁸ Kaldellis 2007, 148. Kaldellis pointed to a passage of *Contra Galilaeos* (229c-230a), which also considered Christians and rhetorical education but was not understood as a legal pronouncement, as supporting evidence.

and limited context for both documents: he argues that the edict was initially a response to a local complaint in Ancyra, which was then given general application empire-wide in an edited form. He points to a reference in Libanius that Julian had welcomed rhetoricians on his journey from Constantinople to Antioch, and Ammianus' account of Julian meeting *curiales* in Ancyra and litigants while travelling. McLynn argues that two laws of Julian which the *Codex Theodosianus* attests were issued around the time of the Spolegium edict are also instructive, and hint that Julian was responding to local issues as they emerged, rather than issuing measures as part of a general 'policy'.⁵⁹ Thus, 13.3.5 should be viewed in a similar light: a response to a complaint from a rhetorician in Ancyra, rather than the start of a wide-reaching educational policy meant to persecute. Indeed, McLynn notes that Ancyra would be a strange place to launch a 'flagship policy', not being an imperial centre or even particularly close to one.

On this basis, McLynn offers a novel interpretation of the rescript, its nature and its relationship to the edict. He agrees that the two documents are linked, but he offers a variation on their relationship. For McLynn, the rescript is a document which is complementary to the edict, and to an extent an explanation of its aims, but also something else. He views the rescript as a document similar to the *Misopogon* and *Letter to the Athenians*: a text presented like an edict but meant to 'mould opinion', and so more performative in nature. He argues that there is little to explain how this document could function as a letter, and suggests it could be 'most easily understood' as a 'paralegal' imperial text, such as those of Constantine quoted by Eusebius, albeit with a more humorous tone than the letter.⁶⁰ On McLynn's argument, the rescript was meant to stir up debate in Ancyra, and was associated closely with a decision on a local issue brought to him while he was travelling, which was then applied more generally.⁶¹ The rescript was not intended as law or to bear any legal weight; it was meant, initially, to stir up debate in Ancyra, for the benefit of those who had witnessed his decision, which had then made up

⁵⁹ These are *CTh.* 8.5.13 on the transport of bullion by the public post, issued at the behest of officials travelling with Julian, and 15.1.5, on the regulation of new public building projects. Elm 2012, 140 has argued that 15.1.5 is connected to 13.3.5, and shows where Julian was heading with his education measures. McLynn 2014, 125 n.23 rejects any such connection as 'heavily disguised'.

⁶⁰ McLynn 2014, 126-127. McLynn emphasises what he sees as Julian's attempt to mould opinion 'by hectoring or provoking or even by teasing' in the rescript, and notes his 'wicked sense of humour'. We can see evidence of Julian's arch or tricky side in his use of the phrase 'born again' in respect to Christian ears (ἐξαναγεννηθῆναι *Ep.* 36.423d), which echoes the New Testament (for example, John 3:3; 1 Peter 1:23).

⁶¹ This would be applied to a wider audience very quickly, given the reception of the edict at Spolegium by 29 July. This is not something which McLynn comments on.

the Spolegium edict.⁶² McLynn concedes that both documents would apply outside of this local context, and envisages a situation in which the edict would be transmitted through the usual administrative channels and received by governors, while the rescript would be read by ‘interested parties’.⁶³

As this discussion has shown, there are a number of ways to interpret the rescript, its nature and its relationship to the edict (or, indeed, its relationship to another, lost edict). While these arguments are certainly interesting and much needed, the traditional view still holds weight. The link between the edict and the rescript has too often been overstressed (and in some cases, conflated), but to assert a link of some kind is still valid. There is a relationship between the two documents, though it is perhaps not as close and obvious as some might have it. That the rescript operates as an explanation of the Spolegium edict is persuasive. It could also be viewed as a commentary on the edict, accounting for its sprawling nature and tone. However, it makes more sense to view it as a clarification and accompaniment to the edict. Some have noted that the two documents share little content to tie them together: the edict makes no mention of Christians, and the rescript has often been viewed as a piece primarily concerned with this religion and its adherents. Similarly, the edict does not discuss belief in the gods as a requirement for teaching. It only puts forward good character and approval by the councils and the emperor as a requirement for teaching. However, both documents discuss character. The first clause of the edict is concerned with this, and the rescript opens with a discussion of this quality. Both documents put character at the centre of the discussion and make it the foremost qualification for teaching.

Banchich criticised this as a ‘superficial’ connection.⁶⁴ However, since it is the focus of both documents, it surely holds more weight than this. That both documents discuss character is significant if we view the rescript as a clarification or explanation by Julian of what exactly he meant by excelling in character.⁶⁵ We could then view the rescript as a response to a governor asking for clarification about the edict. We could also view the rescript as an unsolicited document, written by Julian to further explain the edict or elaborate on his ideas, a way of expanding on a theme – after all, he was not an

⁶² McLynn 2014, 126.

⁶³ McLynn 2014, 129 suggests pagans travelling with Julian and the pagan elite of Ancyra; again, quite a narrow and local context.

⁶⁴ Banchich 1993, 10.

⁶⁵ Whether the rescript is successful as an explanation or clarification of this is another matter.

emperor unlikely to write without external motivation. We might compare the rescript to the *Fragment of a Letter to a Priest*. Indeed, McLynn's comparison of the rescript to the *Misopogon* and the *Letter to the Athenians* is apposite.⁶⁶ There is a shared tone here, particularly with the *Misopogon*. As argued in chapter three, Julian was aware of the ongoing Christian debate and there is a sense that Julian is trying to antagonise in the rescript, though this is not the same as persecution. There is something of the mischievousness that McLynn notes, but also the learned and sincere tone that is recognisable from Julian's other letters, such as the *Letter to a Priest*, the *Edict on Funerals* and *To the Citizens of Bostra*.⁶⁷ This shared tone also gives a sense of the nature of the rescript, and its weight. The traditional view is to have the rescript bear some legal weight, to view it as *like* a law. However, it reads much more like a clarification or a further explanation of a law, making McLynn's suggestion of the rescript being a 'paralegal' document attractive. The rescript reads like an explanatory document, but one which did not necessarily have the explicit force of law. However, that is not to say that it was not read as such or interpreted in this way: it would surely make sense for a governor to read this document as a signal of imperial will and to treat it as such; to consider it as a document which carried more weight than a simple piece of correspondence. It is not unreasonable to think that this document was read as an implicit legal pronouncement; it was an imperial document after all, and one might expect readers to notice and bear in mind any words from the emperor. However, the fact that we only know of two teachers leaving their posts and do not have evidence of its enforcement suggests that it was not, in fact, a law in itself and that it was not widely interpreted as if it were.⁶⁸

While it is tempting to argue for a lost edict, one which the rescript is more closely connected to, the arguments for this are not entirely persuasive. There is no extant evidence that we can adduce to positively support this idea, but we can see that the rescript and Spolegium edict are linked through a common concern for character. The issuing rescript seems most likely to be connected to the Spolegium edict, though not as tightly as some have argued. They are two different and separate documents, and should be treated as such. To speak of the edict as 'banning Christians from teaching' is

⁶⁶ McLynn 2014, 126.

⁶⁷ Julian referred to the letter to the Bostrans as an edict or ordinance, διατάγματος (*Ep.* 41.437b). That he did not refer to the rescript similarly is interesting.

⁶⁸ Millar 1977, 253 concludes that there was a genuine distinction between edicts and other types of imperial correspondence, such as *rescripta*, despite the blurred distinction.

misleading and unnecessary. Indeed, to speak of the rescript in this way could also be misleading, as we shall see. The rescript is rather an explanatory document, an accompaniment which was meant to be a clarification on the matter of character. Whether this was a response to a request from a governor is difficult to gauge due to its fragmentary survival. However - to reiterate my view of the matter – it seems more likely that it was a paralegal text, a document which was not an explicit legal document and which did not have the force of law.

5.2.2 The audience(s): the target readership and those affected

The audience of Julian's edict and rescript is debated. Indeed, we can establish two different 'audiences' of Julian's edict and rescript: those who would receive and read the texts, and a category of person intended to be affected by the texts. A discussion of audience raises several questions: whether it was aimed at public and private teachers, or just those holding a public chair; whether the rescript had a wide circulation; whether either or both documents were aimed primarily at Christians or at a wider audience.

It is clear from the information provided in the *Codex Theodosianus* that the edict was widely promulgated – from Ancyra to Spolegium – and it is safe to assume that it was sent to governors across the empire. The resignation of Marius Victorinus from teaching in Rome is also an indication of the edict's geographical scope. The promulgation and audience of the rescript is more difficult to ascertain. As discussed, it has been preserved and transmitted undated and unaddressed. While we can tentatively date it to late summer 362 and therefore argue for Antioch as place of publication, it is more difficult to gauge its immediate audience. If we argue that it was a response to a request for clarification, it is possible that the request was from an unsure governor, upon receipt of the edict. It has been argued that the rescript would then have been given general circulation, and sent to provincial governors like the edict.⁶⁹ This is persuasive, especially when we consider the ancient reception of the rescript: Gregory of Nazianzus displays knowledge of the rescript in his invectives against Julian, as do the fifth century Christian writers.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Browning 1975, 170; Smith 1995, 213. McLynn's idea that it would be posted up outside the imperial residence in Ancyra like the *Misopogon* in Antioch is interesting, if not wholly persuasive (2014, 126).

⁷⁰ Many Christian writers criticise what they interpreted as his attempt to ban Christians from teaching pagan works, which is not a provision of the edict or the rescript. While the edict may have been edited, it is

Modern historians are divided on the issue of whether the edict was aimed at both public and private teachers or rather just those teachers who held a public chair. This is a significant question, as it impacts the interpretation of the rescript and the scope of Julian's measures, whether Julian was attempting to start 'open warfare' with all Christians.⁷¹ If Julian meant the edict and rescript to affect all teachers, the scope is obviously much broader and one could therefore make an argument that Julian was not only interfering in education to an unprecedented extent, but also laying the groundwork for the perceived persecution of a much wider group of people.⁷²

Bidez asserted that Julian's 'school laws' were only concerned with public instruction,⁷³ and Banchich argued that both Julian's edict and rescript were only concerned with public chairs. In support of this, he argued that Prohaeresius resigned his public post but continued to teach privately, and pointed to Marius Victorinus as another public teacher who left his position in response to Julian's rescript.⁷⁴ Criboire, too, argued that the rescript meant public chairs would have to resign.⁷⁵ However, the wording of the edict is instructive here: Julian states 'any man who should wish to teach' would need to be first approved by the council and then by the emperor.⁷⁶ Further, the first sentence of the edict does not make any distinction between public and private teachers – Julian simply wrote 'masters of studies and teachers'.⁷⁷ This suggests that the edict was aimed at both public and private teachers, since some distinction between public chairs and private teachers would certainly be possible (and preferable).

One could argue that since Julian was asking the councils to approve teachers first, he meant the edict to be aimed solely at public teachers, as councils were traditionally involved with their selection. Julian could thus be reminding the councils of their duties, and reasserting their power in this, in line with his other measures concerning

unlikely to have been edited to such an extent. It is more likely that these writers knew the rescript, which suggests a wider circulation. GNaz. *Or.*4.96; Soz. *HE.* 5.18; Socrat. *HE.* 3.12; 16.

⁷¹ Downey 1957a, 98 argued that in the latter half of his reign, Julian passed into 'open warfare on Christianity', following Bidez 1930, 263.

⁷² Watts 2006, 69 argues that the edict laid the groundwork for his subsequent and, as Watts perceives them, anti-Christian measures.

⁷³ Bidez 1930, 265.

⁷⁴ Banchich 1993, 10-11, 12. Saracino follows this argument (2002, 123), as does Kaldellis (2007, 148). Saracino further argues that the rescript refers to teachers already employed, pointing to the examples of Prohaeresius and Victorinus, while the edict outlined provisions for new teachers (2002, 132).

⁷⁵ Criboire 2013, 231. She does not cite any evidence for this.

⁷⁶ *quisque docere vult*, *CTh.* 13.3.5. (Trans. Pharr).

⁷⁷ *Magistros studiorum doctoresque*, *CTh.* 13.3.5. (Trans. Pharr).

the councils and decurions. We have previously discussed Julian's efforts to reinvigorate the councils throughout his reign: he issued a series of edicts in 362 after only a short while in Constantinople, and continued to do so in Antioch.⁷⁸ One of these edicts confirmed the myriad responsibilities of the decurions, and one could point to *CTh.* 13.3.5 as similarly focused: Julian was asserting their responsibilities as members of the city councils, but also extending their duties to include the safeguarding of education through the character assessment of teachers.

One could also point to Julian's use of the phrase 'they publicly express' in the rescript to argue that he was concerned only with public teachers.⁷⁹ However, that Julian addressed the edict to 'any man' who wished to teach and used the more general 'masters of studies and teachers' is significant. It is this which surely signifies that the edict was addressed to both public and private teachers.⁸⁰ That the edict was focused on both public and private teachers strengthens his image as an emperor concerned with the rejuvenation of the city councils. If city councils were charged with the approval of all teachers, public and private, it marks a significant shift in the scope of their powers, as well as in imperial involvement in education and the private sphere. Further, Julian was only specific about his intentions when he stated in the rescript that he was directing his words at grammarians and rhetoricians but especially sophists.⁸¹ That he does not specify holders of public chairs here is important, more important than his use of the phrase 'opinions you express in public', which could instead be interpreted as simply contrasting those opinions they hold in their private lives, outside of their profession. The view that Julian's edict and rescript were aimed at all teachers is also strengthened by the argument that the edicts on teachers' exemptions were similarly aimed at a broad audience of public and private teachers, discussed above.⁸²

There is also a debate as to whether the edict and rescript were aimed at only Christian teachers, or whether Julian may have been targeting a wider category of teachers. Traditionally, the edict and especially the rescript have been viewed as anti-

⁷⁸ *CTh.* 10.3.1; 12.1.50; 11.23.2; 11.16.10; 12.13.1; 11.12.2; 11.28.1; 12.1.51.

⁷⁹ μή μαχόμενα οἷς δημοσίᾳ μεταχειρίζονται τὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ φέρειν δοξάσματα, *Jul. Ep.* 36.422c. δημοσίᾳ can be somewhat imprecise and also mean 'openly', 'outwardly' or 'commonly'.

⁸⁰ This is argued by Marrou 1956, 442; Browning 1975, 171 and Elm 2012, 140.

⁸¹ εἴτε ῥήτορες εἴτε γραμματικοί, καί ἔτι πλέον οἱ σοφισταί, *Jul. Ep.* 36.422d. That he makes a distinction between masters (*magistros*) of studies and teachers (*doctors*) is also interesting in this regard.

⁸² *CTh.* 14.9.3 makes the distinction between public and private teachers, which neither the edicts on exemptions discussed above do, or 13.3.5.

Christian, the point in Julian's reign which marked a more decisive turn to persecution, following the Christian sources.⁸³ Those historians who view Julian's reign as one of persecution against Christianity argue that both documents, if not inherently anti-Christian, were certainly aimed at Christians.⁸⁴ They argue that both documents taken together form one measure or a policy, meant to reverse the progress made by Christians, previously aided by the legislation of Constantine and Constantius, and to stop the spread of Christianity among the elites.⁸⁵ Julian meant to drive the Christians from the schools.⁸⁶ This is a difficult argument, as it assumes that Christian parents would be less inclined to have their children taught by pagans, an idea which ignores that fact that many teachers were pagans and taught Christians apparently without any issue or fear of conversion – Libanius is one such example, and, vice versa, both Basil and Gregory studied in Athens without threat to their religion. Similarly, pagan students were taught by Christians without worry; Eunapius was taught by Prohaeresius, for example.⁸⁷ This argument also ignores the end of the rescript in which Julian emphatically stated that Christian children would be allowed – encouraged, even – to attend classes.⁸⁸

More recently, there have been attempts to revisit this argument. McLynn, as mentioned, argued for a more local context for both the edict and the rescript, and so viewed the citizens of Ancyra as Julian's primary audience. He suggested that it was a response to a specific complaint from a local, possibly a rhetorician. However, he still saw this as a complaint 'presumably' against a Christian; that is, for McLynn, Christians are still likely to be the primary focus of the edict and rescript, despite a more local context. It is possible, however, that if the edict was given a wider application then the audience was more general than this.⁸⁹

Cribiore has gone further and has argued persuasively for a wider audience than just the (elite) Christian community. She contends that the intended audience also included moderate pagans, those 'lax and apathetic worshippers' – 'grey pagans'.

⁸³ Downey 1957a, 98; Bowersock 1978, 84; 91.

⁸⁴ Hardy 1968, 139; Bouffartigue 1992, 602-603; Saracino 2002, 131; Tougher 2007, 57; Teitler 2017, 67.

⁸⁵ Elm 2003, 274.

⁸⁶ Kaster 1988, 66; Smith 1995, 214. Bidez argued that Julian would transform the schools into pagan seminaries (1930, 264).

⁸⁷ Tougher 2007, 57 discusses this.

⁸⁸ Jul. *Ep.* 36.423d-424a. The argument that Julian meant to ban Christians from the schools follows the Christian sources, which largely write of Julian banning Christian children from learning: GNaz. *Or.* 4.96; Soz. *HE.* 5.18; Socrat. *HE.* 3.12; 16; August. *civ. Dei* 18.52.

⁸⁹ McLynn 2014, 124.

Religious experience was not cut and dried, and did not consist of two diametrically opposed groups; it was (and is) more nuanced than that.⁹⁰ Cribiore counts Libanius and Ammianus among those whose allegiance to paganism was more moderate and less committed than Julian's 'burning zeal'.⁹¹ While Cribiore does not doubt that the rescript indicated 'unmistakably' the direction Julian was heading and should be seen as part of his policy to reassert the place of the pagan gods, she does not view it as solely aimed at Christians.⁹² Neither document should be viewed as entirely anti-Christian, but perhaps as championing the pagan religion – we might call them pro-pagan. In this way, both documents, particularly the rescript, had implications for a wider audience which also included pagans. Cribiore argues that the traditional view which paints Christians as the sole audience of Julian's educational measures have been too influenced by Christian sources, who themselves 'put a disproportionate emphasis on the religious elements of his policies'.⁹³ For Cribiore, Julian was urging the moderate pagans to step up and be more committed in their religiosity; he wanted a united pagan front.⁹⁴ She also notes the discrepancy between Julian's view of religion and others': for Julian, it was black and white, without a grey, apathetic middle ground.⁹⁵ This brand of paganism and Julian's rescript threatened the 'grey pagans', and it is this which accounts for the silence of Libanius and criticism of Ammianus. Cribiore argues that the rescript sent pagans a 'troubling, controversial message that they too had to conform to the emperor's strict religious guidelines.' Julian was actively calling for them to be more rigorous and committed in their paganism, as well as more open about their private religious feelings.⁹⁶

There is much to recommend this argument. As mentioned, Julian makes no mention of religious persuasion in the edict, which is significant for a law which supposedly started an education policy meant to persecute Christians. Rather, it is concerned with moral character, and the approval of this. The rescript, too, is largely concerned with moral character, and it is this which links them. However, the rescript also mentions Christians ('Galileans') and suggests those who do not believe in the gods

⁹⁰ Cribiore 2013, 230. Cameron 2011 argued for five overlapping categories of pagans and Christians: committed Christians; committed pagans; centre-Christians; centre-pagans; and, a large group of those who defied classification (176-177).

⁹¹ Cribiore 2013, 24; 172-3.

⁹² Cribiore 2013, 231.

⁹³ Cribiore 2013, 234.

⁹⁴ Cribiore 2013, 235. Cribiore sees the influence of Julian's Christian upbringing in this.

⁹⁵ Cribiore 2013, 234. She emphasises Julian's religious intensity, his passion, stating he had the 'burning zeal of a neophyte' and said he had the intransigence of a fundamentalist (235).

⁹⁶ Cribiore 2013, 236.

of pagan literature should instead expound Matthew and Luke.⁹⁷ This has been used as proof that the rescript and the edict were aimed at Christians, and part of a persecution and attempt to weaken or eliminate Christianity. Indeed, there is no doubt that the rescript was targeting Christians – *as well as* pagans. This is applicable to the edict too.

Christianity had no official role in the state at this point; it was simply the favoured religion of recent emperors. While Christianity had recently been shown favour, there was a longer history of imperial goodwill shown to the pagan gods. Julian was under no obligation to continue with those favours given to Christians by his uncle and cousin, and we might reasonably expect Julian to, rather, favour or promote his own religion – as Constantine and Constantius had done. Julian’s rescript mentions Christians but not as much as one might think. The first mention of Christians comes about two thirds of the way through the document, and one could argue that Julian was using Christians as an example of those he perceived as being hypocritical and insincere teachers. Whilst he used Christians to illustrate his point, it is certainly reasonable to argue that Julian also intended his rescript to apply to the less enthusiastic pagans. Julian did not have qualms about criticising other pagans, as we can see in his piece on the Cynic Heraclius,⁹⁸ and we can see from his other works how strongly he felt about the behaviour of pagans. His *Letter to a Priest* and the letter to Arsacius illustrate this: both demonstrate clearly that Julian felt strongly about the actions of pagans, particularly those in an influential and powerful position, such as priests – or even teachers.⁹⁹ We could view the edict and particularly the rescript in this light.

Julian’s *Edict on Funerals* is also a comparable text. It is included in the Loeb volume as a letter, and is thought to be an early version of Julian’s law on funerals, *CTh.* 9.17.5.¹⁰⁰ It reveals Julian’s concern for pollution and impiety, as he stated burials should

⁹⁷ Jul. *Ep.* 36.423d.

⁹⁸ Julian criticised Heraclius’s allegorical interpretation of a myth and thus his understanding of the gods, *Or.* 7.205a. Cynics, if they observe the division of philosophy into the speculative and the practical, should only compose serious, edifying and religious fables, *Or.* 7.208d-209a, 215c-216d. He went on to criticise later Cynics as a whole, *Or.* 7.225b-c, 236b. Smith 1995, 69-71.

⁹⁹ Jul. *Ep.* 22 to the priest Arsacius called on pagan priests to be charitable and mimic Christianity. Julian recommended establishing hostels and gave provisions for this. He also advised priests not to attend the theatre or drink in taverns. *Letter to a Priest* was also concerned with the conduct of priests, and discussed philanthropy and giving to the poor. He also advised which books a priest should and should not read, gave wardrobe recommendations, and said they should not attend the theatre or associate with actors, dancers, mimes or chariot-drivers.

¹⁰⁰ Jul. *Ep.* 56. It is similarly unaddressed and tentatively dated to February 363 by Wright. The edict is dated to February 12, 363. *CTh.* 9.17.5 also stated that funerals should only be held at night to avoid pollution and to discourage excessive displays of grief, but opened with a warning against the removal of ashes and grave goods, which is not found in the letter.

only take place at night to avoid such religious pollution.¹⁰¹ This document also had a broad audience – Julian was not specific – but it would mainly affect Christians, who traditionally performed burials during the day and had no such qualms about pollution. Like Julian’s educational measures, Christians might be those most affected, and they were certainly part of the intended audience, but likely not the sole audience. While the rescript might rouse grey pagans to be better and more committed in their religious persuasion (or scare them into silence, if we follow Cribiore), it would have a potentially negative impact on their livelihood unless they agreed that the canonical texts were sincere religious works. The edict and rescript might have had a disproportionate effect on Christians as opposed to pagans, but they were still documents intended to affect a wide range of people – public and private teachers, Christians and pagans, and those in the middle ground.

5.3 Morality and education in the thought of Julian

Both the edict and rescript assert that character and morality were the most important characteristics and qualifications for a teacher, and suggested that there was a strong moral purpose in education: teachers needed to be moral because they were shaping the character of their students as well as teaching eloquence. For Julian, for a teacher to be of ‘upright character’ required honesty.¹⁰² It was this that he presented as the most important quality for a teacher: he needed to be honest about his personal beliefs even in his public life and career. While Julian applied this to all teachers, it was especially important for sophists because they taught moral character as well as correct Greek.¹⁰³

This focus on the moral character of teachers was not new. Quintilian had stated that education and morality were linked, and that education and character were also linked: a good orator needed to also be a good man.¹⁰⁴ He repeated this, and in reference to Cato the Elder, argued that an orator must be a ‘good man, speaking well’. He was clear, however, that being a good man was most important.¹⁰⁵ Further, he argued that the school environment could corrupt a student; bad teachers and the influence of other

¹⁰¹ Jul. *Ep.* 56.

¹⁰² τὸν τρόπον ἐπιεικεῖς, Jul. *Ep.* 36.422c. Bouffartigue 1992, 640-641.

¹⁰³ ἡθῶν, Jul. *Ep.* 36.422d.

¹⁰⁴ Quint. *Inst.Or.* 1.2.3; 1. pr.9.

¹⁰⁵ *vir bonus, dicendi peritus*, Quint. *Inst.Or.* 12.1.1.

students could negatively impact the moral character of a man.¹⁰⁶ Education shaped not only students' minds, but also their character, and thus how they would operate in elite Roman society.

Quintilian's arguments are remarkably similar to those of Julian in the Spoletium edict and rescript, as has often been noted.¹⁰⁷ While we could argue for a potential influence of Quintilian (and Cato the Elder) on Julian, this was an idea which was not unique to Quintilian or Roman thought; it was a general principle, which many assumed.¹⁰⁸ As Kaster noted, society valued good character in a grammarian just as highly as intellectual abilities.¹⁰⁹ This applied to rhetoricians and sophists too, as well as pedagogues,¹¹⁰ although it is interesting that Julian placed so much stress on sophists in particular.

Lucian had described the moral value of education and the virtues which it conferred: temperance, justice, piety, kindness, reasonableness, understanding, steadfastness, love of all that is beautiful, ardour towards all that is sublime.¹¹¹ Libanius was certainly aware of this paradigm, and argued that he taught a sense of decency as well as literature.¹¹² He wrote to one student encouraging him to return to study by arguing that the qualities, which made his father govern well and elicit admiration were not wealth, beauty or birth, but rather the rewards of rhetoric, which included good character.¹¹³ Themistius also stressed moral character and virtue as a result of education, and encouraged students to seek this out rather than money, arguing it was only by pursuing virtue that one could be a better person.¹¹⁴ Macrobius emphasised the moral qualities of the grammarian Servius, particularly modesty (*verecundia*).¹¹⁵ Servius was also described, positively, as looking to the floor when he entered a room, which is reminiscent of the behaviour Julian learned from Mardonius, suggesting a continuity of

¹⁰⁶ Quint. *Inst.Or.* 1.2.4.

¹⁰⁷ Matthews 2001, 276; Watts 2006, 70; Cribiore 2013, 230.

¹⁰⁸ It is unlikely that Julian read Quintilian or was directly influenced by Quintilian's work, as it is unlikely that Julian studied Latin rhetoric to any appreciable degree. A more general influence is more valid. Browning 1975, 169; Kaster 1988, 66.

¹⁰⁹ Kaster 1988, x.

¹¹⁰ Cribiore 2001b, 45-46; 49.

¹¹¹ σωφροσύνη, δικαιοσύνη, εὐσεβεία, πραότιτι, ἐπιεικεία, συνέσει, καρτερία, τῶ τῶν καλῶν ἔρωτι, τῇ πρὸς τὰ σεμνότατα ὀρμῇ, Luc. *Somm.* 10. Swain 1996, 309.

¹¹² Lib. *Or.* 62.41.

¹¹³ Lib. *Ep.* C123.

¹¹⁴ Them. *Or.* 27.339-340.

¹¹⁵ Macrobius *Sat.* 1.2.15; Kaster 1988, 171.

ideas and focus on certain behaviours redolent of a moral character.¹¹⁶ It also worked the opposite way: education provided crucial insight into the moral character of a man, but it could also reveal a lack of such character. So, according to Plutarch, Gaius Marius came to a bad end due to his apparent lack of Greek education and culture, and thus, his inability to restrain the irrational features of his mind.¹¹⁷ Gregory of Nazianzus suggested something similar when he remarked that education was the first of their advantages, and those who dishonour it were boorish and uneducated.¹¹⁸

Education taught virtue and moral character, through teachers and the texts. Like Quintilian, Plutarch stressed the moral qualities of texts, and we see that texts were chosen for their moralising content.¹¹⁹ *Gnomai* (general principles) and *progymnasmata* (preliminary rhetorical exercises) were explicitly moralising and focused on virtues.¹²⁰ As Kaster argued, a student would likely leave a grammarian's school with a 'collection of ethical commonplaces'.¹²¹ Education was concerned with transmitting *mores* as much as with the intellectual training of the young.¹²² Students were thus encouraged to take from Homer the moral lessons.¹²³ This was something which was repeated also by the Christian writers. As discussed in chapter three, many of the Christian writers valued and promoted the moral lessons which could be learned from pagan texts. Augustine recognised the useful moral instruction available in pagan texts, and Basil, particularly, argued for the usefulness of those texts and passages which praised virtue and were thus moral, in line with Christian thought, while avoiding the 'thorns'.¹²⁴ Basil also advised that Christian students imitate the words and deeds of good men, and argued that the lessons one learned from these texts could lead to virtue becoming a habit. He also noted that Homer should be especially heeded, as all he wrote praised virtue.¹²⁵ Basil was concerned with the education of Christian children, and for him the usefulness of pagan texts was to be found in their moral instruction.

¹¹⁶ Jul. *Misopog.* 351a.

¹¹⁷ Plut. *Mar.* 2.3; Swain 1996, 139.

¹¹⁸ GNaz, *Or.* 43.11.

¹¹⁹ Plut. *Quomodo adol.* 22f; Morgan 1998, 147.

¹²⁰ Morgan 1988, 120-121.

¹²¹ Kaster 1988, 12.

¹²² Kaster 1988, 14;41.

¹²³ Marrou 1956, 10; Jul. *Misopog.* 351b.

¹²⁴ August. *De Doct. Christ.* 2.145; Basil, *Ad Adol.* 4.7; 4.9; GNaz, *Carm. Ad Seleucum*, 1.61.

¹²⁵ Basil, *Ad Adol.* 4.1-2; 5.6.

Julian also knew the lessons of Greek texts: he wrote that he felt he had to live up to the example set by these texts, by Homer, and the persons of Alexander and Marcus Aurelius.¹²⁶ It is reasonable to assume this was in part encouraged by Mardonius. He was, as we discussed previously, instrumental in Julian's early instruction and the formation of his character, which included an emphasis on morality, virtuousness and the constant need for self-improvement.¹²⁷ Education involved more than learning how to read and speak polished Greek. It taught students how to be good men and live good, moral lives in the public sphere. As Marrou elegantly wrote, 'learning to speak properly meant learning to think properly, and even to live properly.'¹²⁸ Julian was well aware of this, and reinforced the sentiment in both the edict and rescript. While it may have been somewhat obvious and well-known, he was stating it as an emperor and therefore giving this principle more force. We might also consider that he was restating it as a reminder, positioning himself as an emperor concerned with rhetoric and the health of the empire, seen also in his efforts on behalf of the city councils. This is also seen in his efforts to reassert paganism and the place of the gods, and it is in this context that historians have placed his emphasis on moral character: they have seen it as another specifically anti-Christian act, whereby no Christian teacher would be able to claim a moral character, as defined by Julian, as they would be dishonestly teaching pagan texts.¹²⁹ However, if we accept that his intended audience also included grey pagans, this is not an entirely valid interpretation. Rather, we can view the edict and rescript as an attempt by Julian to reassert the place of morality and virtue in education, and by extension, society. The notion of honesty was a major part of this: honesty in public expression and private living, which we might also link to his attitude of 'Homeric simplicity', his attitude towards the law and kingship, as well as the structure of the palace.¹³⁰

Julian also wished for honesty in religious attitude, from both the Christians who taught pagan texts and the grey pagans who were less committed than the emperor. While the pagan texts were morally instructive (this was accepted by both pagans and Christians), we can see that for some, Julian included, they were also religious texts, and

¹²⁶ Jul. *Ep ad Them.* 253a-b; *Or.* 3.124c-d.

¹²⁷ Mardonius encouraged dignity, sobriety, and manliness, Jul. *Misopog.* 251b; 253c-d.

¹²⁸ Marrou 1956, 196.

¹²⁹ Bowersock 1978, 84.

¹³⁰ Athanassiadi 1992, 16. Julian thought the emperor should act as a citizen, and abide by the law rather than act above the law: *Or.* 1.45d; *Ep ad Them.* 262a-b. He purged the palace in Constantinople early in his reign in a show of his simple needs, *Amm.* 22.4.1; *Lib. Or.* 18.130.

related also to the piety owed to the gods: they were revealed texts. If a teacher was not honest and upright, there was a danger that they would not teach students the truth about the gods. While Julian was clearly concerned with the moral character of teachers in both the edict and rescript, something which had been accepted by many before him, it is not this which draws most attention. It is the religious aspect of these documents which has elicited most comment, and we now turn to this feature and its implications.

5.4 Religion and education: Julian and the Christians

Julian's edict and rescript have both largely been linked to religion, and used as an example of or evidence for Julian's anti-Christian attitude and policy of persecution. These documents have been seen as his attempts to bar Christians not only from education but also from the rest of public life.¹³¹ They have been presented as a choice between public profession or private belief.¹³² Further, many have argued that Julian was aiming to revert to a time when paganism was prominent and central, and to undo the work of Constantine and Constantius: in effect, to remove Christianity from the realm of the elites.¹³³ The edict and rescript are viewed as part of a persecution of the Christians, as a way of banning Christians from traditional education and making education overtly, and solely, pagan.¹³⁴

Christians, starting with Gregory of Nazianzus, framed Julian as a persecutor. Indeed, persecution was even redefined to further this image of Julian, and he was subsequently counted as a renowned scourge of Christianity.¹³⁵ Gregory argued that Julian 'forced with gentleness' and embarked on subtle persecution; his unflattering portrait of Julian as a student in Athens surely helped this aim also.¹³⁶ This was followed by fifth century Christian writers: Socrates and Sozomen both present Julian as a

¹³¹ Bowersock 1978, 84; Watts 2006, 68.

¹³² Downey 1957a, 100; Matthews 2001, 276.

¹³³ Downey 1957a, 98; Browning 1975, 172, 174; Smith 1995, 214; Bowersock 1978, 84.

¹³⁴ 'Persecution' is a loaded word and one which I understand here to mean oppression, hostility or ill-treatment of a religious community, expressed violently, which caused displacement, injury or death. While one could reasonably employ a definition of persecution that included non-violence, my understanding follows the fourth-century Christian understanding of persecution: it is notable that when they talked about Julian as a persecutor, they qualified it as subtle or redefined the concept to include any action meant to disquiet Christians (GNaz. *Or.* 4.79; Socr. *HE.* 3.12.7). This suggests they knew the general understanding of persecution was violent and bloody: Teitler 2017, 65. More applicable for Julian's actions, I think, than persecution is the term 'discrimination'.

¹³⁵ Van Dam 2002, 192. Socrat. *HE.* 3.12.

¹³⁶ GNaz. *Or.* 4.61, 79; 5.23-24.

persecutor, as does Augustine who counts him alongside Nero, Domitian, Decius and Diocletian;¹³⁷ Orosius argued that Julian attacked the Christians by cunning and Cyril of Alexandria felt so strongly as to argue against every point Julian made in his *Against the Galileans*.¹³⁸ Modern historians have largely followed this view, and argue that Julian embarked on a persecution of Christians, although it was less overt and thus viewed as insidious and underhand.¹³⁹

However, if we look at Julian's own comments on Christians, we can see that he did not aim for a violent persecution; he was clear that there was to be no violence and, indeed, said as much.¹⁴⁰ He did not instigate any violence against Christians.¹⁴¹ Nor did he want any forced worship; indeed, he repeated that it was only by reason they could persuade Christians to come to the gods, calling to mind his comments in the rescript about teaching Christian students rather than punishing them.¹⁴² Julian was a pagan, and disliked Christianity: he consistently referred to Christianity as a disease, mocked Jesus in *The Caesars* and called him the 'Nazarene', and repeatedly referred to Christians as 'Galileans' in order to suggest it was simply a local Jewish cult; his *Against the Galileans* also gives some indication of his attitude.¹⁴³ While this might be taken as offensive, it is not the same as persecution; he was not working towards a solution of 'total elimination'.¹⁴⁴

Julian compared his own stance on Christians (and his rule) to that of Constantius. In the *Misopogon*, he criticised Constantius and expressed disbelief that the Antiochenes should prefer his predecessor.¹⁴⁵ He also criticised Constantius in a letter to the Bostrans,

¹³⁷ Socrat. *HE*. 3.12, 16; Soz. *HE*.5.5, 17-18; August. *Civ. Dei*. 18.52. For a discussion of Augustine's changing attitude to Julian's measures, and possible amplification of their effects due to the influence of the Christian tradition, see Germino 2004, 97-100.

¹³⁸ Orosius, *Hist.*, 7.30; Cyril, *Contra Julianum*.

¹³⁹ Kaster 1988, 72 refers to Julian's 'vindictive logic' in reference to the edict and rescript. Bowersock 1978, 88 argued that Julian had a 'scheme to wipe out the Christians', and that in his later reign he was 'edging close to persecution' (91). Watts 2006, 70 saw malignant intent in Julian's education edict and rescript, referred to the (lost) edict as 'malevolent genius' (71), and argued it 'laid the groundwork' for his later actions (69).

¹⁴⁰ Jul. *Ep.* 40.424c; 37.376c. Bidez 1930, 265 stated that though the persecution was not bloody, it risked becoming dangerous. Smith 1995, 212 referred to a 'bloodless persecution'.

¹⁴¹ It could be argued that Julian's lukewarm response to the death of Bishop George by an Alexandrian mob set a tone, however: Teitler 2017, 40.

¹⁴² Jul. *Ep.* 40.424c; 41.436c, 438b; 36.424a. This is perhaps in reference to Maximinius Daia.

¹⁴³ Jul. *Ep.* 41.438c; 58.401c; *Or.* 7.229d; *CG* 327b; *Caes.* 336a-b; *Ep.* 55; *Ep.* 36.423d. His criticisms of Christianity presented in *Against the Galileans* are similar to those of Celsus and Porphyry, Wright 1923, 314.

¹⁴⁴ Bowersock 1978, 85; 87. Downey 1957a, 98 also refers to Julian's aim as the elimination of Christianity.

¹⁴⁵ Jul. *Misopog.* 357b.

and felt that he should instead be praised for his more reasonable and fair treatment of the Christians:¹⁴⁶ Constantius, in comparison, was sectarian and divisive in his support of Arianism, which had led to bloodshed and violence, while Julian had issued an edict of toleration¹⁴⁷ and welcomed the return of exiled priests to their cities.¹⁴⁸ Ammianus, however, claimed that Julian was trying to encourage factions and foment discord.¹⁴⁹ Indeed, we can see some of this in Julian's attitude: his letters to the Alexandrians and the citizens of Bostra certainly betray someone who saw little problem in aggravating the Christian community (perhaps the mischievous or sly tone that McLynn argued for). In the letter to the Alexandrians, Julian made it clear that while he was unhappy with the lawlessness and violence that had resulted in the death of Bishop George in December 361, he would restrain himself to admonition, partly because he respected their illustrious history and reputation, but also (one suspects) because he admitted that impious George deserved such treatment.¹⁵⁰ Bowersock argued that the letter to the Bostrans was 'sophistry in the cause of sedition', and one can see why: Julian wrote that all citizens, but especially the Bostrans, should not join in with the feuds of the clerics, and cited a letter in which Bishop Titus claimed it was instead the citizens who were inciting violence. He advised them to expel Titus. There is a sense that by disabusing the Bostrans and advertising (and mocking) the duplicitous nature of Titus Julian was trying to cause conflict or at least divisions.¹⁵¹

Julian was certainly partisan. Tougher noted that Julian took a more 'subversive path' than outright persecution, and pointed to his edict on funerals, and the education edict and rescript, as proof.¹⁵² Throughout his reign, Julian targeted Christians in so much as he undertook to remove, or limit, the privileges they had enjoyed under Constantine

¹⁴⁶ Bowersock 1978, 76 referred to Julian's 'self-righteous and ostentatious fairness'.

¹⁴⁷ This was issued on February 4, 362, Wright 1923, xvii. *Jul Ep.* 15.404b. *Soz. HE.* 5.5.9. Bowersock 1978, 70.

¹⁴⁸ They were not welcomed back to their sees, however. Julian reprimanded Athanasius and the Alexandrians on this point, *Ep.* 24; 46.

¹⁴⁹ *Amm.* 22.5.3-4.

¹⁵⁰ *Jul. Ep.* 21.379a, 380a, 380c. Julian's mild reaction to the murder of Bishop George is certainly odd and jarring. One could argue that the Alexandrians were acting in a way they thought acceptable to the new regime, perhaps responding to a prevailing attitude in the hopes of gaining approval. This could be used as further proof of a Christian persecution or intolerance on the part of Julian, though it is important to note that this was very early in Julian's reign which may account for his lukewarm or tolerant response. We might also consider that the punishment of a city as large as Alexandria would require military action, which he could not afford. Julian's decision to punish the Alexandrians through words rather than anything stronger is also reminiscent of Libanius's attitude towards corporal punishment in the classroom.

¹⁵¹ *Jul. Ep.* 41.437b, 437d-438a. Bowersock 1978, 92.

¹⁵² Tougher 2007, 57.

and Constantius.¹⁵³ For example, he recalled decurions, who had avoided duties through their conversion to Christianity, and those who had enjoyed exemptions by virtue of becoming clerics were restored to the city councils.¹⁵⁴ They were similarly prevented from using the costly public post.¹⁵⁵ Many of his actions can be linked to his efforts to restore and revive the city councils. However, these financial blows have also been interpreted as the actions of a persecutor: Philostorgius saw the return of Christians to the councils as part of Julian's 'malignant policy', while Sozomen bemoaned the deprivation of immunities.¹⁵⁶ Bowersock pointed to Julian's decision to confiscate the Church funds and property of Edessa (on the stated grounds that they, as Christians who saw virtue in poverty, would more easily be able to enter heaven) as the action of a persecutor.¹⁵⁷

Julian did not discourage in-fighting and felt strongly that certain benefits previously given to the Christian community should be rescinded: as Brown remarked, he was trying to 'out-Constantine Constantine'.¹⁵⁸ This necessarily involved withdrawing financial support from the Church.¹⁵⁹ However, Julian did not engage in state-sponsored violence or, indeed, persecution. There were no martyrs under Julian, much to Gregory's chagrin.¹⁶⁰

Many of those actions which have been called anti-Christian, however, can be viewed as Julian championing the pagan religion and as part of a pagan revival. He attempted to undo the actions of Constantine and Constantius against paganism (figures who are, interestingly, not generally talked about as persecutors or operating anti-pagan policies), and redress the balance, part of his vaunted 'policy of tolerance'.¹⁶¹ As part of

¹⁵³ Bishops and clerics (along with their wives and children) had been exempted from taxes and public services under Constantius (*CTh.* 16.2.10; 16.2.11; 16.2.13; 16.2.14; 16.2.15). The clergy of Antioch were also exempted from all compulsory public services (*CTh.* 16.2.16).

¹⁵⁴ *Jul. Ep.* 39; *CTh.* 12.1.50; 16.2.3.

¹⁵⁵ *CTh.* 8.5.12.

¹⁵⁶ Philostorg. *HE.* 7.4; Sozom. *HE.* 5.5.

¹⁵⁷ Bowersock 1978, 92; *Jul. Ep.* 40.

¹⁵⁸ Brown 1989, 97.

¹⁵⁹ We might remember that Julian was, at the time, also planning a costly campaign against the Persians.

¹⁶⁰ *GNaz, Or.* 4.58. Later Christian tradition did, however, claim martyrs under Julian. Sozomen argued that a presbyter, Basil of Ancyra, was tortured and put to death under Julian; he is the only Church historian to claim this (*Soz. HE.* 5.11.7-11; Teitler 2017, 71-72). Flavius Artemius, the *dux Aegypti* who had sided with Bishop George in Alexandria was claimed as a martyr. According to the *Artemii Passio*, dated to the eighth or ninth century, Artemius travelled to Antioch to meet Julian; in the meeting, he took Julian to task over his unjust treatment of Christians (such as Eugenius and Macarius, two Christians Julian had had tortured, apparently) and was subsequently tortured and died in October 362. We know from Ammianus that Artemius was executed in 362 (*Amm.* 22.11.2), but the *Artemii Passio* is of 'dubious historicity' (Teitler 2017, 44-48, 102-106).

¹⁶¹ Julian's tolerance was much debated during the Enlightenment; Voltaire, for one, argued for the sincerity of Julian's tolerance: see Smith 2012, 307-308. Bidez took seriously Julian's tolerance early in his reign (1930, 228-229). This was followed by Browning, who argued that Julian's stay in Antioch marked a

this religious ‘tolerance’, previously exiled bishops were recalled, such as Aetius and Athanasius; Julian also invited a number of Christians to court.¹⁶² Julian’s ‘religious toleration’ also extended to pagan temples. Under Constantine and Constantius temples, as Libanius observed, sacrifices and priesthoods had suffered, from both a lack of funds and lack of interest.¹⁶³ Julian encouraged the promotion of pagans and pagan interests, what today we might call positive discrimination. In a letter of 362, he explicitly stated that pagans (‘god-fearing’) be preferred to Christians in selection for offices.¹⁶⁴ He also embarked on a policy of restitution. According to Ammianus, upon his arrival in Constantinople in December 361, Julian ordered that the temples be opened and the worship of gods resume, including sacrifice.¹⁶⁵ Temples were reopened,¹⁶⁶ and in 362 Julian issued an edict which stated that temple lands were to be restored to the municipality, many of which had been given to Christians, and altars be set up.¹⁶⁷ He also issued an edict on June 29, 362 declaring the reconstruction of temples a priority, and gave imperial patronage to those cities which looked after their temples well.¹⁶⁸ Julian built a pagan shrine in the palace in Constantinople, lauded by Himerius and Libanius.¹⁶⁹ Pagan priesthoods were revived, as were ancient ceremonies.¹⁷⁰ He also, significantly,

turning point in his policy of toleration (1975, 108-109, 182-185), and Armstrong (1984, 7). Bowersock, meanwhile, argued that Julian was intolerant towards Christians from the start (1978, 84-5). Smith argued that the idea of Julian sliding from toleration to persecution was misleading, and proposed that Julian’s initial tolerance was due to caution and pragmatism (1995, 210-212).

¹⁶² Jul. *Ep.* 15; 24. Aetius was invited to court, as was Basil (*Ep.* 26) and bishops of Constantinople (Elm 2012, 57; Teitler 2017, 38).

¹⁶³ Lib. *Or.* 18.23. The decline of paganism is also tied to the “crisis” of the third century and the financial issues which followed in the fourth century: see Bradbury 1995, 351-353. Note, however, Julian’s description of a temple in Ilion which was still active and overseen by a Christian, Pegasus, who was later made a pagan priest, which suggests that there was not such a large-scale destruction of temples by Christians under Constantine and Constantius, *Ep.* 19, although Eusebius reports that Constantine had ordered some temples demolished and the desecrated earth removed (Euseb. *VC.* 3.55-8).

¹⁶⁴ Θεοσεβείζ, Jul. *Ep.* 37.376b. He did not blindly promote only pagans however, as the appointment of Gregory of Nazianzus’s brother Caesarius as court doctor indicates. This also suggests that Julian did see a place for Christians and was not wholly intolerant of them.

¹⁶⁵ Amm. 22.5.2. The epigraphic evidence suggests that Julian’s restitution of pagan temples and revival of paganism was met with support: Greenwood 2014 presents Latin inscriptions from North Africa, the Balkans and the Jordan Valley which referred to Julian as the restorer of Roman religion (*Romane religionis*), the restorer of sacred rites (*restitutor sacrorum*); Julian was praised for restoring the temples (*templorum restauratori*), with an inscription from a temple near Bostra in Arabia, confirming its restoration in February 362. Julian was praised as the man destined to undo previous corruptions. There are also a number of pro-Julian inscription overwritten on milestones bearing the Chi-Rho.

¹⁶⁶ Closed under Constantius and Constans in 346, *CTh.* 16.10.4. Those outside city walls which were used for plays or spectacles were allowed to remain ‘uninjured’, *CTh.* 16.10.3.

¹⁶⁷ *CTh.* 10.3.1; Jul. *Misopog.* 361b; Lib. *Or.* 17.7.

¹⁶⁸ *CTh.* 15.1.3; Lib. *Or.* 18.126, 129.

¹⁶⁹ Himerius, *Or.* 41.8; Lib. *Or.* 18.126.

¹⁷⁰ Bradbury 1995, 331.

encouraged the revival of blood sacrifice.¹⁷¹ Blood sacrifice – the offering of an animal by a human at an altar¹⁷² – has long been considered a distinctive and central element of pagan worship; it accounted for ‘group formation and cultural self-definition’.¹⁷³ This form of ritual was reviled by Christians, as the Christian sources and trail of laws against blood sacrifice reveals.¹⁷⁴ Under Constantine blood sacrifice had possibly been banned by general law. Certainly, by 341 blood sacrifice was banned.¹⁷⁵ A further edict of February 20, 356, issued by both Constantius and Julian, had made sacrifice punishable by capital offense.¹⁷⁶ Julian lifted this ban, but also participated in blood sacrifices publicly (and often), adding visible imperial weight to the pagan revival. He wrote to Maximus in November 361, the start of his reign, that he had started publicly sacrificing to the gods.¹⁷⁷ The significance of Julian publicly sacrificing and being openly pagan should not be understated. He continued to perform blood sacrifices, although it was met with criticism and lack of enthusiasm – Julian was particularly disappointed by the lack of provisions for proper pagan worship in Antioch during the festival of Apollo: instead of the oxen he expected, there was only a goose.¹⁷⁸

It has been argued that Julian’s promotion and participation in blood sacrifice was ‘discrimination, if not persecution’, and that he was being confrontational through the

¹⁷¹ Bradbury 1995, 333.

¹⁷² Elsner 2012, 120.

¹⁷³ Faraone and Naiden 2012, 2, 5. Naiden has also demonstrated that blood sacrifice was particularly significant for the elite, as evidence suggests that priests and ‘other social superiors’ were the ones who ate the sacrificial meat (2012, 7). The centrality of blood sacrifice in pagan religion has, though, recently been debated: Rives 2011, 187.

¹⁷⁴ Elsner 2012, 124-125. The fourth-century Christian writer Firmicus Maternus referred to the ‘incessant slaughter’ of animal sacrifice (*Err. prof. rel.* 13.4). Arnobius was also critical of blood sacrifice (*Adv. nat.* 4.30-31, 6.1-3). Elsner argues that we should be careful of this evidence (‘heightened rhetoric’) as it may not reflect the reality: from the third century onwards, the visual representation of blood sacrifice declined (2012, 125-126), even as imperial authorities called for mass participation (for example, under Decius; 2012, 159; Rives 1999, 137, 141). Elsner concluded that blood sacrifice had been declining since the first century and that the significance of animal sacrifice had been overstated by scholars (2012, 163).

¹⁷⁵ There is some confusion and debate over this: Eusebius stated Constantine banned sacrifice (*VC.* 2.44-45) but the source is often deemed untrustworthy. However, a law of 341 reasserts that blood sacrifice was banned, and supports the argument that it was banned under Constantine (*CTh.* 16.10.2; 16.10.4). Constantius was perhaps referencing or making more out of Constantine’s banning of the cult of Venus. Libanius confirms that there was a law forbidding blood sacrifice, but complicates matters when he remarks that Constantine made no changes in the traditional forms of worship (*Or.* 1.27; 30.6). Bradbury concludes that Constantine did issue legislation against blood sacrifice, but that it was not enforced throughout the empire (Bradbury 1994, 139). Constantius also banned nocturnal sacrifice (*CTh.* 16.10.5); Julian’s edict on funerals could be viewed as a response to this. Sacrifice was still being legislated against in the 390s, indicating pagan sacrifice continued (*CTh.* 16.10.9-12): Bowersock 1990, 2.

¹⁷⁶ *CTh.* 16.10.6.

¹⁷⁷ *Jul. Ep.* 8.415c-d.

¹⁷⁸ *Jul. Misopog.* 362a-b; 357d. *Amm.* 22.12.6 criticises Julian’s ‘excessive’ sacrifice.

reconstruction of temples.¹⁷⁹ However, we can instead view Julian's actions as pro-pagan rather than anti-Christian, and argue that this attitude motivated his legislation and public persona, rather than any desire to wipe out Christianity or embark on an anti-Christian policy.¹⁸⁰ This is a slight but significant shift in focus and emphasis. Criboire argued that he was aiming at a united pagan front, and this is convincing.¹⁸¹ We can see that Julian was most concerned with the promotion of paganism and worship of the gods: his *Letter to a Priest* and *To Arsacius*, with their careful and detailed discussion on the disposition of pagan priests, show this, as do his efforts for the city councils, which were concerned with the revival of traditional roles and cults. Indeed, much of the 'anti-Christian' legislation can be tied to his efforts on behalf of the councils, as he sought to restore absconding decurions and redirect funds. The education edict and rescript, too, demonstrate this pro-pagan focus (and his concern for the responsibilities of the councils): Julian was confirming the place of paganism and the gods in education, and by extension, in society. While Julian can be seen to be exclusionary in his attitude and policies, he did not act as a persecutor.¹⁸²

5.4.1 *The religious element of education*

By issuing an official statement on the place of paganism and the gods in traditional education, Julian made this education overtly religious and gave it a religious slant which was previously absent, or at least only implicit.¹⁸³ The rescript, particularly, points to this. Julian was asking for honesty, as we have discussed, in the teaching of the canonical texts, but also arguing that these texts were inherently religious. They were not just meant for moral instruction or intellectual development: they offered the truth about the gods and worship, and thus it would be disingenuous for non-believers to teach from them.¹⁸⁴ Julian argued that the canonical writers had written with the help of divine inspiration; the gods had revealed 'all their learning' to these poets, orators and historians, and so they

¹⁷⁹ Bradbury 1995, 347. Armstrong stated that Julian's attitude towards the Christians was 'thoroughly hostile and discriminatory' but not a persecution (1984, 7), while Teitler argues we could accuse Julian of discrimination but not persecution (2017, 69).

¹⁸⁰ Smith 1995, 19 referred to an anti-Christian policy.

¹⁸¹ Criboire 2013, 235.

¹⁸² Bouffartigue 1992, 603 noted that Julian sought to exclude.

¹⁸³ Athanassiadi 1992, 123-124. Athanassiadi notes the influence of Iamblichus on Julian's conception of the divine nature of all Greek culture (1992, 8-9).

¹⁸⁴ Lamberton 1986, 119 on Porphyry's use of Homer, particularly to communicate abstract truths. Ruether, 1969 [2003], 163; Van Dam 2002, 199.

were sacred, revealed texts.¹⁸⁵ By singling out Christians in the rescript, and arguing that those who cannot teach pagan texts as truth should teach Scripture, Julian was making education ineluctably religious, paganism in opposition to Christianity.¹⁸⁶ In a fragment, he refers to these texts as ‘our writings’ and places them in opposition to Christians.¹⁸⁷ He was also drawing an analogy between Scripture and pagan texts: Homer and Hesiod were comparable to Matthew and Luke, although they were clearly superior from Julian’s point of view.

This would obviously affect and anger Christians. One only has to read Gregory’s two invectives and note the concerted effort by the fifth century Church historians to demonise Julian to deduce that. There is also a link here to the Christian debate, discussed in chapter three: many prominent Christians recommended traditional education and pagan texts solely in terms of language, intellectual development and morality. The religious aspects, necessarily, were minimised as contrary to their Christian beliefs. By inserting himself into this debate, and asserting that the pagan texts were not just intellectually and morally sound, but were also religiously significant, Julian was hampering the argument often used by Christian writers in defence of traditional education: he was holding Christians to their own principles.¹⁸⁸ He was also preventing the allegorical reading of pagan texts by Christian writers by asserting their religious element.¹⁸⁹ In Julian’s view, Christians could not avoid the religious nature of the texts by interpreting them through a Christian lens.¹⁹⁰ He could also be seen to be emphasizing the anti-intellectual element of Christianity, and thereby undermine and weaken its attraction to the elites, by forcing a choice between pagan texts (and traditional education) and Scripture.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁵ Van Dam 2002, 167. *Jul. Ep.* 36.423a; Athanassiadi 1992, 8-9. It is unclear whether Thucydides, less religious, exemplified this for Julian; Kaldellis 2007, 150.

¹⁸⁶ Bowersock 1990, 6.

¹⁸⁷ *Jul. Frag.* 7.

¹⁸⁸ Kaldellis 2007, 149. Kaldellis is critical that Julian’s argument ‘about the foundations of his own faith has been recast as anti-Christian legislation’ (148) and argued that Julian ‘put his finger on a problem that others did not want to face with such clarity’ (149).

¹⁸⁹ For example, Clement argued all things were God’s and that Homer and Hesiod were dependant on the Scriptures, (*Strom.* 5.4.24.1); Lamberton 1986, 241. See also *Frag.gr.theos* 221-22, cited by Lamberton 1986, 248-9, in which prophecies are told by, among others, Homer, who apparently foretold the coming of Christ.

¹⁹⁰ Browning 1975, 171; Lamberton 1986, 136, 139; Bourffartigue 1992, 602.

¹⁹¹ Browning 1975, 174. Eusebius was aware of this reputation (e.g. Origen, *Conta Celsum*, 3.44) and sought to present a more intellectual Jesus for an educated audience by quoting a letter he apparently wrote to Abgar of Edessa, *HE.* 1.13.1-9; Corke-Webster 2017 [forthcoming].

Julian's assertion of the religious nature of these texts would also, though, affect 'grey pagans', who were, as suggested above, another intended audience of the rescript. By treating the texts as religious in nature, Julian was also asking these pagans to be more committed in their beliefs, and publicly so.¹⁹² While for some this may not have been such an issue,¹⁹³ for others this may have been a troubling message, and indicated that they had to conform to Julian's own view of paganism.¹⁹⁴ Indeed, Julian had been concerned about the commitment of pagans and the progress of his 'pagan revival': his *Letter to a Priest* demonstrates this, as does his outrage at the lack of enthusiasm for sacrifice at Antioch. From Ammianus we see that Julian was mocked for his ostentatious dedication to worship and sacrifice, earning the nickname 'axe-man'.¹⁹⁵

Watts has argued that due to Julian's measures, particularly the rescript, the goal of education changed; he suggested that education would become a tool for religious conversion. He called Julian's edict and rescript 'religious intrusion'.¹⁹⁶ While we have no evidence that any conversion took place (it would seem unlikely simply due to the death of Julian nearly a year after the publication of the edict and rescript), Julian's measures do mark a shift in the character of education, as the religious nature of pagan texts was emphasised. As Bowersock remarked, Julian had made this literature 'the exclusive preserve of the pagans', but he also made it the preserve of publicly committed and enthusiastic pagans.¹⁹⁷

5.5 Hellenism: "The Hellenic religion..."

It has been argued that in order to understand Julian's measures one has to also understand Julian's conception of Hellenism.¹⁹⁸ Athanassiadi stated that Hellenism was the driving force behind both religion and literature, and thus key to Julian's actions as

¹⁹² Watts 2006, 71 suggested that pagan teachers would be expected to emphasize the pagan religious aspects of texts, while Browning 1975, 168 suggested education might be used a tool for conversion. Cribiore 2013, 234 also speculates that Julian hoped Christian students would be converted ('seduced').

¹⁹³ Libanius wrote in his *epitaphios* that literature and the worship of the gods were 'akin' (ἀδελφά, *Or.* 18.157). Downey 1957a, 101 took this as proof of Julian's own attitude and motivation for the edict and rescript. It certainly gives some indication of the prevailing attitude towards pagan literature, or at least the perceived attitude of Julian from his supporters.

¹⁹⁴ Cribiore 2013, 236-237.

¹⁹⁵ *victimarius*: Amm. 22.14.3; 22.12.6-7.

¹⁹⁶ Watts 2006, 77.

¹⁹⁷ Bowersock 1978, 85.

¹⁹⁸ Van Dam 2002, 166.

emperor, while Bowersock argued that Julian worked, particularly in his early reign, to facilitate a return to traditional Hellenism.¹⁹⁹ Hellenism has been defined as the interrelation of religion, literature and institutions, while *logos* came to mean not just speaking but also the language of the Hellenes on a religious level.²⁰⁰ This is clear from Julian's actions and words. While Julian asserted the religiosity of the pagan texts common to traditional education, he also made a link between these texts, paganism and Hellenism. He glorified these texts as cultural monuments, and emphasised them not only as the pride of Hellenism but also the result of Hellenism.²⁰¹ In his religious measures and attitude, Julian redefined Hellenism, and linked it to paganism; he made Hellenism religious and explicitly pagan. He 'expanded' the definition and altered the understanding of Hellenism and Hellenes.²⁰²

Previously, Hellenism had been a specifically Greek concept, linked to language, culture and identity.²⁰³ Kaldellis has argued that this was especially true of the Second Sophistic, with its influential 'normative model of cultural Hellenism'; the link between 'Greekness' and language was particularly emphasised.²⁰⁴ Johnson argued we should view Hellenism as a 'sort of rhetorical and conceptual toolbox' from which one could form an identity. At the basic level, the use of the Greek language was key, but knowledge of history and literature, as well as grooming and dress were important 'tools' also.²⁰⁵ An ethnic dimension of Hellenism was also understood.²⁰⁶ Hellenes were those from the Greek world who spoke Greek and participated in Greek culture, while Hellenism represented the 'language, thought, mythology, and images' of Greece.²⁰⁷ For example, we see that in 2 Maccabees, Hellenized Jews who built stadiums and

¹⁹⁹ Athanassiadi 1992, 100.; Bowersock 1978,74.

²⁰⁰ Lambertson 1986, 138; Van Dam 2002, 196.

²⁰¹ Lambertson 1986, 138.

²⁰² Bowersock 1978, 84; Van Dam 2002, 167. Athanassiadi wrote that 'the universal religion of the universal state, as Julian preached it, was Hellenism' (2003, 197).

²⁰³ Bowersock 1990, 7; Van Dam 2002, 166; Kaldellis 2007, 6. Hellenism as a concept has a long history, and is now often linked to Alexander the Great: Canfora 2009, 173, 174; Johnson 2012, 437-439. Kaldellis offers a valuable survey of the history of Hellenism in Classical and Hellenistic Greece, tracing the development from an ethnic understanding to a more cultural one (2007,14-30).

²⁰⁴ Kaldellis 2007, 36-37. Bowie has discussed Hellenism in the Second Sophistic and demonstrated that it was largely a cultural marker, contrasted with *barbaroi* (1991, 183, 195, 203).

²⁰⁵ Johnson 2012, 439.

²⁰⁶ Kaldellis argues the ethnic understanding was more prominent in Classical Greece, noting that the ethnonym Hellenes had emerged 'roughly at the time of Homer in the eighth century BC', but it was still relevant in the Second Sophistic (2007, 13, 37).

²⁰⁷ Bowersock 1990, 7. I take the 'Greek world' and 'Greece' to include mainland Greece and Asia Minor in this period.

participated in Greek athletic events were pejoratively called *Hellênistai*.²⁰⁸ This is also seen in *Acts*, where Hellenes are defined as Greeks who speak Greek.²⁰⁹ Greek language and culture were the main elements of Hellenism and what it meant to be considered a Hellene. This definition continued, and we see Philostratus apply the term Hellene to a body of students, those studying Greek rhetoric, without a hint of religion.²¹⁰

By the fourth century, *Hellênismos* took on a new meaning and the definition altered: one could understand Hellenism and Hellene linguistically and culturally, signifying Greeks and correct Greek language, but also religiously to indicate paganism as well.²¹¹ We might also see an ethnic as well as a cultural understanding of Hellenism: as Johnson has stated, Hellas remained a topographical marker and ‘Hellenes’ were its inhabitants.²¹² In the fourth century, there was an expanded understanding of Hellenism, one which drew together language, culture and religion, an understanding that included education.²¹³ Indeed, Greek culture and language were linked to paganism. One could speak of Hellenism and refer to Hellenes purely on the basis of language and culture: for example, in many of his letters Libanius wrote of Hellenes meaning Greeks, those people of Greece who spoke the (correct) language.²¹⁴ Notably, in 363/3 he wrote to thank the grammarian Nicocles for spreading word of his talent; he noted that since Nicocles was not known for flattery that the objects of such praise were made ‘great and glorious among the companies of the Hellenes.’²¹⁵ The particular professional context of this letter suggests that Libanius did not mean pagans, but rather those of good Greek education. Themistius, meanwhile, conceived of a Hellenism which was cultural, rather than religious; for him it was not in opposition to Christianity, and therefore attractive to Constantius.²¹⁶

²⁰⁸ Ἑλληνίσται, 2 Macc. 2:44; Athanassiadi 1992, 2; Kaldellis 2007, 27-29.

²⁰⁹ Acts 6:1; 31:28.

²¹⁰ Philostrat. VS. 571, 613.

²¹¹ Bowersock has also noted that in the third century the standard word for pagan was ‘ethnikos’ and the equivalent of ‘Hellenismos’ was ‘ethnos’ in this period, indicating the local associations and character of paganism (1990, 10-11). Bouffartigue 1992, 658.

²¹² Johnson 2012, 448. Jul. Or. 1.13b, 14b reflects this geographical or ethnic usage; Curta 2002, 6. Johnson has demonstrated Eusebius’s use of the ‘language of ethnicity’ in the *Praeparatio Evangelica*, which marked Greekness or Hellenism as a ‘racial identity’, so that in this text there were no pagans, only Greeks (2007, 97-98, 108, 114).

²¹³ Bowersock 1990, 9-10.

²¹⁴ Lib. Epp. N13.2;15.1; 25.4; 66.6; 109.1; 181.4; 95.4; Orr. 30.23; 29.13. Stenger 2014 discusses Libanius’s use of Hellenism as a cultural and ethnic term.

²¹⁵ μέγαν ποιεῖς καὶ λαμπὸν ἐν Ἑλλήνων χοροῖς, Lib. Ep. N99.2.

²¹⁶ Heather and Moncur 2001, 98-100, 73-4. Cameron 1993a, 26. Kaldellis argued that Themistius was a proponent of a ‘neutral’ *paideia* that highlighted the affinities between Hellenism and Christianity (2007,

However, ‘Hellene’ and ‘Hellenism’ were also being used in religious contexts, to indicate Greek pagans, and that is how Julian tended to use the terms, perhaps taking his cue from Iamblichus and Porphyry.²¹⁷ This is clear throughout his writings, but particularly in *Contra Galileaos*, where he often discussed Hebrews and Hellenes as analogous and in opposition to Christians.²¹⁸ It is clear that through his use of Hellene that he meant to refer to pagans, the followers of the religion of Hellenism. In a letter, he observed that the Cappadocians were largely Christian and, using ‘Hellene’ as a synonym for pagan, he asked where the ‘genuine Hellene[s]’ were, noting a lack of sacrifice and knowledge.²¹⁹ This letter suggests that cultic activity was central, for Julian, in Hellenism.²²⁰ After the death of Constantius and on his way to Constantinople, Julian, as legitimate emperor, wrote to Eutherius saying that to sacrifice to the gods on his behalf would benefit the ‘whole body of the Hellenes’.²²¹ A fragment reveals that Julian did not want Christians to learn arguments they could use against ‘their Hellenic opponents’ – that is, the pagans.²²² In the letter to the Bostrans, Julian used the term ‘Hellene’ to mean ‘pagan’ and placed it in opposition to Christianity again, though he was apparently citing a letter from Bishop Titus; it is unclear if Titus himself used this term or if Julian inserted it.²²³ The clearest expression of Julian’s understanding of the terms, though, comes in his letter to the priest Arsacius.²²⁴ This letter outlined Julian’s hopes for the revival of

156). Cameron has argued that Synesius followed Themistius’s usage of Hellenism and only conceived of it as a cultural concept: 1993a, 27-28; Synesius, *Dion* 42b.

²¹⁷ Athanassiadi 1992, 4-6, 8; 2013, 25-27. Bowersock suggested that the first religious use of ‘Hellenism’ came in a letter to Iamblichus in the early fourth century (1990, 10). In a letter addressed to Iamblichus, Julian referred to him as the ‘universal blessing of Hellenes (τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀγαθὸν)’, *Ep.* 76.449b. It is debated whether this correspondence is genuine; some have argued that it belongs to Julian of Caesarea or a student of Iamblichus’ called Julian, Athanassiadi 1992, 8 n.23. Cameron noted that in more than half of Julian’s works Hellenism designates pagans or paganism (1993a, 25-26), while Bregman argued that Julian understood Hellenism ‘ultimately in religious terms’ (1998, 135).

²¹⁸ Jul. *CG.* 42e; 43a; 69b; 106b; 116a; 176a-b; 178b; 200a.

²¹⁹ καθαρῶς Ἑλληνα, Jul. *Ep.* 35. In a letter to Libanius, τῶν ἀληθῶς Ἑλλήνων is also translated as ‘genuine Hellenes’, *Ep.* 53.

²²⁰ Johnson 2007, 96.

²²¹ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, Jul. *Ep.* 10.

²²² τῶν Ἑλλήνων, Jul. *Frag.* 6.

²²³ Jul. *Ep.* 41.437d.

²²⁴ Van Nuffelen disputes the authenticity of the letter *To Arsacius* and argues it was the work of fifth century forger, possibly inspired by Gregory of Nazianzus and the Christian tradition that Julian wished to create a pagan church (GNaz. *Or.* 4.111; Van Nuffelen 2002, 145). Van Nuffelen argues that the letter is a fake partly due to its survival in Sozomen (*HE.* 5.16.5-15) and to certain anachronistic elements, such as the imperial heading (Van Nuffelen 2002, 139) and the recommendation that priests set up hostels (ξενοδοκεῖα, Jul. *Ep.* 22.430b) for strangers, which Van Nuffelen argues was a fifth century practice (Van Nuffelen 2002, 139-141). In comparing this letter to the *Letter to a Priest*, Van Nuffelen notes a number of differences in Julian’s recommendations, with the *Letter to a Priest* more concerned with private morality than public practicalities; Van Nuffelen argues that the two letters are contradictory and that this points to a forgery (2002, 141-144). Van Nuffelen also points to Julian’s use of the term ‘Hellenism’ as anachronistic, arguing that Julian tended only to use the term ‘Hellenism’ in a cultural sense (Van Nuffelen 2002, 137-

paganism and advised how he wished the priests and officials to behave, their disposition and attitude. However, he opens the letter by stating that *Hellenismos*, translated as the ‘Hellenic religion’, was not prospering as he wished.²²⁵ This is a clear statement of his understanding of Hellenism: it was a religion. While it might continue to have nationalistic and cultural connotations, for Julian it was to be understood religiously.

We might see Julian being exclusionary here – and his use of Hellenism in opposition to Christianity is surely exclusionary – but it is important to note that others in the fourth century also used the terms ‘Hellene’ and ‘Hellenism’ in a religious sense, including Christians.²²⁶ Indeed, it is an understanding which continued, as Bowersock demonstrated: local pagan cults flourished well into the sixth century, and at this level, Hellenism ‘really meant “paganism”.’²²⁷ It is a reasonable assumption that Julian was aware of the Christian usage of Hellenism and readily accepted this redefinition.²²⁸ Eusebius had referred to the Hellenes and the Hellenic faith; when discussing Constantine’s law against blood sacrifice he used the term *hellênizein*, to practise paganism or be a pagan, in this context to offer pagan sacrifice.²²⁹ It is clear from the context that Eusebius meant it religiously rather than nationally; he was referring to the act of being a pagan rather than to those who spoke Greek. In his *Demonstratio evangelica* of 311, Eusebius also contrasted Christianity with Hellenism and Judaism, suggesting a religious understanding.²³⁰ The Christian Athanasius, also, meant it in a religious way when he referred disparagingly to Arian Christians as Greeks, meaning ‘pagan’.²³¹ We have mentioned Libanius’s use of Hellene as a cultural and national term, but under Julian, perhaps more aware of the emperor’s attitude, he used it also in a religious sense.²³² He wrote in 363 to the pagan Scylacius, a teacher at Berytus, that he

138). This element of Van Nuffelen’s argument is less convincing. While Elm (2012, 326-327) agrees that it was a forgery and McLynn considers the overall argument ‘cogent’, further speculating that the forgery was written in the rhetorical schools (2014, 133-134), Bouffartigue 2005 argued convincingly for the authenticity of the letter.

²²⁵ Ὁ Ἑλληνισμὸς, Jul. *Ep.* 22.429c. Athanassiadi has demonstrated how Julian’s understanding of Hellenism in relation to the state was quite ‘Byzantine’ in nature (1992, 109-10, 121, 231), as does Armstrong 1984, 5.

²²⁶ Bowersock 1990, 10; Bouffartigue 1992, 601; Kaldellis 2007, 122; Cribiore 2013, 8. Athanassiadi has argued that the religious connotations of Hellenism were a result of Christian polemic, which linked Hellenism with idolatrous polytheism (2003, 197).

²²⁷ Bowersock 1990, 13.

²²⁸ Cameron 1993a, 25.

²²⁹ ἑλληνίζειν, Euseb. *VC.* 2.44; Bowersock 1990, 10.

²³⁰ Euseb. *DE.* 1.2.1. Johnson 2012, 444.

²³¹ Athan. *Or. con. Ar.* 3.16; 4.10. Bowersock 1990, 10.

²³² Cameron 1993a, 26.

was sending a letter ‘by means of a Hellene’ who was ‘not just a Hellene but a genuine Hellene’, indicating that the anonymous courier was a Greek pagan by birth, education and religion.²³³ Eunapius, too, seems to have been influenced by Julian and the trend towards the religious meaning of Hellene: unlike Philostratus, he referred to the ‘Hellenic faith’, notes that Julian worked for the Hellenes, and has Maximus say that attending Julian at court was the ‘duty of genuine Hellenes, especially if they are learned men’.²³⁴

The notions of Hellenism and Hellene were expanding in the fourth century to include a religious aspect, and by the fifth century this had become standard: Theodoret used *hellênizein* in a similar way to Eusebius, as a reference to pagan worship, while Sophronius in the sixth century used Hellenism to mean paganism and sacrifice.²³⁵ The Church historians of the early fifth century also stressed the religious aspect of Hellenism.²³⁶ This was certainly aided by Julian, who emphasised the religiosity of the terms almost to the exclusion of other definitions, and frequently set it in opposition to Christianity.²³⁷ This was not an understanding shared by all, however, and Gregory of Nazianzus was particularly vocal on this. In an extended section in his first invective against Julian, Gregory argued against Julian’s understanding and application of Hellenism, saying it was illogical.²³⁸ He expressed incredulity that Julian could even consider claiming Hellenism as a pagan concept and rhetorically asked Julian (by then safely deceased) to explain his reasoning behind this understanding, before asking ‘Whose property are the words of the Greek language?’²³⁹ Gregory then seeks to answer the question, and argue that Hellenism was not a religion, and that Greek culture, language or education did not belong exclusively to the pagans, to Julian’s ‘Hellenes’.²⁴⁰ Gregory asked where and how Greek words were said to have a religious connotation, how they were used in worship, pointing to the multiplicity of pagan cults and types of worship: ‘for whom of the gods or demons do you pretend that speaking Greek is reserved?’ He concluded that Greek had not been set apart by the gods in the same way in which proper sacrifice had been, and had never been a requirement for pagan worship of

²³³ πρώτην δὲ Ἑλληνι δι' ἀνδρὸς Ἑλληνος πέμπων ἐπιστολὴν ἰσως οὐκ ἀδικῶ, τῷ δὲ οὐχ Ἑλληνι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ χρηστῷ συμβέβηκεν εἶναι, Lib. *Ep.* 114.5.

²³⁴ ὡς τῶν ἄκρων γέ ἐστιν Ἑλλήνων καὶ ταῦτα πεπαιδευμένων, Eunap. *VS.* 477; 465; 493.

²³⁵ Theodoret, *Curatio*, 3.79-84; Sophronius, *Narratio*, 32.2-4. Johnson 2012, 440-445.

²³⁶ Johnson 2012, 445, 447.

²³⁷ Cribiore 2013, 231.

²³⁸ GNaz. *Or.* 4.104.

²³⁹ τίνας γὰρ τοῦ Ἑλληνίζειν εἰσὶν οἱ λόγοι, GNaz. *Or.* 4.101, 103.

²⁴⁰ Bouffartigue 1992, 658; Cribiore 2013, 231.

the gods.²⁴¹ Gregory further argued that, if Julian argued that those who speak Greek are the same people as pagans, the Greek language belonged to the religion, not the Hellenes. He noted that this argument was illogical, that just because some people who believe in the gods also speak Greek does not mean that Greek belongs to the gods.²⁴²

Gregory, in a mocking tone, took his arguments and use of logic to extreme, almost absurd, lengths. He asked which type of Greek, exactly, Julian would bar Christians from speaking, the Atticizing Greek of the well-educated, or ordinary, plain Greek? Or, indeed, all Greek? Does Julian believe that poetry belongs to pagans, exclusively? That speaking Greek is the right only of pagans? He recounted the history of language and mathematics, pointing to the Phoenicians, Egyptians and Euboeans as inventors and the thus the true owners of Greek language and thought, by Julian's argument.²⁴³ This is Gregory in full pedantic mode.

Gregory argued that Greek was the property of all those who partake in it, not just those who invented it; it was a common property, available to Christians and pagans alike.²⁴⁴ He argued against Julian's interpretation and tried to claim Hellenism and Hellenes as a purely linguistic and cultural term, and to remove all religious connotations. For Julian, Hellenism was a 'unity' of Greek culture and religion.²⁴⁵ Hellenism was the sum of everything it meant to be a pagan and a Greek, and this is where Gregory disagreed, vehemently, with Julian. Gregory envisioned a Hellenism separate from religion and asserted that eastern Christians could (and should) lay claim to Greek culture due to their birth and language. As Bowersock stated, Gregory knew well that Greek literature, rhetoric and philosophy were 'integral to the thought and structure of Christian discourse' and his argument against Julian's Hellenism accounted for this.²⁴⁶ For Gregory, those who spoke Greek in Greece were Hellenes.²⁴⁷

Kaldellis noted that there was never a single Hellenism, even among its chief exponents, and we can see an illustration of that principle here.²⁴⁸ As Elm has persuasively argued, Julian and Gregory approached Hellenism with different

²⁴¹ GNaz. *Or.* 4.103. (Trans. King, adapted). Elm 2012, 392-3.

²⁴² GNaz. *Or.* 4.104; Elm 2012, 392-3.

²⁴³ GNaz. *Or.* 4.105, 107-109.

²⁴⁴ GNaz. *Or.* 4.106.

²⁴⁵ Athanassiadi 1992, 1; Smith 1995, 83; Kaldellis 2007, 143.

²⁴⁶ Bowersock 1990, 12.

²⁴⁷ Matthews 1989, 425.

²⁴⁸ Kaldellis 2007, 120.

assumptions: for Julian language and content were one, united, which meant that Hellenism was cultural as well as religious, the product of the same literature, while for Gregory they were not; religion and language were separate and Hellenism was purely linguistic and cultural.²⁴⁹ Julian linked ‘Greekness, *logoi*, and the sacred’.²⁵⁰ Julian’s concept of Hellenism was not as simple or oppositional as the equation of Hellenism and paganism.²⁵¹ Gregory, on the other hand, sought to separate this and reclaim Greek language and literature for all Greeks. He argued that the language (and thus its literature) belonged to any who participated in it; Greek language was not limited to religious purposes. In this way, we see Gregory further engaging in the debate on the tensions between pagan thought and Christian doctrine. In his view, Hellenism was not a synonym for paganism, and ‘Greekness’ was inherently universal.²⁵²

5.6 Conclusion

Julian’s edict and rescript are two of the most significant documents for the study of education in late antiquity, and have come to define the religious programme he espoused in his reign. They also encapsulate many of his ideas and arguments: exclusionary, pro-pagan (or, anti-Christian), concerned about the moral character of teachers (and the empire) and also with the responsibilities of the city councils. All these themes can be seen in his other measures and surviving works. In the edict and rescript he reasserted the purpose of education, and reframed the traditional texts as religious in nature, redefining Hellenism, previously a concept linked primarily to Greek language and culture, as something inherently religious, specifically pagan. For Julian, the texts central to traditional education – Homer, Hesiod, Demosthenes – were sacred and specifically pagan in that they transmitted knowledge about the gods and worship. By presenting Hellenism as a religion, and Hellenes the pagan adherents of this religion, Julian asserted

²⁴⁹ Kaldellis has criticised Gregory’s argument and claimed that Gregory was only linking Hellenism to Greek language, rather than culture. Kaldellis further argues that Gregory’s argument against Julian was disingenuous, noting that elsewhere Gregory ‘almost always uses Hellene to mean pagan’ (2007, 160).

²⁵⁰ Elm 2012, 391. Elm has also persuasively argued that Gregory’s arguments here are similar to those he put forward regarding the Arian controversy: Elm 2001, 84-85. Johnson, too, argued that Gregory’s understanding of Hellenism without the religious elements ‘refused to work within the contours of Julian’s own conception of Hellenicity’ and noted the ‘holistic Hellenicity of Julian’, which incorporated religious, geographical, historical, racial and literary features (2012, 448-449).

²⁵¹ Kaldellis 2007, 151.

²⁵² Elm 2003, 506; 2012, 394.

that this literature was only for pagans; it was the property of Hellenes who believed in the gods of these texts. Education was thus a vital part of Hellenism, of paganism.

This was an exclusionary argument – obviously in the case of the Christians, but also for the grey pagans. The edict and rescript had a very wide intended audience: both public and private teachers, both Christians and more moderate pagans. While we only have evidence that Prohaeresius and Marius Victorinus left their posts (possibly) as a result of Julian’s edict and rescript, the response to Julian’s measures was loud and long-lived. We have touched on Gregory’s invectives, perhaps the most immediate and striking reactions to Julian’s rule, and especially the edict and rescript, but also the model for Christian responses to Julian ‘the Apostate’, an epithet by which he is still known. Even non-Christians, who otherwise supported Julian vociferously, expressed dismay, or even ‘charged silence’ over these measures, lending support to the argument that Julian’s edict and rescript were aimed also at pagans.²⁵³

The responses to Julian’s edict and rescript, particularly Gregory’s invectives, also give some insight into the perceived impact the measures would have. They would affect not only the teaching profession and the purpose and character of education, but also the place in society which this education opened up. Education for the elites was more than acquiring knowledge of Atticizing Greek and the work of Homer and Hesiod. It afforded one opportunities and connections which were otherwise impossible to gain – or at least, they were significantly more difficult to gain. Education was inextricably linked to *paideia*, a vital concept in elite society, if difficult to define. Gregory’s invectives make it clear that Julian was perceived as impacting *paideia*, especially for elite Christians. Julian was seen to be decreeing what ‘correct *paideia*’ was. It is to a discussion of *paideia*, its definition and examples of the concept in action, which we now turn.

²⁵³ Amm. 22.10.6. Libanius was silent on Julian’s education edict and rescript, which is odd considering both his support for Julian and position as a prominent sophist; Cribiore 2013, 24, 233.

Chapter six: *Paideia*

“The possession which no man can take away from man is *paideia*.” - Menander¹

“They say that some men become immortal. I [the female personification of *Paideia*] shall bring this to pass with you; for though you yourself depart from life, you will never cease associating with men of *paideia* and conversing with men of eminence.” – Lucian²

6.1 Introduction

Previous chapters have discussed education in the fourth century and its developments as the status of Latin and law studies increased, and elite Christians questioned whether pagan texts were appropriate for a faith-led life. Julian’s education measures have also been discussed, particularly the edict and rescript, aimed at both Christian teachers and pagans, which asserted the primary importance of moral character in rhetorical education, and attempted to reassert the essential paganism of the canonical texts upon which education was based. This chapter will tie these ideas together and focus on *paideia*, an important, if ambiguous concept linked to education. Indeed, *paideia* in modern scholarship is often defined simply as ‘education’. It could also be defined as the result of this education, which connected education to the (elite) political and social world of the later Roman empire. *Paideia* was the culmination and product of the study we discussed in the previous chapters.

Paideia has been dismissed as something insignificant and at odds with the absolutist political reality of late antiquity; something peripheral and to be ignored.³ This is in contrast to the evidence of the scholars of the Second Sophistic, who long recognised *paideia*’s importance and weight; Goldhill even referred to *paideia* as the ‘buzzword’ of the Second Sophistic.⁴ Brown admitted that he had not taken *paideia* seriously enough until his 1992 book, *Power and Persuasion*, in which he consciously sought to make amends and concluded that it ‘carried a moral and quasi-legal weight of its own’.⁵ *Paideia* was not simply a badge of status or something superficial. It was part of a

¹ ἀναφάρητον κτήμ' ἐστὶ παιδεία βροτοῖς, Men. *Monost.* 2. (Trans. Jaeger 1943 [repr. 1976], ix).

² ὃ δὲ λέγουσιν, ὡς ἄρα καὶ ἀθάνατοι γίνονται τινες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, τοῦό σοι περιποιήσω· καὶ γὰρ ἦν αὐτὸς ἐκ τοῦ βίου ἀπέηθης, οὔποτε παύση συνὼν τοῖς πεοπαιδευμένοις καὶ προσομιλῶν τοῖς ἀριστοῖς, Luc. *Somn.* 10. (Trans. Harmon, adapted).

³ MacMullen 1964, 437; Brown 1992, 8.

⁴ Swain 1996; Goldhill 2001, 17; Whitmarsh 2005; Van Hoof 2013, 387.

⁵ Brown 1997, 26.

complex political system, in which the power and ruling style of the emperor and his representatives was governed by expectations largely stemming from *paideia*.

This chapter will consider *paideia* as a political and social force. Firstly, we will consider the most significant scholarship on *paideia*, such as Marrou, Jaeger and Brown, to discuss the common translations and definitions of this concept, before coming to a working definition on which to base this chapter (6.2). Bourdieu's capital theory will then be introduced and used to further facilitate an understanding of *paideia* and how it operated in the fourth century (6.2.1). On that basis, we will examine examples of *paideia* in action as seen in literary sources.⁶ This includes instances of *paideia* operating successfully but also examples of failing *paideia*, cases in which the codes were not upheld and a breakdown can be observed (6.3). This will present the ideals of *paideia*: particularly relevant here are Eunapius's account of the interaction between Prohaeresius and the proconsul of Achaëa, and the inscribed statue base of Oecumenius (6.3.1). We will then move on to a discussion of the correspondence and friendships between local elites and governors, and examine what this tells us about the significance of *paideia* in politics: how letters facilitated friendship based on a common culture that enabled (or disguised) political favours (6.3.2). The breakdown of *paideia* will also be considered; how 'bad' governors flouted the ideals of *paideia* and responded to situations with anger and violence. This provides insight into the significance of *paideia* in the politics of the empire, and what happened when magistrates were disconnected from it (6.3.3). Following this, there will be a discussion of the ideals and practice of the *paideia* by emperors. This section will show that emperors were bound by the same ideals, and discuss the importance of *parrhêsia* (free speech) in relation to the imperial power (6.3.4).

The importance of *paideia* for Julian in particular will be discussed, not only in the image he cultivated, but in his actions as emperor (6.4). This section will focus on his diffusion of anger through words, discussing particularly the *Misopogon* and the letter to the senator Nilus. Both pieces were a reaction to ingratitude, and both Antioch and Nilus were punished by careful compositions rather than violence. Whether these texts can be considered successful examples of *paideia* will also be considered. Finally, Gregory's

⁶ One could also examine *paideia* in material culture, particularly mosaics which publicly demonstrate the learnedness and culture of the master of the house. The Woodchester mosaic and those found in the House of Aion, in New Paphos, are good examples of this, as is the mosaic depicting Socrates and the seven sages in Apamea, dated to the fourth century. Bowersock 1990, 22-8. This chapter, however, will focus on literary sources.

invectives will be discussed (6.5). These are vital documents for the discussion of Julian, his edict and rescript, and *paideia*, as they highlight not only how Julian's measures were perceived, but also the supposed effects of these measures as they pertain to Christian access to *paideia*. Gregory understood Julian's education measures as a ban on Christians teaching and learning Greek rhetoric and his invectives provide insight into the significant benefits of *paideia*.

6.2 Towards a definition

As Elsner has emphasised, there is not any simple agreed upon definition of *paideia* in modern scholarship, and the ancient meanings of the term can remain elusive. Indeed, Elsner has even doubted if we really know what *paideia* meant.⁷ Marrou has commented on the 'essential' ambiguity of the term *paideia*,⁸ and that is reflected in translations, as the thick connotations of the term *paideia* are not easily translated: often it is translated from the Greek simply as 'education'. For example, the first word of Julian's rescript on the Christian teachers, in the Greek, is Παιδεία[ν], which was translated by Wright as 'education'.⁹ Similarly, in Lucian's *The Dream*, in which personifications of Sculpture¹⁰ and *Paideia* appear to him and help to guide his future, *Paideia* is translated by Harmon throughout as 'Education',¹¹ while Libanius's phrase 'τὸν ἐν παιδείᾳ γεγενημένον' is translated by Norman in the Loeb as 'that educated gentleman'.¹² These translations reflect the etymology of *paideia* and its link to youth and children (it is often defined as the rearing of a child; teaching, education),¹³ but only suggest one aspect of its meaning, and perhaps the simplest, as we shall see. As such, there is a need for a discussion of the

⁷ Elsner 2013, 151, 137.

⁸ Marrou 1956, 196.

⁹ Jul. *Ep.* 36.422a. The word παιδεία occurs twenty-four times in the works of Julian, more so than its corresponding verb παιδεύειν (Bouffartigue 1992, 581, 580).

¹⁰ Ἑρμογλυφικός, who in appearance was more masculine and unkempt, and spoke poorly (Luc. *Somm.* 6, 8).

¹¹ Παιδεία ultimately convinced Lucian by arguing she could make him conversant with 'almost all knowledge' (πάντων ὡς εἰπεῖν ἔμπειρον ἀποφανῶ) and ornament his soul with 'temperance, justice, piety, kindness, reasonableness, understanding, steadfastness, love of all that is beautiful, ardour towards all that is sublime' (τὴν ψυχὴν, ὅπερ σοι κυριώτατόν ἐστι, κατακοσμήσω πολλοῖς καὶ ἀγατοῖς κοσμήμασι - σωφροσύνη, δικαιοσύνη, εὐσεβεία, πραότητι, ἐπιεικεία, συνέσει, καρτερία, τῷ τῶν καλῶν ἔρωτι, τῇ πρὸς τὰ σεμνότατα ὀρμῇ); she would teach him everything, of the gods and man (ὅλως ἅπαντα ὅποσα ἐστὶ, τὰ τε θεῖα τὰ τ' ἀνθρώπινα, οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν σε διδάξομαι), which would inspire envy and jealousy and lead to office and stature (Luc. *Somm.* 10-11).

¹² Lib. *Ep.* 174.2. Brown 1992 preferred the alternative translation 'a man "formed in *paideia*"' (53).

¹³ Παις is the root of παιδεία. Jaeger 1939, 283; Marrou 1956, 218; *LSJ* 2001, 511.

meaning of *paideia*, to facilitate a better understanding of a concept which was a vital part of society and, thus, an aspect of the study of this period.¹⁴

Elsner noted the lasting influence of Jaeger's and Marrou's work on *paideia* in modern discussions and examined the ideological biases behind the definitions suggested by Jaeger and Marrou.¹⁵ Their understandings of *paideia* are slightly different, owing to both the diverging ideologies and the contemporary context in which they worked, but also due to their different chronological focus: Jaeger wrote three volumes which largely focused on Classical Greece and Plato, while Marrou placed the roots of *paideia* in later Hellenistic Greece.¹⁶ Jaeger equated *paideia* with the German concept of *Bildung*, stating that it indicated the 'essence of education in the Greek, the Platonic sense'.¹⁷ He argued that *paideia* was the 'epitome of Greek culture and education', and was concerned with the formation of man as the ideal, the shaping of the Greek character.¹⁸ However, education was not just concerned with shaping the individual character of a man; it was also a 'function of the community' and it was the character of the wider community which was expressed by the educated individual.¹⁹ In this way, *paideia*, as conceptualised by the elite men of the later Roman empire, expressed the ideal character, the essence, of the elite, the notables.

Marrou also linked *paideia* and Greek culture, arguing that *paideia* came to mean, in Hellenistic Greece, the results of education and the culture of those educated men who have become 'truly' men, with a fully developed mind.²⁰ He noted that the differences

¹⁴ Elsner argued that *paideia* was 'a given in the study of antiquity – a key cultural assumption for ancient literature, history, and the social relations of the elite as well as those that aspired to join the elite' (2013, 149).

¹⁵ Elsner stated that 'the context cannot be separated from the very fundamental ideological complexity' (2013, 139) and examined the influence of contemporary politics upon both Jaeger and Marrou's work, noting that Jaeger's understanding of *paideia* was heavily influenced by the 'culture of *Bildung* in the German university system' and then by the outbreak of the Second World War (2013, 139-141). Marrou, meanwhile, was also influenced by the Second World War and its aftermath; Elsner noted it was 'fraught and over-determined by ideological motives designed to be at once purifying and redemptive' (2013, 139, 146-147).

¹⁶ Marrou 1956, 100; Elsner 2013, 147. Jaeger stated that Plato 'must be the culmination of any history of Greek *paideia*' (1976, x). Jaeger's chronological focus demonstrates *paideia*'s long history prior to the fourth century AD. Jaeger later undertook a history of early Christianity and *paideia*.

¹⁷ Jaeger 1939, xxiii. He equated *Bildung* with 'culture' in the English (xxiii n.1).

¹⁸ Jaeger 1939, vii, xvi, xxiv; 1943 [repr. 1976], 11. He also referred to *paideia* as 'the development of a conscious ideal of education and culture' (1943 [repr. 1976], 5), and elsewhere as 'Greek literature as a whole' (1962, 91).

¹⁹ Jaeger 1939, xiii.

²⁰ Marrou 1956, 98-99; Gleason 1995, xxi, xxii, 160.

between ‘education’ and ‘culture’ grew fainter; there was no clear-cut distinction.²¹ However, unlike Jaeger, Marrou saw more of a religious element in *paideia*: he said it was a ‘thing divine – a heavenly game, a nobility of soul’ and that *paideia* was ‘invested with a kind of sacred radiance that gave it a special dignity of a genuinely religious kind’.²² This is a ‘religion of culture’, absent from Jaeger.²³

While there are clear ‘divergence[s] of interpretation’, there are commonalities too: interestingly, both Jaeger and Marrou found merit in Aulus Gellius’s account of Cicero and Varro, who apparently translated *paideia* as *humanitas*;²⁴ indeed, Marrou argued that the essence of ancient education was ‘humanism’.²⁵ Both see *paideia* as something undeniably and indelibly linked to education, but also as a concept which is more akin to our understanding of culture (itself a word open to different competing connotations). This is an expanded understanding of the term, in which *paideia* comes to mean both education and culture, and what a student would gain and become through traditional rhetorical education. While both Jaeger and Marrou present a definition of *paideia* that includes culture or humanism, it is Marrou’s understanding of *paideia*, perhaps more developed than Jaeger’s, which has proved more influential and has been largely followed by modern scholars. Modern discussions tend to reflect this more expanded understanding and use *paideia* to mean Greek culture.²⁶ Van Hoof directly equated *paideia* with Greek culture, arguing that it comprised ‘language, literature, philosophy and medicine’ and was a defining characteristic of the elite, as well as a vital, performative ‘instrument for social promotion’.²⁷ This is similar to Bouffartigue, who argued that the essential constituents of *paideia* were literature, poetry, rhetoric and philosophy, and that inseparable from *paideia* were the values of morality, religion, reason, Hellenism and fidelity to the past.²⁸ In this way, he too equated *paideia* with culture. Bouffartigue further argued that the benefit of *paideia* was largely social; *paideia*

²¹ Marrou 1956, 196.

²² Marrou 1956, 101.

²³ Marrou 1956, 100; Elsner argued Marrou’s interpretation of *paideia* as a ‘redemptive, salvific, overtly religious absolute’ was motivated by post-war Europe and the desire to ‘save European humanism’ (2013, 148). Limberis follows Marrou in interpreting *paideia* as ‘something of a religion itself’ (2000, 387). This is further explored by Marrou 1938a.

²⁴ Gel. 13.17.1-2.

²⁵ Jaeger 1939, xxiii; Marrou 1956, 99, 217-218; Elsner 2013, 139.

²⁶ Of the more recent works, Cribiore 2013 defines *paideia* as education (96) and links it to rhetoric (26). However, she does not develop a detailed discussion of the concept and only signals her understanding briefly. Saddington also defines *paideia* as education (2003, 325).

²⁷ Van Hoof 2013, 387, 389.

²⁸ Bouffartigue 1992, 579.

was a social passport which defined a ‘micro-society’ and enabled the members of this group to recognise each other.²⁹ For Watts, education taught one a proper code of conduct, how to behave as a gentleman. This was *paideia*, and with it came an understanding of virtues and deportment. He refers to a ‘code of *paideia*’, and argued that it provided a common set of interests and a ‘universally accepted pattern of behaviour’.³⁰ *Paideia* was not ‘mechanical’ education, but rather its outcome. This is most clearly seen in Brown’s work on *paideia*. Brown defines *paideia* as the ‘traditional culture of the upper classes, as this was imparted to them through the system of education’.³¹ The role of culture was partly to elaborate on the ‘exacting codes of courtesy and self-control’ and was linked to ideals of behaviour and authority – and therefore also to the operation of politics.³² Brown emphasises that *paideia* was a distinguishing feature of the Greek world, and calls it a ‘system of grooming’, linking it to traditional education which taught correct behaviour, including strategies for persuasion, and the ideals of a particular style of rule.³³ *Paideia* was a ‘singularly tenacious common code’, one which was imparted through Greek rhetorical studies.³⁴ Brown’s conception of *paideia*, while building on Marrou’s work, is more directly linked to the politics and social relationships of the later Roman empire than Marrou allowed.

This commonality is an aspect of *paideia* that is often stressed: that *paideia* was shared and common to the educated elite, and contributed to a sense of unity, is central to the understanding of the concept. Marrou had argued that *paideia* offered unity where there otherwise was none in the Hellenistic era: *paideia* provided the shared ideal of human perfection and a common attitude, and was a ‘common civilization, or rather, culture’.³⁵ Referring more specifically to late antiquity, Brown argued that *paideia* was not only a traditional culture, but also a shared culture, a ‘common culture’, which bound the elite (the ‘governing class’ or ‘notables’) as a whole, including the emperor.³⁶ He refers to ‘cultural homogeneity’, following the consistency of Greek rhetorical education, discussed in chapter two, and argues that *paideia* was a uniting force.³⁷ This is something

²⁹ Bouffartigue 1992, 585, 588.

³⁰ Watts 2006, 6, 17, 153.

³¹ Brown 1992, 3-4.

³² Brown 1992, 8, 42.

³³ Brown 1992. 34.

³⁴ Brown 1992, 61.

³⁵ Marrou 1956, 99. Marrou argued that there was no racial or political unity in the Hellenistic era, and unity came rather from ‘devotion’ to *paideia*, reflecting again the religious element he saw.

³⁶ Brown 1992, 35-36.

³⁷ Brown 1992, 39.

that both Watts and Van Hoof also emphasise. Watts argued that *paideia* bound the elite together and engendered cultural unity and a network based on this ‘common cultural and educational background.’³⁸ Similarly, Van Hoof stated that *paideia* was the ‘common language’ of the ruling men.³⁹

It needs to be asked, however, to whom exactly was this culture common: who possessed and shared in *paideia*? Since *paideia* was a result of education, those who shared in this culture and laid claim to *paideia* were, reasonably, those who had access to Greek rhetorical education.⁴⁰ Mainly, these were young boys or men whose families could afford to send them to one or a number of educational centres.⁴¹ However, it is important to note that the ‘men of *paideia*’, as Brown refers to them,⁴² were not necessarily those ‘culture heroes’ we discussed in chapter two. While ‘culture heroes’ such as Gregory, Basil and Libanius were certainly men of *paideia* (and exemplary ones, too), they were not its sole possessors. *Paideia* was linked to rhetorical education, a result of it, but it did not need five years of Greek rhetorical studies. It might be reasonable to argue that those who opted to study for such an extended period of time were possessors of an exceptional level of *paideia* (if we can talk of levels of *paideia*, or indeed of culture in the modern sense) but those who studied for a year before starting a career or studying Roman law or Latin would also be considered men of *paideia*. *Paideia* was an expression of one’s education and was linked to a literary, polite and refined culture, learned through rhetorical studies. One could be educated without being a ‘culture hero’, and thus possess *paideia* without achieving that status.

³⁸ Watts 2006, 5, 7.

³⁹ Van Hoof 2013, 387.

⁴⁰ Having no knowledge of literature or oratory seems to prevent one from claiming *paideia* (see Ammianus’s disparaging comments on lawyers, 29.1.10; Henck 2001, 183) so those who by-passed rhetorical studies in favour of Latin or law were at somewhat of a disadvantage.

⁴¹ The question of whether women could possess *paideia* is an interesting one, made difficult by lack of evidence. As *paideia* was determined by one’s experience of rhetorical education, it seems unlikely that many women could lay claim to *paideia* simply because so few girls attended school at the rhetorical stage. The papyri demonstrate that women of the upper class had access to elementary education, were literate and educated to a degree. The papyri also attest to female teachers of primary letters. However, access to higher education seems limited, available to women of exceptional status only (and usually to those women whose fathers or husbands were involved in scholarly pursuits) – Hypatia or Aedesia, for example. The question of women and *paideia* is further complicated by the performative aspect of *paideia*; how many women would be in a position to express their education publicly, as a peer? I would venture few. See Criboire 2004, 74-91, 246-247.

⁴² Brown 1992, 46.

Similarly, while *paideia* was primarily a possession of the elite or the upper classes, it was not exclusive to the wealthier members of society.⁴³ As we have seen, students, whose families, while prominent were not prosperous, also attended rhetorical studies and could lay claim to *paideia*.⁴⁴ Brown refers to them as the ‘natural leaders’ of a community or ‘notables’, and argues that despite ‘low-born’ exceptions, *paideia* was not widespread and was instead the possession of a ‘few leading families in each locality’.⁴⁵ It was the possession of those families whose sons attended rhetorical studies and then passed it on to their own sons. *Paideia* was a common culture of the educated elite, but the emphasis was on the ‘educated’ and elite was not unqualifiedly a synonym for wealthy.

It is clear from this discussion of modern interpretations of *paideia* that, while it can be understood as the rearing of a child or education, a better understanding would be the culture which comes from this education. *Paideia* was the common culture of the elite and one of the main benefits of rhetorical education. It operated as a code of conduct which governed deportment and relationships, unspoken but ever present. If education was aimed at perfecting the character of a student, then *paideia* was its (public) expression. This is crucial to the understanding of *paideia* and has been emphasised by Van Hoof: *paideia* could not operate in a vacuum; it required an audience. It had no value unless it was expressed, shown and seen; it was necessarily performative. This will be emphasised below, through a discussion of literary examples of *paideia* – of *paideia* in action. This section (6.3) will also examine its other key elements: ideals of behaviour and interaction such as self-control, friendship and polite, cultivated language. As a preliminary, though, a discussion of a framework for understanding the operation of this concept will be useful.

⁴³ Brown argued that *paideia* was the common culture of the upper classes, but it is important to note that wealth did not always equal high status: as he has demonstrated, there were members of the local councils who were admitted due to their wealth but were not possessors of *paideia*, as they were not necessarily educated, and could be illiterate (1992, 37).

⁴⁴ One thinks of Augustine who attended rhetorical studies thanks to the help of a local patron (August. *Conf.* 2.3.5-6), Prohaeresius who struggled financially during his studies (Eunap. *VS.* 487), or those students whose fees were waived by Libanius (Lib. *Or.* 3.7).

⁴⁵ Brown 1992, 37. He refers to them as the ‘aristocracy of the eastern empire’. A modern analogy might be the old boys’ club.

6.2.1 *Paideia as capital*

One of the more helpful ways to sharpen ones understanding of *paideia* is offered by the use of Bourdieu's capital theory as a framework. Bourdieu has been used by a number of scholars in their discussions of *paideia*, focusing on both the Second Sophistic and late antiquity, with the majority finding merit in his capital theory and judging *paideia* to be a form of 'cultural capital'.⁴⁶ Gleason argued that *paideia* was a form of cultural capital, but also suggested that *paideia* for both Roman and Greek 'gentlemen' was a form of symbolic capital.⁴⁷ This is distinct from other scholars' interpretation of *paideia*: they view it simply as a form of cultural capital. Gleason, however, suggests that it was transformed through display from cultural to symbolic capital. In order to assess this, we first need to discuss Bourdieu's conception of capital, and define the key notions of 'capital' with which it engages.

Bourdieu's theory of capital argues that there are four forms of capital: economic, cultural, social and symbolic. Each are used to purchase power and can be converted, one into another. Economic capital (consisting not just of monetary income, but also inherited wealth and ownership of assets such as land) is the governing form, used to purchase other forms of capital, which are in turn able to be transformed back into economic capital.⁴⁸ Social capital presupposes networks and relationships, and implies a reciprocity: it is used to 'mobilize power and resources'.⁴⁹ Cultural capital is something which is possessed and displayed; it demonstrates one's competence in a 'socially valued area of practice'.⁵⁰ Cultural capital is bound up with cultural competence and education: Bourdieu remarked that 'academic qualifications are to cultural capital what money is to economic capital'.⁵¹ Bourdieu also conceives cultural capital to be further divisible into three subspecies: incorporated, objectified and institutionalised cultural capital. Incorporated cultural capital refers to tastes and practices acquired through socialisation; objectified capital signifies the possession of valued cultural goods and property; and

⁴⁶ Brown 1992 quotes Bourdieu at 49. Gleason 1995 stated that Bourdieu and his theories of capital and *habitus* had been 'extremely helpful' (1995, xii). *Habitus*, the structures which form habits or dispositions, could also be relevant for our understanding of *paideia*: the educational system of antiquity could be seen to be the *habitus* that led to the internalisation of strategies and preferences which led to students to then behave according to the ideals of *paideia* (Sallaz and Zavisca 2007, 24-25). Capital theory has also been used by Limberis (2000, 391), Whitmarsh (2005, 38) and Van Hoof (2013, 398); they each view *paideia* as a form of cultural capital.

⁴⁷ Gleason 1995, xxi.

⁴⁸ Sallaz and Zavisca 2007, 23.

⁴⁹ Sallaz and Zavisca 2007, 24.

⁵⁰ Sallaz and Zavisca 2007, 23.

⁵¹ Bourdieu 1977 [repr. 2013], 186, 187.

institutional capital indicates the capital gained through certification from academic institutions.⁵²

Symbolic capital, meanwhile, while less easily measured, is ‘perhaps the most valuable form of accumulation in a society’.⁵³ It is linked to symbols of power, such as titles which indicate standing and distinction, and the prestige and renown which comes from the possession of other forms of capital.⁵⁴ Bourdieu stated that symbolic capital was always in credit, ‘in the widest sense of the word’, and is a disguised form of physical ‘economic’ capital, which is successful only inasmuch as it ‘conceals the fact that it originates in “material” forms of capital’.⁵⁵ When the device is exposed, there is failure.⁵⁶ The ‘device’ is concealed through collective silence which guarantees the complicity of the group. In this way, a person’s ‘undeclared calculation must reckon with the receiver’s undeclared calculation, and hence satisfy his expectations without appearing to know what they are’. Those who possess symbolic capital must interact and respond to one another and to situations accordingly, without stating explicitly what forces of power are operating or influencing their behaviour and attitude: it must appear natural, lest a breakdown of the framework and relationships occur.⁵⁷ Any form of capital, it has been argued, can serve as symbolic capital, as long as the unequal distribution of, say, cultural capital is recognized as legitimate.⁵⁸

The way cultural capital has been described already brings to mind *paideia*: it is something to be possessed and displayed. That cultural capital is also linked to education adds to the understanding of *paideia* as a form of cultural capital. On Bourdieu’s model, we can construct *paideia* as a form of cultural capital, which was purchased using economic capital (the fees, discussed previously; the often-prosperous family background of those attending extended training; the amount of time involved) and often contributed to social capital: this level of education and demonstration of one’s ability contributed to (encouraged, even) the cultivation of a network and relationships (one thinks of Gregory and Basil’s friendship, formed in Athens, and also Libanius’s large network of

⁵² Sallaz and Zavisca 2007, 23-24.

⁵³ Bourdieu 1977 [repr. 2013], 182, 179.

⁵⁴ Bourdieu 1977 [repr. 2013], 179.

⁵⁵ Bourdieu 1977 [repr. 2013], 1181, 183.

⁵⁶ Bourdieu 1977 [repr. 2013], 173.

⁵⁷ Bourdieu 1977 [repr. 2013], 171. Bourdieu further explained that ‘owing to their duality, the social relations they [double-sided notions] designate represent unstable structures which are condemned to split in two as soon as there is any weakening of the social mechanisms aimed at maintaining them’ (172).

⁵⁸ Sallaz and Zavisca 2007, 24.

correspondents). Cultural capital, as conceived by Bourdieu, required one to demonstrate competence in socially valued areas of practice: central to *paideia* was its performative aspect, the ability to demonstrate one's familiarity with the authors and texts taught at rhetorical level, not to mention one's ability to express oneself well, both in declamations and letters. Among the elites, this behaviour was socially valuable because it was the basis of their relationships and their social position.

If we consider the sub-groups of cultural capital, two seem most relevant to *paideia*: the incorporated cultural capital and the institutionalised one. The incorporated form referred to an embodied disposition or knowledge, which was gained through socialisation or one's environment – we might even refer to the broader culture. In this way, *paideia* is part of the child's life and environment, and the qualities central to it are present even before formal training begins and the student consciously acquires it. Institutionalised cultural capital is also applicable, in that it usually requires the formal recognition of a person's cultural capital through academic or professional qualifications. While there were no formal qualifications in ancient education, *paideia* was a result of academic achievement and the consistency (standardisation, perhaps) of education lent itself to the recognition of a student's ability.

We can see that *paideia* as a concept can be understood using Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital in that it was something which was purchased and possessed; it required the demonstration of educational expertise and ability. However, as Gleason indicated, *paideia* can also be seen as a form of symbolic capital, in that the knowledge and ability to display and perform this could confer honours, distinction and a good reputation: things which cannot be exactly measured or counted but which are highly valued. *Paideia* was a form of cultural capital that could be converted into symbolic capital, which in turn could be converted into economic capital. To illuminate further how Bourdieu's theory of 'cultural capital' offers a helpful framework for the conceptualisation of *paideia*, the following section (6.3) will consider how the concept operated in practice: it will adduce and discuss a range of exemplary cases of *paideia* in action, focusing chiefly on descriptions of interactions in literary sources.

6.3 *Paideia* in action

Of the cases to be discussed, some of the most notable concern cases where *paideia* failed, when communications have broken down or the behaviour of one or more parties has been unsatisfactory or deficient: the disintegration Bourdieu spoke of.⁵⁹ We will discuss several such examples, but first we will examine some more successful displays of *paideia*, when behaviours and deportment have been reciprocated and the response has conformed to the codes of *paideia*. The more successful examples of *paideia* in action will reveal the ideals of *paideia* and make it clearer when, and how, this performance falters. A discussion of these examples will also illustrate the qualities and behaviours most valued and central to the concept of *paideia*.

6.3.1 *The ideals of paideia*

A particularly striking example of *paideia* in action is recounted by Eunapius. He wrote that the pupils of rival teachers Aspines and Julianus of Cappadocia were involved in a series of fights in the early 330s, with the Aspines faction gaining the upper hand.⁶⁰ The students of Aspines then, rather unfairly, charged the Julianus faction, one of whom was Prohaeresius, with assault. By this point, Prohaeresius had been a student of Julianus for some time; Watts argued that he was fifty-five during this incident.⁶¹ However, Eunapius marked a distinction and did not refer to him as a student in the strictest sense: Prohaeresius is described as one of Julianus's *hetairoi*, rather than *mathētai*.⁶² As such, he was not one of Julianus's pupils, but rather one of his companions. Watts argued that Prohaeresius should be thus seen as one of Julianus's inner circle, someone who engaged in discussions and also taught at the school.⁶³

The case of assault between the rival groups was brought before the proconsul of Achaëa (unnamed), who arrested not only the students involved, but every member of the

⁵⁹ Bourdieu 1977 [repr. 2013], 172.

⁶⁰ Student riots were increasingly common in the fourth century, described by Eunapius, Libanius and Himerius, and discussed in chapter 2.7. This particular instance has been dated by Watts to 'about 330', based on the careers of both Aspines and Julianus, and the death of Julianus before 336, perhaps 333 (2006, 51). Brown dated this incident to the late 330s (1992, 44).

⁶¹ Prohaeresius started studying under Julianus at the turn of the fourth century after a period of study in Antioch (Watts 2006, 50-51). Brown described Prohaeresius as 'young' at this point (1992, 44).

⁶² ἑταῖροι, Eunap. VS. 484.

⁶³ Watts 2006, 52. Watts likens the relationship between Prohaeresius and Julianus to that of Marinus and Proclus.

school, Julianus included.⁶⁴ When the case was tried, neither Julianus nor Aspines were permitted to speak; rather one of their respective *hetairoi* was chosen to make the case for each. Thus, Themistocles, who, according to Eunapius, was the cause of all the trouble, was put forward for the prosecution and Julianus chose Prohaeresius to speak on behalf of the defence.⁶⁵ Eunapius reports that there was no time for Themistocles or Prohaeresius to prepare speeches: this makes the contrast between the two more marked. Themistocles struggled and apparently gave no speech.⁶⁶ Prohaeresius, however, gave an astounding speech, despite the lack of preparation. Indeed, it was such an eloquent speech that the proconsul was quite overcome by ‘the force of his arguments, his weighty style, his facility and sonorous eloquence.’ The proconsul applauded with the rest of the audience (Julianus apparently wept) and proceeded to pardon Prohaeresius and his comrades, instead threatening the accusers with severe punishment.⁶⁷

This episode reveals several significant points about *paideia*. Firstly, it demonstrates the value and importance of eloquence and education. At this point, Prohaeresius had been aligned with Julianus for thirty years and was a well-established member of his school: this speech was a clear way of signalling not only his own superiority and high level of learning but also that of Julianus himself. It is conceivable that he also set himself even more firmly as the man to take lead the school following Julianus’s death. Thanks to Prohaeresius’s successful performance, Julianus is also seen as a man of *paideia*; he had a hand in shaping Prohaeresius, who did not let him down when the opportunity arose. The speech reflected well on both: Prohaeresius is seen to be triumphant and so educated that he can summon his declamation-training at will and give a speech that is remembered forty years later, while Julianus proves that his reputation and following is deserved.⁶⁸ Conversely, Themistocles’ dire performance reflected poorly not just on himself, but also on Aspines: Eunapius wrote that Themistocles was ‘a scandal and a disgrace to his great name’.⁶⁹

⁶⁴ Eunap. VS. 483.

⁶⁵ Eunap. VS. 483-484.

⁶⁶ Eunap. VS. 484. Themistocles and the rest of the Aspines faction had apparently come prepared only to shout and show support for their teacher. As Gleason wrote, ‘not to speak is to lose’ (1995, 163).

⁶⁷ κάτω δὲ τοῦ ἀνθυπάτου νεόντος, καὶ τὸν τε νοῦν τῶν λεγομένων καταπεληγμένου καὶ τὸ βᾶθος τῶν λέξεων καὶ τὴν εὐκολίαν καὶ τὸν κρότον, καὶ πάντων μὲν βουλομένων ἐπαιεῖν, καταπηξάντων δὲ ὥσπερ διοσημίαν, καὶ σιωπῆς κατακεχυμένης μυστηριώδους, Eunap. VS. 484.

⁶⁸ Eunapius source was Tuscianus, who had been present and remembered lines verbatim, VS. 484.

Eunapius studied under Tuscianus, who was himself part of Prohaeresius’s *hetairoi*, (Watts 2006, 75).

⁶⁹ ἐνταῦθα κατηγορεῖ μὲν οὐδεὶς, ἀλλὰ Θεμιστοκλῆς ὀνόματος ἦν ὕβρις, Eunap. VS. 484.

The speech also gave the nameless proconsul an opportunity to be viewed as a man of *paideia*. Reciprocity was a significant part of the relationships between imperial magistrates and notables (a famous sophist at Athens with a great reputation and large following surely marks Julianus as a ‘notable’, even if he was not directly politically involved), and by responding positively to such a great speech, the proconsul has shown himself able to appreciate not only culture (an excellent speech) but also the local power dynamics and the codes of conduct dictated by *paideia*. If he had aligned himself with Aspines and found against Julianus and his students, following a persuasive display of oratorical power, the proconsul might have found himself isolated locally due to the sway Julianus held. It would also have marked him out as someone unconcerned with, and unappreciative of, education and culture, *paideia*: being visibly moved to applause and pardon by the force of speech demonstrates that he too was part of this community and had been initiated into the norms of *paideia*. He demonstrated he was ‘one of them’, a man of *paideia*.⁷⁰ The proconsul had responded correctly. He also showed himself to be just and wise in his decision to pardon Julianus and his students, rather than continuing with a lengthy trial.⁷¹ The proconsul had upheld the codes of conduct and could then, presumably, continue in his job with the added reputation as a fair-minded child of the Muses, with even greater authority. As Brown observed, he had ‘played the game correctly’.⁷²

This is all the more important because it was such a public performance. The performative aspect of *paideia* needs to be emphasised: it could not operate in a vacuum just as it could not succeed without acknowledgement. *Paideia* was very definitely the public demonstration of one’s education and culture, of one’s capital. *Paideia* needed to be seen and heard, and responded to. Prohaeresius publicly displayed his *paideia* (and that of Julianus also), while Themistocles failed to do so. By responding correctly, with courtesy, the proconsul confirmed not only the *paideia* of Prohaeresius and himself, but also the value of *paideia* in relationships and politics.

⁷⁰ Eunapius wrote as much: Ῥωμαῖός τις οὐκ εἶναι τῶν ἀπαιδευτῶν, οὐδὲ τῶν ὑπ’ ἀγροίκῳ καὶ ἀμούσῳ τύχῃ τεθραμμένων, VS. 483.

⁷¹ An alternative route was followed by another proconsul in 339/40: following student rioting, the proconsul dismissed three teachers, perhaps holders of official chairs in Athens, blaming them for leading their students astray. He looked for replacements but eventually re-instated the three dismissed teachers, (Lib. Or. 1.25; Watts 2006, 45). I would argue that this proconsul went too far and realised his mistake late, and had to go back on his judgement, perhaps with some embarrassment.

⁷² Brown 1992, 45.

Brown argued that this episode was ‘set at a slight distance from reality’ because it took place in Athens, a place where ‘improbable things could still happen’ due to its political seclusion and status as an educational oasis.⁷³ However, it shows well that *paideia*, in such an idealised fashion,⁷⁴ was highly valued and mattered in real situations. It was part of the fabric of government and a vital aspect of relationships. The arguments of Prohaeresius may have been persuasive enough for the proconsul rule in his favour, but the act of being persuasive and publicly demonstrating the power of the Julianus faction was likely also a major factor in the outcome for the proconsul. This incident shows how *paideia* could operate in a real situation when both parties behaved according to the same codes of conduct. It also shows the importance and power of *paideia* for imperial magistrates, as well as for private citizens, for notables.

This is also seen in the case of Oecumenius, or rather, of the statue honouring him. Oecumenius was a provincial governor of Aphrodisias in the late fourth century, and had likely also spent time in Salamis as an imperial magistrate, if we judge a similar portrait head to be Oecumenius.⁷⁵ The Aphrodisias statue was above life size (1.91m. high) and was located inside a double stoa outside the Bouleuterion: a ‘key honorific locale.’⁷⁶ Oecumenius is shown wearing the long chlamys, associating him with office, and holding a thin scroll, signifying the codicils of office or markers of his *paideia*.⁷⁷ The bearded face bears natural and individual features, and there is a hidden Christian tag on the back of the head, which Smith argues was surreptitiously included by the sculptor.⁷⁸ For our purposes, what is interesting is the inscribed statue base, which preserves a complete verse text in praise of the governor. The epigram makes it clear that the statue was set up by the ‘friendly’ council of Aphrodisias and praises Oecumenius as an expert lawyer, bilingual in Greek and Latin, and incorruptible, being ‘pure in mind and in hand’.⁷⁹ The

⁷³ Brown 1992, 45.

⁷⁴ We must also be aware of Eunapius bias towards his beloved teacher Prohaeresius. According to Eunapius, Prohaeresius’s speeches were met with intense envy and an enthusiasm bordering on worship, (VS. 488-90; Criore 2007b, 52-53).

⁷⁵ Smith 2002, 140, 149. For Smith, the Salamis portrait head suggests an authorised portrait. He rejects the argument that this Oecumenius was the same who was governor of Crete in 382-3, that is, Dositheos Oecumenius Asklepiodotos (148-149). Ševčenko favours a date at the end of the fourth century (1968, 40), while Smith argues for the later fourth or early fifth century (2002, 149). Ševčenko identifies Oecumenius as a *praeses* of Caria, a governor of the lowest rank (1968, 30, 36).

⁷⁶ Smith 2002, 134, 142.

⁷⁷ Smith 2002, 142.

⁷⁸ Smith 2002, 138, 150-153. The facial features suggest that while Oecumenius is presented as one of his class (‘aristocratic Theodosian-style courtier and office-holder’), the statue was also meant to look like a real portrait (Smith 2002, 140).

⁷⁹ Τὸν σὲ νόνων πλήθοντα, τὸν Ἰταλιώτιδα Μοῦσαν/

epigram engages with three motifs, common to epigrams in praise of governors: that the governor is just; that he is incorruptible; that the governor is connected to the Muses. It also praises his bilingualism, something which was less common but not without parallels.⁸⁰

While we cannot know the details of the relationship between the Aphrodisians and Oecumenius or what prompted them to set up this statue, we can venture that they enjoyed a good, successful relationship. It is also notable that, considering the high turnover of governors, Oecumenius was apparently deserving of two statues in two cities in the late fourth century.⁸¹ The inscription does tell us what type of man Oecumenius was, and what type of attributes were worthy of praise in a governor; it tells us of the ideals held about those in positions of power in the fourth century. We can see that Oecumenius was a man of his time, having apparently studied Latin and law, as well as the generally required rhetoric.⁸² We can also see that he is a man of *paideia*: just, incorruptible, well-spoken, and literary. He was cultured enough to warrant a prominent statue and an effusive epigram. It would be a safe assumption that Oecumenius, like the proconsul of Achaëa, played the game correctly by demonstrating his own *paideia* to such an extent that it was not only noticed, but celebrated by the council after his tenure.

The statue and inscription also reveal that the councillors themselves, or at least the prominent senior members, were persons of *paideia* who maintained the ideals of this (Greek) literary culture. They were publicly demonstrating their own learned nature and culture by celebrating these qualities and the character of Oecumenius through a well-crafted, prominent statue and verse inscription, written in what Smith calls ‘typically

Ἀτθίδος ἠδευπεῖ κιννάμενον μέλιτι/
 τῆιδ’ Οἰκουμένιον τὸν ἀοίδιμον ἡγεμονῆα/
 στήσε φιλη βουλή τῶν Ἀφροδισιέω·
 τῶι γὰρ δὴ καθαρῶι φρένα καὶ χέρα, τί πλέον εὐρεῖν/
 μνημοσύνης ἀγαθῆς ἄλλο πάρεσι γέρας;

“You who are full of (knowledge of) laws, who have blended the Italian Muse with the sweet-voiced honey of the Attic, Oecumenius, the famous governor, the friendly council of the Aphrodisians has set you up here; for what greater reward than that of being well-remembered can the man find who is pure in mind and in hand?” (Smith 2002, 144).

⁸⁰ Ševčenko 1968, 30, 32. On the bilingualism of Greeks in Latin and the mixed feelings of Romans towards the Greek language, see Adams 2003, 15-18 and 9-14, 756.

⁸¹ Ševčenko has questioned the sincerity of the statue by stating that Oecumenius commissioned it (1968, 36). However, even if the governor encouraged the dedication, it would still testify to their collective impulse to exhibit *paideia* and to be praised for it.

⁸² This also shows that rhetoric, knowledge of Greek, was still considered a worthy achievement, something to be celebrated. Libanius might have been pleased.

elevated and pretentious style'.⁸³ There might also be an implicit warning to future governors of Aphrodisias in this statue: they are making it clear through a prominent statue that they appreciate *paideia* and will reciprocate it – even memorialise it. Thus, subsequent governors should engage in a relationship based on these codes of conduct.⁸⁴

Cribiore argued that, while governors must have appreciated the statues and epigrams as 'gifts of *paideia*', since they associated them with the gifts of the Muses, the epigrams do not testify to the education of the governors. She argued that they also often focused on justice and public buildings, and made no reference to *paideia*: this suggests that it was not a prerequisite, or a reason for pride.⁸⁵ However, there is a danger of being too literal here, and of linking *paideia* too closely to education: while the epigram does not state explicitly that Oecumenius was a man of *paideia*, the point is implicit. As Robert showed in his famous collection of epigrams *Hellenica*, *paideia* was very much in the minds of the governors and the elite, even if it was not overt.⁸⁶ Indeed, to have noted his *paideia* so explicitly would have diminished the claim; as Bourdieu argued, there was breakdown in the good-faith economy when the device is exposed.⁸⁷ *Paideia* was supposed to be something inherent and to appear as a natural gift, rather than something studied and performed, despite the reality. While the epigram reflects an image of the ideal governor,⁸⁸ it also reflects something real: good governors were those who managed to play the game and approach their interactions with *paideia*, and part of this brief involved being just and having integrity, to demonstrate their culture through forming successful relationships with the local notables. Oecumenius seems to have done just that – twice.

6.3.2 Letters, friendship and *paideia*

This celebration of good governors is also found in literary sources. It becomes clear that maintaining a good relationship between governors and local notables was important and

⁸³ Smith 2002, 144. Brown referred to the style of these epigrams as 'esoteric' and 'elegant' (1992, 35, 36).

⁸⁴ Brown 1992, 36. For an earlier history on role-assignment strategies between cities and monarchs, see Ma 1999, 201-206, who cites Brown 1992.

⁸⁵ Cribiore 2007b, 227.

⁸⁶ Robert 1948; Smith 1995, 45.

⁸⁷ Bourdieu 1977 [repr. 2013], 173.

⁸⁸ Cribiore also asserts that the epigrams only reflect the ideal, (2007b, 227). Ševčenko, too, has argued that the epigram and the common motif of the just governor reflects 'wishful thinking of the *curiales* [...] rather than the reality' and referred to the 'make-believe world of the epigrams and adulatory texts' (1968, 30, 31).

valued for the smooth operation of government, and was based largely on the mutual recognition and expression of *paideia*. We see this most clearly in letters sent between our ‘culture heroes’ and governors across the empire. From the corpus of letters of Libanius, we see a large network in action; his letters reference about 700 different people, including court officials, prefects and, significantly, governors.⁸⁹ Of 1544 letters, 315 were sent to governors of the Eastern provinces while they held office.⁹⁰ The various governors of Galatia received twenty-six letters while in office between 360-365, and Maximus alone received thirty letters in three successive governorships.⁹¹ If we examine these letters, we see that they attempt to establish a connection through a shared status and experience, based on rhetorical education. Letters to Maximus and Acacius, both governors of Galatia in the mid-360s, contain references to classical texts and authors, such as Homer, Plato and Demosthenes, and to mythological heroes and episodes.⁹² These allusions establish and emphasise their shared literary culture – their *paideia*. One could only reference something which the recipient was sure to understand; by referencing Homer or Plato, Libanius was marking the recipient as a man of similar, if not equal, status and *paideia*, sure to appreciate and respond in kind.⁹³ Thus, Libanius praises a letter written by Maximus, which was apparently so eloquent he felt moved to read it aloud to a crowd gathered for a literary function at the imperial palace at Antioch, and acclaims the intelligence of Acacius as infectious.⁹⁴ We see this also in a letter to Priscianus, governor of Euphratensis, in which Libanius states that ‘one of the Muses dwells with you, and Justice also’.⁹⁵ This is particularly reminiscent of the epigram on the Oecumenius statue base, and similarly, emphasises not only Priscianus’s exemplary *paideia* but also that of Libanius, who can appreciate and pay tribute to it.

This can also be seen in the letters from Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil to governors, written in their capacity as bishops: they allude to the behaviour of Croesus, Cyrus and Pythagoras, and include flattering phrases such as ‘your Nobleness’ and ‘your

⁸⁹ Bradbury 2014, 220.

⁹⁰ Bradbury enumerates the Eastern provinces Libanius sent letters to: ‘Phoenicia (69), Palestine (51), Euphratensis (41), Cilicia (31), Syria (27), Galatia (27), Armenia (22), Arabia (16), Isauria (15), other Eastern provinces (0-5)’ (2014, 233).

⁹¹ Bouffartigue 1992, 588; Bradbury 2014, 225-226. Maximus 19 (PLRE I: 583).

⁹² Lib. *Epp.* B108; B109; B110 to Maximus 19; B99 references the mythical king of Athens, Codrus; B100 opens with references to Croesus, Gyges and Midas; B101; B102 to Acacius 9 (PLRE I: 7).

⁹³ Bradbury 2014, 227. Cabouret 2014, 152.

⁹⁴ Lib. *Ep.* B107; B101.

⁹⁵ τῶν Μουσῶν τις ἔοικέ σοι συνοικεῖν μετὰ τῆς Δικῆς καὶ συλλαμβάνειν πῆ μὲν ἐκείνην, πῆ δὲ ταύτην, Lib. *Ep.* N60.2. Priscianus 1 (PLRE I: 727).

Magnanimity'.⁹⁶ A letter from Basil to the governor of Neocaesarea opens with a quote from Euripides, establishing from the start the tone of their correspondence and the basis of their relationship.⁹⁷ This letter also refers to the governor as 'your Magnanimity' and praises the loftiness of his spirit, the gentleness of his manners, his experience, judgement and ability as an orator.⁹⁸ The references to ancient history and classical literature establish a connection based on a shared education and culture, while the compliments, which might be dismissed as mere flattery, speak to the expectations of good governors and are reminiscent of the inscriptions on statue bases, such as that to Oecumenius.⁹⁹ These letters are demonstrations of the *paideia* of both parties, writer and recipient. They demonstrate their cultural capital through these exchanges, peppered with literary allusions and lofty language. This was something of which the writers of the letters were also acutely aware: both Libanius and Basil remark that letters to governors ought to be especially eloquent.¹⁰⁰ Both recognise that when writing to governors, one needed to perform *paideia* to the best of one's abilities, because the position and authority of governor required it.

These letters also bring up the issue of *paideia*'s expression in friendship (*philia*) and favours (*charis*), two concepts that are closely linked in the ancient world. Thus, we see many letters sent with the purpose of securing a favour, either for the writer themselves or on behalf of someone else, often using the language of friendship, explicitly, to make their case. This is clearly seen in the corpus of Libanius. One of the main causes for Libanius's correspondence with Maximus and Acacius as governors of Galatia was the attempt to secure favour for an ex-student Hyperechius and his father, an episode discussed in chapter 2.5.2. Hyperechius, in search of a notable career after

⁹⁶ σου τῆ καλοκάγαθία and σου τὴν μεγαλόνοιαν, Basil, *Epp.* 84, 112, 94; GNaz, *Epp.* 198, 125, 131. Van Dam 2002, 83.

⁹⁷ Basil, *Ep.* 63. That Basil is explicit about the provenance of the quote might indicate the perception of the governor's education and culture. Implicit or offhand references imply greater knowledge (Nesselrath 2014, 266-267). Perhaps Basil was unsure the governor would otherwise be able to place the quote. We might compare this to the correspondence between Gregory of Nazianzus and Olympius 10, which is entirely without classical allusions, leading Van Dam to suppose that Olympius was unfamiliar with classical culture (2002, 84-85). However, Gregory does praise Olympius and his virtues in terms similar to Basil and Libanius, but focuses more on their shared Christianity (*Epp.* 104, 105, 140); a different type of common culture or *paideia* perhaps. Gregory did, however, share classical allusions with Olympius's successor, Nemesius: *Ep.* 199; Van Dam 2002, 86. Bouffartigue argued that explicit allusions satisfied the vanity of the person writing the letter or speech, and implied victory over archaic allusions (1992 588-589).

⁹⁸ σου τῆς μεγαλοφυίας, το μεγαλοπρεπὲς τῆς ψυχῆς, τοῦ φρονήματος τὸ ἀνάστημα, τῶν τρόπων τὴν ἡμερότητα, ἐμπειρίαν πραγμάτων, σύνεσιν γνώμης, σεμνότητα βίου φαιδρότητι κεκραμένην, λόγου δύναμιν, Basil *Ep.* 63.

⁹⁹ Van Dam 2002, 84.

¹⁰⁰ Lib. *Ep.* B99; Basil, *Ep.* 84.

finishing his education, relied on letters of recommendation sent by Libanius. Libanius canvassed his friends, such as Maximus, but also governors he did not know in order to help his ex-student and his family, even suggesting to Acacius that it was his duty as governor to help.¹⁰¹ Even when writing letters to near-strangers, one positioned oneself as a friend. Libanius wrote to Maximus that as he was his friend, he ought to help Hyperechius, and so help Libanius.¹⁰² Libanius continued to ask Acacius and Maximus for other favours on behalf of needy friends and ex-students, as he warned Acacius he would.¹⁰³

Basil, too, wrote letters to governors seeking favour or asking for favours, often in the name of friendship. Indeed, he wrote to a censor (a tax official) that he had been taught friendship along with the other virtues and throughout his correspondence claimed several of the governors he wrote to as friends.¹⁰⁴ Basil wrote a long letter in 372 to a governor on behalf of an ‘unfortunate old man’ who had previously been exempted from public duties but was now forced to resume his duties after his four-year-old grandson had been enrolled in the city council.¹⁰⁵ He wrote to another governor (the names of the recipients have not survived for some letters) on behalf of Dorotheus, a presbyter, whose grain had been stolen. The governor’s commitment to justice was emphasised, predictably, but so was his commitment to his friends.¹⁰⁶ Thus, the tone of the letter was established and the governor’s help all but assured: who could deny their care for justice and friends? In 372, Basil wrote to a governor (possibly Elias, the governor of Cappadocia), saying that he had delayed writing in case it would seem that he was only writing to serve some advantage, rather than out of ‘disinterested friendship’.¹⁰⁷ Only after this disclaimer did he ask for his favour. This claim to friendship is most notable in a

¹⁰¹ Libanius sent a number of letters to Acacius 8 when he was governor of Galatia (such as *Ep.* C110, B99, B100, B101), and admitted to Maximus 19 that they became friends only through the correspondence concerning Hyperechius (PLRE I: 449-450), *Ep.* B107.5. He was already friends with Maximus 19, and sent a number of letters about Hyperechius: *Ep.* B107, B109. Julianus 14 also received a letter about Hyperechius, *Ep.* C115.

¹⁰² *Lib. Ep.* B107.

¹⁰³ *Lib. Ep.* 99.2.

¹⁰⁴ μὴ θαυμάζῃς δέ, εἰ ἔμαντοῦ λέγω τὰ τῶν φίλων, μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης ἀρετῆς καὶ φιλίαν πεπαιδευμένος, καὶ μεμνημένος τοῦ σοφῶς εἰπόντος, ἄλλον ἑαυτὸν εἶναι τὸν φίλον, Basil, *Ep.* 83. Brown 1992, 46 on Basil’s collection of gubernatorial friends.

¹⁰⁵ τοῦ ἀθλίου γέροντος ἱκεσίαν, Basil, *Ep.* 84. This demonstrates the ongoing issues with the city councils and enrolment, discussed in chapter four.

¹⁰⁶ Οἶδα μεγίστην καὶ πρώτην σπουδὴν οὖσαν τῇ τιμιότητι σου πάντα τρόπον χαρίζεσθαι τῷ δικαίῳ, δευτέραν δὲ τὸ καὶ τοὺς φίλους εὖ ποιεῖν καὶ τῶν προσφευγόντων τῇ προστασίᾳ τῆς σῆς μεγαλονοίας ἀντιποιεῖσθαι, Basil, *Ep.* 86. *Ep.* 87 also concerns this case.

¹⁰⁷ αἴτιον δέ, ὅτι αἰσχύνομαι δοκεῖν, μὴ φιλίας γε ἔνεκεν καθαρῶς, ἀλλὰ χρεῖαν τινὰ θεραπεύων ἐκάστοτε, γράφειν, Basil, *Ep.* 84.

letter of introduction to the governor of Neocasearea in 371: Basil did not know this man, but claims him as a friend throughout. He explains that he has only heard good things about the governor ('for as the promoter of our friendship we have Fame')¹⁰⁸ and praises him thoroughly. He ends by asking the governor to accept the title of friend and states that this friendship is already 'true and genuine'.¹⁰⁹

This same trend is seen in the correspondence of Gregory of Nazianzus. Like Basil and Libanius, Gregory wrote to governors asking for help and favours, most notably Olympius.¹¹⁰ In 382, Gregory appealed to Olympius to settle an issue with the see of Nazianzus: while he was convalescing at the hot baths of Xanxaris, the Apollinarians had installed one of their own as bishop, to his dismay. Gregory wrote asking Olympius to intervene, if he also found this unbearable and against the wishes of the Emperor.¹¹¹ As McLynn has noted, this was not a straightforward request: Gregory did not know Olympius, but had elected to appeal directly to him rather than to fellow bishops, or even Theodore, bishop of Tyana and friend of Gregory.¹¹² This episode, however, saved Gregory from humiliation, emphasised his independence from his compatriots, and provided an easy win for the governor. Gregory and Olympius continued to correspond throughout his time in office, and Gregory continued to ask for favours, often referring to him as a friend.¹¹³ When Olympius's term was finished, Gregory wrote a farewell letter filled with sorrow at the prospect of losing such a governor; as it was with Libanius, once out of office governors were of little use.¹¹⁴ His successor, Nemesius, was the recipient of only four letters, requests for favours on behalf of private individuals, although Gregory did write him a long honorary poem.¹¹⁵

This constant emphasis on and reference to friendship, also seen in the epigram in praise of Oecumenius, is notable.¹¹⁶ As Brown argued, *paideia* showed itself through

¹⁰⁸ ἔχομεν γὰρ φήμην πρόξενον τῆς φιλίας, Basil, *Ep.* 63.

¹⁰⁹ ἀληθινῆς καὶ ἀδόλου, Basil, *Ep.* 63. This letter is reminiscent of Lib. *Ep.* B36 to Florentius, *magister officiorum*: Libanius had only heard of Florentius by reputation and sought to make friends with him through this somewhat awkward letter. Bradbury 2014, 234.

¹¹⁰ Olympius 10 (PLRE I: 646).

¹¹¹ GNaz, *Ep.* 125.

¹¹² McLynn 2014, 57-58, 62.

¹¹³ Olympius 10 received a total of 13 letters from Gregory, out of a total of 245 letters. This makes him a significant correspondent. Friend: *Epp.* 141, 146. McLynn 2014, 48.

¹¹⁴ GNaz, *Ep.* 154. Bradbury 2014, 233.

¹¹⁵ GNaz, *Carm.* II.2.7. Van Dam 2002, 86; McLynn 2014, 64.

¹¹⁶ The statue was sponsored by the 'friendly council' (φιλη βουλή) of Aphrodisias.

philia.¹¹⁷ It also shone particularly through letters. Distance was a friend to no one and letters helped overcome that.¹¹⁸ Letters were a ‘friendship’ genre, and in the absence of a language of patronage in Greek, friendship was called upon to smooth the way for favours or goodwill.¹¹⁹ The exchange of letters, ‘vehicles of friendship’, was an important aspect of *philia* but also *paideia*: letters cultivated a network which was based on a common language and a common set of values.¹²⁰ These values – this *paideia* – was expressed in writing a letter and also by responding to it in kind, by being persuaded by beautiful words and friendship alone. As a form of ‘capital’, also, *paideia* transformed letter writing and requests for favours into something more noble: for Bourdieu, capital can change a ‘disinterested exchange’ into ‘elective relations of reciprocity’.¹²¹ That is, *paideia*, as a form of capital, changed repetitive and cynical requests for favours into an artful correspondence between friends, two willing parties engaged in a relationship. In this way, letters were also gifts, acts of friendship and generosity without any calculation. Just as signalling the implicit *paideia* in the Oecumenius epigram would have diminished this *paideia*, a ‘rational contract would telescope into an instant a transaction which gift exchange disguises’. Letters were gifts from friends, asking for favours, which disguised the fact that, at root, they were often requests for economic or political benefit – or indeed both.¹²²

¹¹⁷ Brown 1992, 45. The importance placed on friendship is reminiscent of Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics. Aristotle considered friendship a virtue or something that involves virtue (ἔστι γὰρ ἀρετὴ τις ἢ μετ’ ἀρετῆς, Aristot. *Nic.Eth.* 8.1.1) and was particularly important for the rich and rulers as it provided them with an outlet for beneficence, displayed in its fullest towards friends (τί γὰρ ὄφελος τῆς τοιαύτης εὐετηρίας ἀφαιρεθείσης εὐεργεσίας, ἢ γίγνεται μάλιστα καὶ ἐπαινετωτάτη πρὸς φίλους; Aristot. *Nic.Eth.* 8.1.1). In this way, *philia* is a philosophic virtue to be embraced and expressed by the *pepaideumenos*. Aristotle proposed three types of friendship: those based on utility, those based on pleasure, and those based on virtue – the ‘perfect’ type of friendship (τελεία, Aristot. *Nic. Eth.* 8.3.1, 6). In our case, the friendship of utility seems most applicable: these letters are proposing a friendship which can offer some benefit, and in many cases, cease once the governor’s term has ended. However, we might also argue that these friendships are also the perfect type, between those who resemble each other in virtue, as they are between men of *paideia* (or, they are certainly presented this way). Indeed, this *paideia* is the basis of friendship and binds them together. Perhaps we can see an overlap, a more complex and blurred type of bond: a friendship of utility between men of virtue (Aristot. *Nic.Eth.* 8.4.1).

¹¹⁸ Brown 1992, 9-10; Cabouret 2014, 152.

¹¹⁹ Bradbury 2014, 226-227, 228. On the definition and use of patronage, and a discussion of its Latin terminology, including *amicus*, see Eilers 2002, 2-18. Brown has discussed how petitions to governors in the name of friendship ‘carried no admission of dependence’, a significant point to the status of local notables (1992, 46).

¹²⁰ Cabouret 2014, 153.

¹²¹ Bourdieu 1977 [repr. 2013], 171.

¹²² Bourdieu 1977 [repr. 2013], 171. Cabouret also refers to letters as gifts and argues that the exchange of letters was thus ‘experienced as an encounter’ rather than an exchange of information (2014, 152).

The reciprocal nature of letters (and friendship) was also emphasised: there are a number of letters that include reminders to write more often or scold the addressee for neglecting their correspondence.¹²³ Reciprocity was a central aspect of friendship, not only in terms of letters, but of actions too.¹²⁴ Those of equal or similar status, who could appreciate the *paideia* expressed in such a letter, were thus called upon in the name of a cultured friendship to grant favours. Favours done in the name of friendship, being suggestive of shared ideals and status, as well as a common goal, are something elevated; they are not just requests or demands. Such communications are above the regular petitions, part of the magistrate's job, because they have been submitted in the name of *philia* by a fellow man of *paideia*. Instead, they are acts of kindness and courtesy: *charis*. Ignoring such letters or neglecting favours marked one as unmoved by *paideia* and outside the code of civilised conduct. Just as the proconsul of Achaëa gave way to Prohaeresius's speech in a show of mutual *paideia*, correspondence was sustained and favours were entertained in a demonstration of *paideia*. *Paideia* and *philia* were thus inextricably linked: *paideia* taught a man 'to give way graciously, as if to a friend' so that it appeared natural, but also taught him how to cultivate, maintain and express friendship.¹²⁵ Through friendly epistles, *paideia* had value beyond a local and more immediate network; it also came to bear on the politics of the empire, in some ways smoothing over the raw politics of realities.¹²⁶

Indeed, it was politically astute for a governor, as an imperial magistrate, to give way to requests for favours and to cultivate these connections, these 'friends'. Those writing to the magistrates clearly gained the most – promotion, security, influence, assistance, reputation – but governors also benefited. A good relationship with local notables and decurions, based on *paideia*, lent their administrative tasks and political machinations dignity, but most importantly, it ensured much-needed support.¹²⁷ The governor needed allies, else they could be subject to a boycott, the 'discreet and persistent

¹²³ Basil, *Ep.* 84 ends with a plea for regular letters, while *Ep.* 20 reproves Leontius for not writing frequently. Libanius also reproached his correspondents for not writing often enough: *Epp.* C30; C111. *Ep.* B47 shows how attentive Libanius was to letter writing: he made the courier wait through the night for a letter which simply recounted the circumstances of its composition and forgave its addressee for not writing frequently. Following the death of Julian, Libanius himself stopped writing regularly, indicative of his grief: *Or.* 17.38; *Epp.* N116; N123.

¹²⁴ Bradbury points to the examples of Theseus and Heracles, Achilles and Patroclus as ancient models of friendship (2014, 227).

¹²⁵ Brown 1992, 45.

¹²⁶ Brown 1992, 45, 48.

¹²⁷ Brown 1992, 48.

withdrawal of collaboration by the local notables'.¹²⁸ The importance of this is seen in the collection of taxes, discussed by Brown. While the governor was nominally in charge of collecting the amount set at a central level, in practice the governor needed the cooperation of the elites – who constituted the local notables and some of the decurions – those who held real sway in the area. Without this support and cooperation, the governor would struggle to exact taxes, either as money or levies in kind. While it was the members of the council who had to collect these taxes (often descending on the countryside) and acting as surety for any shortfalls, it was the governor who would ultimately fail if the taxes were not collected: he was vulnerable and needed the support and cooperation of the right people, as well as their local authority.¹²⁹ Without this support, governors faced losing favour with the court and a struggle to advance their careers; local elites could ruin a governor. As Brown has argued, the collection of taxes only served to highlight, annually, the 'permanent importance' of the local notables and councillors. It also, though, serves to stress the permanent importance of *paideia*.

6.3.3 Anger and *paideia*

For the governor, usually in term for only a year or two, the collection of taxes was vital and showed the constant need for collaboration and support from the local elite. The withdrawal of this support also marked a failure of *paideia*: when a governor refused to play by the rules and was not seen to be bound by the behaviour inherent in this common culture, tensions arose. Governors could also lose support through the ill-advised flogging of local notables. *Curiales* were legally exempted from flogging,¹³⁰ but it happened with increasing regularity in the fourth century, as they were held responsible for tax arrears.¹³¹ This appalled many, particularly Libanius, who wrote a number of speeches and letters against these governors and in support of the councillors. Indeed, he felt so strongly about the unjust treatment of councillors by certain governors that they merited inclusion in his *Autobiography*. He described an episode in which Philagrius, *comes Orientis*, resorted to

¹²⁸ Brown 1992, 15, 23.

¹²⁹ Brown 1992, 25-26. Van Dam minimises the role governors played in the collection of taxes, and notes that Basil and Gregory wrote to prefects or 'almost anyone except provincial governors' regarding taxes, again citing their friendship and shared classical culture (2002, 87-89).

¹³⁰ *C.Th.* 12.1.75, 12.1.80, 12.1.82, 12.1.85. See Brown 1992, 55.

¹³¹ *C.Th.* 12.1.126. Brown 1992, 53. Libanius mentions this: Tisamenus flogged those who could not collect the sum indicated (*Or.* 33.32). Basil mentions the 'persecution' (διωγμούς) of Maximus, governor of Cappadocia; this might be a reference to ecclesiastical persecution or a particularly harsh method of collecting taxes (*Ep.* 98.2; Van Dam 2002, 224n.21).

flogging a group of bakers during a food crisis. He flogged seven men in a public place, possibly the agora, before Libanius intervened with a speech.¹³² Another *comes*, Proclus, was bound up with ‘storm and tempest, flogging and blood’ for Libanius.¹³³ Proclus apparently was an inveterate flogger, and Libanius accuses him of defiling the grove of Zeus in Daphne with slaughter and bloodshed.¹³⁴ Libanius avoided him and withdrew any semblance of friendship.¹³⁵ Proclus resigned his post in 384.¹³⁶ In a speech, Libanius criticised this same Proclus for having little education: he knew neither Latin nor Greek, and had no knowledge of law either.¹³⁷ This is in contrast to Icarus, the good governor who was a ‘nursling of the Muses’ and held office as a reward for his poetry.¹³⁸ This demonstrates the importance of education and the resulting *paideia* for magistrates: their character and reputation was judged on it. Libanius wrote to the governor Cyrus, rebuking him for having flogged a decurion, despite being an ‘educated gentleman’.¹³⁹ The implication is that men of *paideia* should know and behave better; they should uphold the standards implied by this common culture.

Some officials in the later fourth century gained a reputation for violence and flogging. Alexander of Heliopolis was criticised by both Libanius and Ammianus as violent.¹⁴⁰ Alexander was installed as *consularis Syriae* by Julian upon his departure from Antioch in 363. Julian apparently remarked that Alexander did not deserve the post,¹⁴¹ but he was nevertheless appointed as a punishment for the insolent Antiochenes, and as Elm has stated, it was a real punishment.¹⁴² Alexander was a pagan known for his harshness; he was described by Ammianus as violent and cruel.¹⁴³ Libanius was aware of his reputation, and wrote to Julian that he at first disapproved of Alexander’s appointment,

¹³² Lib. *Or.* 1.207-208. Libanius found the sight unbearable, and mentions elsewhere that he could not abide the sight of blood, *Or.* 1.161. Philagrius 2 (PLRE I: 693).

¹³³ Πρόκλου δὲ μνησθεὶς χεμιῶνός τε μέμνημαι καὶ αἰγίδος καὶ πληγῶν καὶ αἵματος, Lib. *Or.* 1.212. Proclus 6 (PLRE I: 746).

¹³⁴ Lib. *Or.* 1.222; 42.41.

¹³⁵ Lib. *Or.* 1.223-224. However, in *Or.* 10.3 he mentions visiting Proclus. Cribiore 2013, 127.

¹³⁶ Lib. *Or.* 1.221.

¹³⁷ Lib. *Or.* 42.40. Cribiore argues that Proclus had not studied rhetoric for many years rather than having no knowledge (2013, 128n.227).

¹³⁸ ὁ δὲ Μουσῶν τε ἦν τροφίμος, Lib. *Or.* 1.225. Icarus 2 (PLRE I: 455).

¹³⁹ Κύρον τὸν ἐν παιδείᾳ γεγενημένον, Lib. *Ep.* N174. Brown prefers the more recent translation ‘a man “formed in *paideia*”’ (1992, 53), which is a more exact formulation. Cyrus 1 (PLRE I: 238).

¹⁴⁰ Alexander 5 (PLRE I: 40-41).

¹⁴¹ Amm. 23.2.3.

¹⁴² Elm 2012, 331.

¹⁴³ *Turbulentus et saevum*, Amm. 23.2.3.

but that he came to appreciate his severity as it bore fruits.¹⁴⁴ Nevertheless, Libanius urged Alexander to be more lenient and gentle as governor.¹⁴⁵ He argued that only those truly deserving should be put to death.¹⁴⁶ Libanius suggested this would make his task easier, and that the council of Apamea would be more willing to obey him if they did not fear being flogged, suggesting he had resorted to this previously.¹⁴⁷ Although the council of Apamea apparently warmed to Alexander, Jovian removed him as *consularis*, though perhaps simply due to his paganism.¹⁴⁸

Some governors were deemed too harsh and prone to violence for gentle letters of advice. Thus, in a speech addressed to Theodosius (though perhaps only delivered locally), Libanius described the misdeeds of the *consularis Syriae* Tisamenus, including excessive flogging, which he described as characteristic of his term. Libanius criticises him further for not releasing those who had been flogged back into the care of family and doctors, as other governors had, but rather imprisoning them, hastening their death – flogging could be a death sentence.¹⁴⁹

Flogging – especially when men of *paideia* were those at the receiving end – suggested that the governor was unsuited to the role of imperial magistrate, but the act itself and its perception by contemporaries is particularly notable, as it is linked to the expression of anger and the loss of control through violence. Libanius reports that one *consularis* was motivated by anger when he levelled charges against two students and prepared to have them flogged; he was dissuaded by ‘sound sense’ and the law was preserved.¹⁵⁰ By flogging and resorting to violence, a governor showed himself to be publicly flouting the attitude and behaviour common to *paideia*. Just as letters and

¹⁴⁴ νῦν δὲ ὁ καρπὸς τε ἀνεδόθη τῆς τραχύτητος καὶ ἄδω παλινωδία, Lib. *Ep.* N100. Libanius consequently wrote Alexander a number of letters, and enrolled him as a governor whom he asked favours of (*Epp.* B95, B97, B98).

¹⁴⁵ ἡμερον, Lib. *Ep.* N104.3.

¹⁴⁶ καὶ τὰς ἀλύσεις ταύτας μόνοι δεξάσθων φονεῖς καὶ τοιχωρύχοι καὶ οὓς δεῖ τεθνάναι, Lib. *Ep.* N104.5.

¹⁴⁷ Lib. *Ep.* 104.5-6. Libanius also wrote to Alexander thanking him for his support but suggested that he might not be so harsh about other teachers and their sons (*Ep.* B94).

¹⁴⁸ Lib. *Ep.* B97. Elm 2012, 462.

¹⁴⁹ Lib. *Or.* 33.30. Tisamenus (PLRE I: 916). Libanius also criticised the frequency with which senators and decurions imprisoned people, calling the governors ‘murderers’ (φονέας, *Or.* 45.3-4; the governor Florentius 9 [PLRE I: 364-365] was also called a murderer, *Or.* 46.9). Lucianus 6 (PLRE I: 516) was an unpopular governor who resorted to flogging and was the subject of a speech by Libanius (*Or.* 56.7; *Or.* 1.269-270). He was eventually flogged to death himself in 393 by the praetorian prefect Rufinus (Lib. *Or.* 1.282; *Ep.* N193.3; Zos. 5.2.1-4). Brown 1992, 54 discusses the use of lead-tipped whips which ‘were tantamount to a death sentence’. Them. *Or.* 1.14b-15d on the lack of honour in death sentences and Constantius’s apparent removal of the death sentence; the legislation and context are unclear.

¹⁵⁰ ξυνετός, Lib. *Or.* 1.169-170.

speeches were a public demonstration of one's *paideia*, flogging was a public demonstration that one's *paideia* had been forgotten or cast aside. Flogging was also a public demonstration that anger and violence had taken over, that one had lost control. Self-control was important for those in public positions and was one of the ideals associated with *paideia*. Restraint of anger in actions and speech was discussed frequently throughout antiquity, with Seneca and Plutarch writing tracts about it.¹⁵¹ Marcus Aurelius also considered the problem of anger as a philosophic question in his *Meditations*.¹⁵² Anger was often seen as a sickness with harmful public effects, while self-control or temperance (*sophrosyne*) was a virtue and an ideal linked to *paideia*.¹⁵³ The restraint or control of anger was important socially and politically, and was a particular concern for subjects of monarchical rule, as the figure of the angry ruler was an 'insistent part of the critique' of anger from the fifth century BC onwards and 'royal rage' appeared in many works.¹⁵⁴ This continued to be an issue, particularly in late antiquity, as the emperor's power became almost absolute, and the question of a good or bad ruler was often determined by his propensity to anger.¹⁵⁵ As Ammianus observed, a good ruler did not give way to anger.¹⁵⁶

We see the dangers of anger and violence in the reputation of Gallus and his time as Caesar in Antioch in 354. Ammianus described Gallus as cruel and prone to inflicting harm, while Libanius noted his temper.¹⁵⁷ Gallus's relationship with all classes in Antioch was fraught according to Ammianus, but particularly so with the *curiales*.¹⁵⁸ He fought

¹⁵¹ Harris 2001, 3-4. Harris also mentions Homer, Aeschylus, Euripides, Cicero, Galen, Juvenal and Virgil, and the Stoics, and argued that it permeated the language of both the Greeks and Romans (2001, 7, 15). Lane Fox suggested that the second century be renamed the 'age of anger' because it was a so pervasive (1986, 64-65).

¹⁵² M. Aur. *Med.* 11.18.

¹⁵³ Harris 2001, 339-340, with reference to Aesch. *PB.* 375-380. Harris also discusses the Christian views on anger as a sin, with reference to Matthew 5:22 (391-392, 399). Ambrose wrote to Theodosius that anger was an illness of the soul which could be healed by Christian penance, while Ammianus wrote that it was a mental ulcer (Ambrose, *Ep.* 51.4-5; Amm. 27.7.4; Brown 1992, 112).

¹⁵⁴ Harris 2001, 229. One thinks of Achilles and Alexander.

¹⁵⁵ Harris 2001, 248-249. One thinks particularly of Ammianus on Valentinian, an emperor frequently overcome with anger (Amm. 27.7.4; 29.3.2-3; 30.6.3).

¹⁵⁶ *bonique esse moderatoris, restringere potestatem, resistere cupiditati omnium rerum et inplacabilibus iracundiis*, Amm. 29.2.18.

¹⁵⁷ *Erat autem diritatis eius hoc quoque indicium nec obscurum nec latens, quod ludicris cruentis delectabatur et in circo sex vel septem aliquotiens deditus certaminibus pugilum vicissim se concidentium perfusorumque sanguine specie ut lucratus ingentia laetabatur. Accenderat super his incitatum propositum ad nocendum aliqua mulier vilis, quae ad palatium (ut poposcerat) intromissa insidias ei latenter obtendi prodiderat a militibus obscurissimis*, Amm. 14.7.3-4. Lib. *Ep.* N64.3. Libanius also described the events of 354 and the temper of Gallus, with a focus on Libanius's own professional issues (*Or.* 1.96-106).

¹⁵⁸ *nec honoratis parcens nec urbium primatibus nec plebeiis*, Amm. 14.7.1.

with them over a food shortage and ordered the execution of the leading decurions when they disagreed with his proposed price freeze. They were saved by the intervention of the *comes Orientis* Honoratus.¹⁵⁹ Gallus blamed the *consularis Syriae* Theophilus for the impending famine; the citizens of Antioch rioted and killed him.¹⁶⁰ Trials followed and, while some individuals were executed, Ammianus remarks that the rich only had property confiscated.¹⁶¹ It is important to note, however, that these trials were conducted by the praetorian prefect Strategius Musonianus, a man perhaps more sensitive to the codes of *paideia* than Gallus.¹⁶² In Antioch, his anger with the *curiales* and the food shortage overtook him and as a result his relationship with the leading *curiales* suffered.¹⁶³ Gallus's handling of the situation and his fraught relationship with the council, plus his murder of the prefect Domitian, contributed to his execution on the orders of Constantius.¹⁶⁴

Rhetorical education was, in part, designed to help mitigate extremes of anger; an eloquent speech could mask anger and prevent one from losing control of both the situation and oneself.¹⁶⁵ As Gregory of Nazianzus wrote, *logos* and reason taught one how to bridle anger.¹⁶⁶ This is something Basil recognised: in his advice to young Christians, he recommended that one not give in to anger, but rather curb it through reflection and learn from the lessons of the past.¹⁶⁷ Restraint – *sophrosyne* – was the watch-word. We see this too in Libanius. While he was critical of those who resorted to violence, particularly in their dealings with the *curiales*, he also considered execution a governor's duty, bound up with justice and authority. This may seem contradictory, but for Libanius punishment in pursuit of justice could often involve violence. The job of a governor, however, was to be controlled and to avoid extremes in emotion and action. It was an issue of degree, and beating men of *paideia* was considered excessive and undeserved; it was against the common code of *paideia*.¹⁶⁸

¹⁵⁹ Amm. 14.7.2. Brown 1992, 80.

¹⁶⁰ Amm. 14.7.5-6.

¹⁶¹ Amm. 15.13.2.

¹⁶² Libanius described his moderation in this matter (μετριώτατα, *Or.* 19.47). Matthews 1989, 408.

¹⁶³ Matthews 1989, 406-407.

¹⁶⁴ Amm. 14.7.13-16.

¹⁶⁵ It 'extorts the essential while seeming to demand the insignificant', Bourdieu 1977 [repr. 2013], 95. Brown 1992, 48-49.

¹⁶⁶ τούτῳ χαλινῶ θυμὸν ἐχφερόμενον, GNaz. *Or.* 6.6. Brown 1992, 50.

¹⁶⁷ Basil, *Ad Adol.* 7. Basil cites the example of Euclid, from Plut. *De Cohib.* 14.

¹⁶⁸ Lib. *Or.* 45.27-30.

Brown argued that disrespecting the council was a serious matter, and the example of Gallus in Antioch in 353 supports this contention.¹⁶⁹ It is clear that maintaining a good relationship between the local notables and the imperial magistrates was paramount. This was a relationship which needed to be maintained on both sides: notables approached magistrates for favours in the name of friendship and an expression of shared culture, while magistrates were supposed to recognise this and respond according to the ideals of *paideia*. Anger expressed through violence represented a break with these ideals. It was a ‘breach of decorum’ and left governors more vulnerable to isolation and revenge, while it left the elite open to injury or death.¹⁷⁰ *Paideia*, based on shared rhetoric, classical culture and friendship, enabled more successful relationships and thus a smoother function of government. Anger and violence exposed a lack of self-control and, when directed at notables, a disregard for the ideals which bound the elite together. For Brown, it was a failure of decorum, but we might go further and call it a failure of *paideia*.

6.3.4 The *paideia* of emperors, ideals and practice

Governors were representatives of the emperor, and, as discussed above, were bound by the codes of *paideia* or at least were expected to demonstrate their *paideia* in common with local notables and members of the council.¹⁷¹ Good governors were friends of the elite, open to granting favours and maintaining contact based on a shared culture and status, who appreciated and demonstrated the ideals of *paideia*, and seemed to be working towards common ends – namely, the harmonious relationship between notable and magistrate, and the linked smooth function of government. Emperors were not exempt from this, as implied by the example of the junior emperor Gallus. They were held to the same standards of behaviour and were bound by the same codes of conduct. Indeed, they were expected to the very model of *paideia* and its demonstration.¹⁷²

Themistius stressed the *philanthropia* of Constantius throughout his panegyric, as well as his virtuous control of anger.¹⁷³ Like governors (or perhaps even more so), emperors were expected to be able to control their emotions and not give in to unseemly

¹⁶⁹ Brown 1992, 80.

¹⁷⁰ Brown 1992, 55.

¹⁷¹ Lib. Or. 51.3. Brown 1992, 22.

¹⁷² Brown 1992, 58.

¹⁷³ Them. Or. 1, dated to c.347 or late 350 by Heather and Moncur 2001, 69-71.

bursts of anger.¹⁷⁴ As Themistius argued, the dignity of a king derived more from honouring than punishing; he should be concerned less with anger, more with virtue, particularly self-control.¹⁷⁵ For Themistius, self-control was particularly important and linked to *philanthropia*, which was the most important virtue.¹⁷⁶ Constantius, naturally, possessed *philanthropia* in abundance; he truly loved mankind, and was thus similar to God.¹⁷⁷ His *philanthropia* also meant that he did not submit to rage, for this would injure men.¹⁷⁸ Thus, Constantius was praised for controlling his anger and softening his passionate soul; he ruled himself.¹⁷⁹ Themistius found this self-control particularly remarkable in one so young.¹⁸⁰

While Themistius proclaimed he did not want honours or money following the panegyric, Constantius conferred them: he wrote a letter, in Latin, announcing Themistius's adlection to the Constantinopolitan Senate in 355.¹⁸¹ This was a real mark of distinction; Ammianus reports that Constantius was careful when making appointments.¹⁸² Constantius wrote that Themistius, with his celebrated reputation, took pride in the right things and that his adlection would be an honour (τιμή) for the senate also.¹⁸³ He praised Themistius's dedication to philosophy, his education and his efforts as a teacher.¹⁸⁴ He hoped Themistius would serve as an example and inspiration, and that his adlection would serve to encourage rhetorical and philosophical studies.¹⁸⁵ Constantius

¹⁷⁴ Ammianus reported that Valentinian, like Gallus, had a bad temper, ordered a number of people to be put to death following unsatisfactory jobs and kept pet man-eating bears (29.3.2-9); however, he is praised for not bending the necks of his subjects in religious matters (30.9.5).

¹⁷⁵ Them. Or. 1.13c.

¹⁷⁶ *Philanthropia* was not traditionally a cardinal virtue recognised by philosophers, and Van Hoof has argued that Themistius's focus on this was inspired by the fourth-century context (2013, 390).

¹⁷⁷ Them. Or. 1.8b-9c. Themistius uses Constantius's suspension of execution as the main example of his *philanthropia* (Or. 14b). That the speech largely lacks concrete examples and speaks only generally about the 'philanthropic king' has been commented on by Van Hoof. She argues that the speech reads as general advice as to how a good king should behave (2013, 391).

¹⁷⁸ Them. Or. 1.4.b-c.

¹⁷⁹ Them. Or. 1.5b, 7c.

¹⁸⁰ Them. Or. 1.17a. Constantius would be in his early thirties at the time of this speech, while Themistius was at most thirty-three (Van Hoof 2013, 393).

¹⁸¹ Them. Or. 18a-b. Constantius's letter addressed the Constantinopolitan senate and the *Demegoria Constantii* is the Greek translation. It was translated into Greek contemporaneously: it was included in a collection of Themistius's early speeches and Libanius read a Greek version (Lib. Ep. N12; Heather and Moncur 2001, 97). Van Hoof 2013, 394.

¹⁸² Amm. 21.16.1, 3.

¹⁸³ *Demegoria Constantii* 19a-b. Van Hoof discusses Constantius's focus on τιμή (2013, 395).

¹⁸⁴ *Demegoria Constantii* 19c-20b.

¹⁸⁵ *Demegoria Constantii* 20d-21c, 23c. Constantius's care for the reputation of rhetoric in this text contrasts with the statements of Libanius, who often argued that Constantius only helped his subject decline (discussed in chapter 4).

hoped that Themistius would introduce Hellenic wisdom to the senate and the city of Constantinople.¹⁸⁶

While Constantius was certainly acting shrewdly here, the appointment of Themistius and the accompanying letter not only demonstrated Constantius' appreciation of philosophy but also *paideia* and thus, his own *paideia*.¹⁸⁷ He showed that he was a ruler who knew the value of *paideia* as a cultural capital and could encourage it in the senate, in high politics. He knew its power.¹⁸⁸ Just as the proconsul of Achaëa responded to Prohaeresius's speech correctly and in accordance with the codes of this culture, so too did Constantius respond to Themistius's speech with an appreciation of literary culture (though with a more significant time delay).¹⁸⁹ He vindicated Themistius's portrayal of him as a lover of mankind. That Constantius expressed this in a letter only boosted this reciprocal performance of *paideia*.¹⁹⁰

Demonstration of one's self-control and appreciation of, if not devotion to, *paideia* was central to image of an emperor. Linked to this was *parrhêsia* and the emperor's acceptance of its place in politics and relationships, his tolerance of this ideal.¹⁹¹ As Brown argued, power was still the defining force – and the emperor still exercised his power – but *parrhêsia*, free speech, was significant, and an emperor needed to demonstrate his willingness to listen to frank opinions and advice.¹⁹² It was another way of showing his self-control and fairness, and of maintaining friendly relationships with the elite.¹⁹³

For Cassius Dio writing in the early third century, it may be that *parrhêsia* was a value which had died with the Roman Republic, but it still remained an ideal for emperors

¹⁸⁶ σοφίαν Ἑλληνικὴν, *Demegoria Constantii* 21b.

¹⁸⁷ Heather and Moncur have also noted that providing wealthy citizens for the senate was a traditional form of friendship (2001, 111n.200). Van Hoof 2013, 399.

¹⁸⁸ Van Hoof argues that Constantius was also showing himself to be part of the worlds of both politics and philosophy, and was presenting himself as the example for both Themistius and the senate (2013, 395-6).

¹⁸⁹ Van Hoof has noted that Libanius received a reward for his panegyric for Constantius much quicker than Themistius: Libanius delivered his speech (*Or.* 59) in 348/9, was ordered to stay in Constantinople even before its delivery and received an imperial summons to return to Constantinople after its delivery; he was on his way to becoming Constantius's preferred sophist, but he left for Nicomedia and then Antioch (2013, 397-8).

¹⁹⁰ Even if the letter was written by the *ab epistulis*, it was still approved as an accurate representation of Constantius and his wishes by the emperor himself (Van Hoof 2013, 399n.59).

¹⁹¹ *Parrhêsia* first appears in the fifth century BC, used by Euripides, and found more usage in the fourth century BC (Momigliano 1973, 259-261).

¹⁹² Brown 1992, 7.

¹⁹³ Plutarch described *parrhêsia* as the voice of friendship (Plut. *Adulator*, 51c; Momigliano 1973, 260).

in late antiquity.¹⁹⁴ While *parrhêsia* was not a quality shared or demonstrated by a large number of subjects, for the elite it was a central component of their relationship with the emperor. Brown has argued that it could be demonstrated only by those who were slightly outside the political world and who did not rely so much on the ‘ties of patronage and friendship’ – that is, philosophers.¹⁹⁵ While sophists and local notables could express their opinions and hope to persuade the imperial power, the bravery and endurance (*karteria*) inherent in *parrhêsia* was curtailed due to their reliance on the support of magistrates and the emperor: they could not afford to offend and isolate themselves or their families; the fear of violence and death might also have played a part.¹⁹⁶ Direct criticism was the preserve of those safely outside these bounds. Brown argues this is why much of Libanius’s criticism of officials happened after they had fallen from power and the atmosphere seemed amenable: for example, his criticism of Constantius as a harm for rhetoric was written after the emperor’s death.¹⁹⁷ Philosophers (and later, bishops),¹⁹⁸ though, were usually part of the elite and highly educated, so that they shared *paideia*, but were sufficiently independent of political ties that they could express themselves frankly and openly in front of the emperor. Their *paideia* combined with this somewhat aloof status – Brown noted the philosopher was ‘free from society’, and had mastered his passions and desire for material gain¹⁹⁹ – meant that their opinions were valued and heeded. There are a number of examples of philosophers advising and speaking freely with emperors in the fourth century: Sopater offered his advice to Constantine; Hermogenes advised Gallus (a philosopher is not always successful, evidently); Iphicles counselled Valentinian.²⁰⁰ However, Themistius is perhaps the best example: he had status and philosophical leanings, and enjoyed *parrhêsia*-laced influence under Constantius, Valens and Theodosius.²⁰¹ Themistius’s panegyric on Constantius shows

¹⁹⁴ Cassius Dio wrote that *parrhêsia* died at the Battle of Philippi and the people never again had absolute freedom of speech (47.39.2-3). As Mallan has noted, the rest of Dio’s imperial narrative focuses on how rulers responded to displays of *parrhêsia* (2016, 269). Interestingly, Dio was the last non-Christian author to discuss *parrhêsia* (Mallan 2016, 275).

¹⁹⁵ Brown 1992, 62.

¹⁹⁶ Cassius Dio wrote that fear of death could be a consequence of *parrhêsia* (45.46.3; Mallan 2016, 266). Brown 1992, 61.

¹⁹⁷ Brown 1992, 62.

¹⁹⁸ In the late fourth and fifth centuries, as the Church gained more political power, Christian bishops enjoyed more *parrhêsia* than philosophers (Brown 1992, 117). Brown points to Ambrose of Milan as an example (1992, 111-112).

¹⁹⁹ Brown 1992, 63. Brown recognises that this was mainly an image, but nevertheless, it was a powerful and influential image which contributed to their exercise of free speech.

²⁰⁰ Eunap. *VS.* 462; Himerius, *Or.* 48.19; Amm. 30.5.8-10.

²⁰¹ Brown 1992, 68-69.

him as philosopher flexing his *parrhêsia*, and stressing the importance of a philanthropic ruler. Themistius also describes how, wearing his philosopher's cloak, he advised and admonished Valens, who apparently bore it well, though he tended to be stubborn in public affairs.²⁰² Indeed, it was part of the job of the emperor to respond well or at least tolerate the *parrhêsia* of philosophers and others who dared speak frankly. Those emperors who could not heed advice or take criticism were 'bad'; like governors who flogged, they were not quite up to the job and did not have the requisite virtues, namely self-control and tolerance. Emperors needed to show that they could respond well not just to polite Attic words, to graceful rhetoric, but also to criticism. They were not truly men of *paideia* if they could not appreciate the wisdom or the *paideia* of the philosopher.

6.4 Julian and *paideia*

From our discussion of emperors and *paideia*, in which it was shown that the imperial power was bound by *paideia*, we now pass to focus on Julian. This section will highlight the important role *paideia* played in the shaping of Julian's character and will demonstrate how the ideals of *paideia* also affected him as emperor, as much as the elites he interacted with. As discussed in chapter two, Julian's education was unique in many ways; he was not quite a culture hero by virtue of his princely status, but nor did his educational path follow that of preceding emperors. He was well-educated and, as the edict and rescript demonstrate, he was concerned about the role and status of education and *paideia*. His large literary output also shows an emperor – and a man – concerned with publicly displaying his acquired cultural capital: there is an argument that each of his pieces demonstrate his *paideia* by virtue of their Atticising Greek and literary allusions. Further, Julian wrote in a number of different genres, putting his rhetorical education and philosophical knowledge to good use: panegyric, polemic, satire, theological and philosophical prose hymns, anti-Christian treatises, letters and edicts. This section will discuss examples of Julian's writings and examine what they tell us about *paideia*. Julian's *Misopogon* will be examined as a potential example of successful *paideia*, as well as an example of imperial anger: Julian was undoubtedly angry with the Antiochenes and responded with a lengthy rhetorical piece. His letter to the senator Nilus will also be discussed, as it likewise pertains to the anger of the emperor but reveals Julian's attitude

²⁰² Them. Or. 34.14.

to certain ideals and aspects of *paideia*.²⁰³ This section will examine distinctive features of Julian's version of *paideia*, his understanding of it and how he performed it (or fell short of its requirements, on occasion).

The *Misopogon, or Beard-Hater*²⁰⁴ is in many ways a strange piece, and has inspired continuing modern debates, mostly concerning its purpose. Ostensibly, it is a satirical piece, written near the end of Julian's seven month stay at Antioch before he left for the Persian campaign in March 363. His stay at Antioch had been fraught: the Antiochenes criticised Julian, quite harshly, focusing on his appearance and his paganism; the food shortage, made worse by the stationed army, and his attempts to solve this did not help matters.²⁰⁵ He apparently was hated by all ranks of Antioch: the common people disliked him because his paganism was at odds with their Christianity; the wealthy because he attempted to stop their greedy profiteering during the food shortage; everyone hated him because he did not enjoy the theatre.²⁰⁶ Julian bore their joking and their jibes, but eventually reached the limit of his patience and restraint.²⁰⁷ The result was the *Misopogon*, which acknowledged and responded to these criticisms and was posted outside the palace. Julian later vowed never to return to Antioch, preferring rather Tarsus as the imperial stopover.²⁰⁸

Downey thought that the *Misopogon*, in which Julian 'pour[ed] forth his bitter anger', was a 'dismal failure', evidence that Julian had lost his mind. He argued that the text harmed Julian's reputation and lost him his dignity.²⁰⁹ Bowersock, likewise, saw the

²⁰³ Jul. *Ep.* 50. Dionysius Nilus 2 (PLRE I: 632).

²⁰⁴ It was also given the title 'Antiochikos' (Ἀντιοχικός), as cited by Amm. 22.14.2, GNaz. *Or.* 5.17 and Socr. *HE.* 3.17. As Gleason has noted, the double title shows Julian's rhetorical strategy: Antiochikos would normally be a panegyric but Julian reverses this and is satirical and mocking, indicated by the title *Misopogon, or Beard-Hater* (Gleason 1986, 106).

²⁰⁵ The Antiochenes apparently mocked Julian's beard quite mercilessly, and shouted that he should twist ropes from it (Jul. *Misopog.* 338d, 360d). He was also criticised for visiting the temples too frequently and for offering too many sacrifices; he was seen as too pious and austere (Jul. *Misopog.* 347c; Amm. 22.14.3). Upon his arrival in Antioch, the Antiochenes shouted 'everything plentiful; everything dear' ("Πάντα γέμει, πάντα πολλοῦ", Jul. *Misopog.* 368c) in reference to the food shortage and high prices. Julian's attempts to solve this were undercut and failed: he tried to limit pricing and imported more corn but this was also sold at too high a price (Jul. *Misopog.* 368d-370c). Ammianus criticised Julian for this, and compared him to Gallus (22.14.1-2).

²⁰⁶ Jul. *Misopog.* 357d.

²⁰⁷ Elm 2012, 328. Gleason argues that the situation reached a head on the Kalends of January, the New Year celebration, which included satire as part of the ritual (1986, 107-108, citing Lib. *Or.* 16.35 which mentions a holiday).

²⁰⁸ John Malalas tells us it was posted outside the palace on the Tetracylon of the Elephants (*Chron.* 13.328.3-4). Lib. *Or.* 1.132 and Amm. 22.2.5 mention Tarsus as the preferred city, where Julian was eventually buried. Gleason 1986, 106; Elm 2012, 327.

²⁰⁹ Downey 1939, 305, 309, 310, 312.

Misopogon as an example of anger and bitter resentment.²¹⁰ More recent work on the *Misopogon* has focused on its purpose and genre. Gleason argued that it should be viewed as festive satire, that Julian was inspired by the New Year celebrations and appropriated this festive license in his text.²¹¹ Gleason noted the ‘healing potential’ of the holiday, and convincingly argued that we should view the *Misopogon* also as an edict of chastisement.²¹² She argued that Julian’s response to the criticisms of the Antiochenes was a continuation of a traditional imperial response to public attacks, a hybrid between an edict and imperial letter, citing as examples the responses of Augustus, Vespasian and Marcus Aurelius to popular jokes at their expense.²¹³ For Gleason, Julian was participating in the celebrations by engaging in a traditional method of public communication and response to these types of criticisms.

Recently, Gleason’s interpretation has been criticised and the *Misopogon* has been reconsidered. Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen argue that there is ‘unresolved tension’ in Gleason’s argument, between the first half which posits that the *Misopogon* was festive satire, and the second half which argues that we should view as an edict of chastisement.²¹⁴ They disagree with the view that the *Misopogon* was festive satire, as the Antiochene criticisms were ongoing rather than seasonal and the *Misopogon* was published too long after the New Year to be directly linked to this celebration.²¹⁵ Indeed, Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen divorce the *Misopogon* from its New Year link and argue that it should be dated to ‘shortly before Julian’s departure’ on 5 March.²¹⁶ Rather, the events in Antioch should be viewed as ‘primarily a crisis in communication’ and, thus, the *Misopogon* should be viewed as Julian’s attempt to salvage his reputation.²¹⁷ They argue the *Misopogon* was an attempt by Julian to ‘redirect and reshape the interpretation of what was a failure of ritualized communication on his part’, made worse by his disinclination to attend the theatre, the setting for much ritualised communication.²¹⁸

²¹⁰ Bowersock 1978, 13, 103-104.

²¹¹ Gleason 1986, 108.

²¹² Gleason 1986, 112.

²¹³ Gleason argues that the distinction at this time was so blurred between edict and letter that those reading it would have no concerns about genre. She noted that this was Julian’s legacy from Constantine (1986, 116-117; Quiroga 2009, 128). Suet. *DA*. 56.1; Cass. Dio, 65.11.1; *H.A. Marcus* 22.5-6.

²¹⁴ Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011, 168.

²¹⁵ The *Misopogon* was written between January 18 and February 18 363, taking into account Julian’s own reference to his seven months stay and Ammianus’s dating of Julian’s arrival at Antioch to July 18 362 (Jul. *Misopog.* 344a; Amm.22.9.14; Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011, 168, 174).

²¹⁶ Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011, 174-5.

²¹⁷ Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011, 166-167.

²¹⁸ Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011, 169, 174.

Julian's suggestion of good humour was merely a rhetorical strategy.²¹⁹ The *Misopogon* was his attempt to have the last word and to disguise his own failures to communicate openly as expected by tradition and the Antiochenes: for Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen, it is Julian's 'massive, one-sided *post-factum* interpretation' of events in Antioch.²²⁰

Modern debates tend to focus on the generic status of the *Misopogon* and try to argue for a suitable context for such a puzzling text. However, we can also view the *Misopogon* as an example of *paideia*. Brown argued that the *Misopogon* was an example of correct imperial deportment and of an emperor diffusing anger through *paideia*. The *Misopogon* demonstrated Julian's good humour and skill, in line with other late Roman rulers.²²¹ Quiroga, too, noted the role of *paideia* and rhetoric in the *Misopogon*.²²²

As discussed above, imperial anger was something which needed to be controlled and contended with. Emperors were reminded in panegyrics and by those with *parrhêsia* to rule from a gentle, reasonable place; to filter their anger through virtue. The same was true of Julian. The *Misopogon* was clearly written in anger, and despite its self-deprecating tone, anger pervades the text, particularly towards the end when the pretence to satire breaks down and the tone shifts from self-mocking and good humoured to defensive and frustrated.²²³ It was received contemporarily as a text written by an angry emperor: Ammianus stated it was written in anger, while Libanius wrote an oration addressed to the Antiochenes 'on the Emperor's anger', as well as a speech to Julian imploring him to return to Antioch following the Persian campaign.²²⁴ These reactions could suggest that Julian's 'edict of chastisement' was not as normal or traditional as Gleason would have it; that, rather, the *Misopogon* provoked a sense of panic or unease which Libanius felt he needed to assuage.²²⁵ Indeed, Libanius presents himself in the speech addressed to Julian as speaking freely; he emphasises his own *parrhêsia* and

²¹⁹ Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011, 166.

²²⁰ Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011, 175.

²²¹ Brown 1992, 59. Brown approaches the *Misopogon* as festive satire in line with Gleason.

²²² Quiroga 2009, 128.

²²³ Towards the end of the text, Julian asks a series of rhetorical questions and frequently refers to the ingratitude of the Antiochenes. *Misopog.* 366b-c, 370d are the most striking examples of this change in tone, from self-mocking to frustrated.

²²⁴ *Infensa mente*, Amm. 22.14.2. Lib. *Or.* 16 Πρὸς Ἀντιχέας περὶ τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως ὀργῆς; *Or.* 15. *Oration* 16 was written about a month after Julian left Antioch, while Libanius composed *Oration* 15 in the preceding months. That Julian had left the harsh Alexander of Heliopolis, discussed above, as *consularis Syriae* might have contributed to the desire to seek forgiveness. We are told that embassies from the city council followed Julian, seeking forgiveness (Lib. *Or.* 1.132; Jul. *Ep.* N58).

²²⁵ Lib. *Or.* 16.5.

Julian's appreciation of it.²²⁶ This suggests that Julian had not acted as an emperor should, that he needed to be advised by a sophist (and friend, as Libanius notes) and reined in: Antioch's punishment was too harsh. However, I would argue that Julian had acted with *paideia* in writing the *Misopogon*, that as emperor he had diffused his anger in an appropriate manner for a *pepaideumenos*, and that Libanius's immediate reaction had more to do with his concern for both himself and the city of Antioch losing imperial favour; as official sophist of the city, he was obliged to intervene and try to regain this favour. Indeed, in his funeral oration for Julian, Libanius looked more favourably upon the *Misopogon* and praised Julian's method of dealing with his anger: 'he chose to avenge himself on our city by an oration'.²²⁷ This was followed by Socrates and Sozomen, writers who as Christians might not be naturally inclined to memorialising Julian in a positive light. Socrates wrote that the *Misopogon* was Julian's way of expending his anger, while Sozomen praised not only Julian's suppression of his anger but the work itself, which was 'most beautiful and very elegant'.²²⁸

Libanius was aware that other options were open to Julian. Like the governors discussed above, an emperor could resort to violence. Libanius lists executions 'by spear and sword, by burnings and drownings' as potential punishments for rebellious subjects.²²⁹ An emperor could, in this way, reduce the greatest of cities very quickly.²³⁰ He could also ruin the city by taking away its metropolitan status; Julian had done this to Caesarea in Cappadocia, and it served as a warning.²³¹ Confiscation of property was also a possibility, as the citizens of Edessa knew.²³² These punishments would be meted out by Theodosius following the Riot of the Statues in 387: he closed the hippodrome, baths and theatre, he jailed the council, and deprived Antioch of its metropolitan status, reducing it to a mere village (κώμη) attached to Laodicea.²³³

²²⁶ Lib. *Or.* 15.12-13.

²²⁷ λόγῳ τὴν πόλιν ἀμύνεται, Lib. *Or.* 18.198. We must, however, remember that Libanius was concerned to present Julian in a positive light in this piece.

²²⁸ τὴν ὀργὴν διελύσατο, Socr. *HE.* 3.17.9; κάλλιστον καὶ μάλα ἀστεῖον λόγον, Soz. *HE.* 5.19.3. See Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011, 183.

²²⁹ δόρυ καὶ ξίφος καὶ πῦρ καὶ θάλατταν, Lib. *Or.* 18.195.

²³⁰ ἰσχύει γέ τοι τοῖς στρατεύμασι κατὰ τῶν ὄπλα οὐκ ἐχόντων, κἂν ἀναρπάσαι νεύση πόιν, οἴχεται ἢ μεγίστη τῶν ἀπασῶν ἐν ἡμέρας συμκρῶ μέρει χειρὶ, σιδήρῳ, πυρὶ, τοῖς ἄλλοις, Lib. *Or.* 16.13.

²³¹ Lib. *Or.* 16.14; Soz. *HE.* 5.4.

²³² Lib. *Or.* 15.55. Julian confiscated the Church property of the Arian Christians in Edessa, as punishment for their excesses and violence (*Ep.* 40).

²³³ Lib. *Or.* 20.6; Gleason 1986, 114; Elm 2012, 328.

Julian, perhaps heeding the lessons of Gallus, did not consider violence or attempt to execute the *curiales*; nor did he formally diminish the city status of Antioch (though he certainly implied a downgrading by preferring Tarsus). He simply wrote a response to the jibes and criticisms of the Antiochenes and left the city to campaign, leaving Alexander as *consularis Syriae*.²³⁴ Appointing a pagan who was known to be strict could be taken as an extension of Julian's punishment of Antioch. However, the *Misopogon* represents Julian's control of anger and his *paideia*. Rather than resort to violence, Julian turned to his education and culture, as he did throughout his time as emperor. Julian presents himself as a tolerant, controlled emperor, gentle and clement. These were the ideals, as Julian well knew,²³⁵ and he emphasised them, explicitly, throughout the *Misopogon*.²³⁶ However, this was also implicit: the fact that he was writing rather than slaughtering demonstrates his *sophrosyne* and *philanthropia*. This act of writing, and the references to Menander, Homer, Herodotus, Plato and the history of Antioch,²³⁷ also demonstrated his *paideia*, while the satirical tone showed his good humour. While this satirical tone is inconsistent, Julian is self-mocking and self-deprecating, particularly about his appearance, responding to the Antiochenes' taunts. This is most striking and consistent at the start of the piece, where Julian is genuinely satirical and almost playful: Julian mocks his beard, the length of his hair, ink-stained fingers, and his ascetic nature, and compares them sarcastically with the 'soft and delicate [...] effeminate' appearance and lifestyle of the Antiochenes.²³⁸ It shows that Julian was very familiar with rhetoric and the forms of composition; he was not only able to engage with these genres but also to change them: this is satire and *psogos*, panegyric and invective.²³⁹ While this might break down somewhat at the end, as the tone is less playful and more bitter (and, perhaps, less successful), the *Misopogon* is a good example of using rhetoric to one's advantage. Julian shows that he is not only a man of *paideia*, capable of writing for any occasion, but also an emperor who is 'gentle', inasmuch as he can diffuse his anger appropriately, further demonstrating this *paideia* and self-control.

²³⁴ There is no evidence to suggest that Julian left for the campaign significantly earlier than planned, only that at the time of writing the *Misopogon* Julian had decided to leave and his court had already left (*Misopog.* 364d, 370b). Elm stated of Julian's punishment 'he merely wrote' (2012, 328).

²³⁵ Julian emphasised these ideals in his first panegyric to Constantius (*Or.* 1.10c, 16a). For a discussion of this oration, see Tougher 2012.

²³⁶ Jul. *Misopog.* 364d, 354a-d. Gleason 1986, 118-119.; Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011, 176.

²³⁷ Jul. *Misopog.* 353c, 354d, 347a-b, 349a, 337a.

²³⁸ ἀβρότητος βίου καὶ ἴσως ἀπαλότητος τρόπου λεῖον ἐπιμελῶς ἐργάζεσθε, Jul. *Misopog.* 339a-b.

²³⁹ Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011, 176; Elm 2012, 328.

Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen wrote that ‘a well-trained emperor was able to express the right emotion on the right occasion, to play his audience well, and, if need be, to deflect tension by a joke.’²⁴⁰ An emperor was supposed to bear insults lightly and not resort to harsh, violent punishment. Julian’s *Misopogon* is an example of this. The fact that Julian died whilst on campaign makes the tense situation in Antioch seem worse, as there is no positive resolution to this strained relationship. We are left with the impression of anger on both sides. However, it is a piece which acknowledged and participated in the criticisms of the Antiochenes, and shows an emperor aware of his image, the need for self-control and the centrality of *paideia*. It is representative of an emperor in dialogue with his subjects.²⁴¹

The *Letter to the Alexandrians* could also be presented as an example of Julian diffusing his anger through words alone (though one could argue that the murder of Bishop George called for a more serious punishment than harsh words).²⁴² Again, Julian diffuses his anger with words, and demonstrates his *philanthropia*. As an emperor, he was concerned to demonstrate – to perform – his *paideia*. Julian’s letter to Nilus-Dionysius is also significant in this respect: his anger is expressed primarily through words and he displays his high regard for *paideia*. It is to this letter that we now turn.

Nilus-Dionysius was a Roman senator who had possibly served under Constans and Magnentius.²⁴³ When his troops proclaimed him emperor in 361, Julian invited Nilus to join him and offered him office. Nilus refused this offer. Julian apparently wrote another letter asking Nilus to accept, to which he did not reply, thereby refusing again. Upon Julian’s confirmation as legitimate emperor, following the death of Constantius in November 361, Nilus went to Constantinople, but Julian refused to receive him. Nilus then wrote Julian a letter, and it is Julian’s long reply to this, written during winter 362/3

²⁴⁰ Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011, 171.

²⁴¹ Even if we fully accept Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen’s argument (2011) that the *Misopogon* was a deliberate attempt by Julian to disguise his mistakes and lack of communication in Antioch, the *Misopogon* still serves as a demonstration of the emperor’s *paideia* as a text which displays his education and culture. It also shows that Julian was aware of the importance of *sophrosyne* and *paideia* in imperial politics.

²⁴² The Alexandrians, according to Julian, had themselves acted out of anger (*Ep.* 21.378d) but Julian decided only to admonish them due to his fondness for the city (*Ep.* 21.380b-d).

²⁴³ All of our information on Nilus Dionysius comes primarily from Julian’s letter. Even his name is uncertain: Julian refers to him as Dionysius but also Nilus. I will refer to him as Nilus throughout. Nilus had praised both Constans and Magnentius in a letter to Julian (*Jul. Ep.* 50.446) and Julian refers to his service under them (*Ep.* 50.443d).

whilst he was staying at Antioch, which has been preserved.²⁴⁴ Julian's response tells us a lot about his sense of *paideia* and approach to anger – for his reply is surely an example of imperial anger and disappointment, though, as Van Hoof noted, it is aimed more at Nilus's recent letter rather than his refusal of office.²⁴⁵

Julian opens by accusing Nilus of abusing him in his recent letter.²⁴⁶ Julian's letter also ends with a sarcastic suggestion for Nilus to spend his days in luxury, abusing the emperor.²⁴⁷ We can gather from Julian's reply and the incorporated quotations some of what Nilus had written to Julian. He had written a letter in defence of himself, presenting himself as a virtuous man.²⁴⁸ He emphasised his values, his bravery and courage, and also his *parrhêsia*.²⁴⁹ He praised previous emperors and advised Julian to fill his court and appoint men like himself to offices.²⁵⁰ Julian was displeased with this letter and with Nilus. His reply and his opening statement that Nilus's letter had been an abuse betrays his anger. Indeed, he claimed that Nilus's previous silence was preferable.²⁵¹ Julian mocked and discredited Nilus throughout: he 'unmasked' him.²⁵²

Julian argued that Nilus was really a coward; further, he had always been a coward and could not now convince others that he had changed and become brave, a claim Julian mocked throughout.²⁵³ Julian claimed that he had been deceived by Nilus and his claims to bravery, and, in a rather passive-aggressive way, stated that he himself should apologise for offering him public office too hastily.²⁵⁴ He argued that Constans had not truly wanted Nilus in his court, and implied that Nilus was politically fickle, as he

²⁴⁴ It was written before the *Misopogon*, as Libanius implies (*Or.* 18.198). Wiemer dated Julian's letter to late 362 (1995, 224). Julian himself acknowledges that his letter is very long and not the brief reply Nilus was hoping for (*Ep.* 50.445d). Bouffartigue suggests that Nilus widely disseminated his letter to Julian, which would account for Julian's lengthy and public reply (1992, 585).

²⁴⁵ Van Hoof noted that others had refused to initially support Julian, such as the senate at Rome and Aurelius Victor, but Julian did not direct invectives against them, suggesting that Nilus's ill-conceived letter was the object of Julian's displeasure rather than the refusal (2013, 399-400). Bouffartigue called the letter a virulent invective (1992, 584).

²⁴⁶ *νυνὶ δὲ ὡσπερ ὠδίνων τὴν καθ' ἡμῶν λοιδορίαν ἀθρόαν ἐξέχεας*, *Jul. Ep.* 50.443c.

²⁴⁷ *ἔρρωσο τρυφῶν καὶ λοιδορούμενος ἐμοὶ παραπλησίως*, *Jul. Ep.* 50.446b.

²⁴⁸ *ἀπολογούμενος*, *Jul. Ep.* 50.443c.

²⁴⁹ Nilus had written of his fearlessness (*ἀφοβία*) and great courage (*μέγα θάρσος*), and claimed a reputation for *parrhêsia* (*Jul. Ep.* 50.444a, 445b).

²⁵⁰ *Jul. Ep.* 50.446a, 446b.

²⁵¹ *Jul. Ep.* 50.443c.

²⁵² Van Hoof 2013, 401. Van Hoof argues this unmasking and dismantling of Nilus and his self-presentation is the key to the letter.

²⁵³ *Jul. Ep.* 50.444b, 446a.

²⁵⁴ *Jul. Ep.* 50.444c-d. Julian cites examples of great men, such as Plato and Hippocrates, who had been deceived.

simply obeyed Magnentius: he implied he was insincere and cynical in his political affiliations, certainly not brave.²⁵⁵

Julian also took exception to Nilus's philosophical pretensions, particularly his claim of *parrhêsia*. He compared him to Thersites and argued that although Nilus had left the court of Constans due to his frankness, this did not make Nilus a free-speaking philosopher.²⁵⁶ Constans had expelled many base men from his court; Nilus could be one of these.²⁵⁷ It did not prove that Nilus was dedicated to the expression of truth. In fact, it simply proved that Nilus was a poor philosopher as he could not persuade Constans to listen to him and behave better. Julian also argued that Nilus was fundamentally incapable of being a free-speaking philosopher because he was not above criticism himself: 'for that matter it is no great achievement to criticise others, but rather to place oneself beyond the reach of criticism.'²⁵⁸ For Julian, then, those with *parrhêsia* must be above suspicion, and Nilus was not: Julian implied that Nilus had behaved badly when he was young and was the source of gossip, and was thus unable to truly criticise or advise others, particularly emperors. Nilus's advice to Julian on how to choose holders of public office – authoritative advice, as Van Hoof noted – was unwelcome and unasked for, but also inappropriate as Nilus was not a true philosopher; he could not express himself frankly.²⁵⁹ Those with *parrhêsia*, as discussed above, were traditionally outside the bonds of patronage and were not as personally invested as other members of the elite. Nilus cannot claim this. He had been offered a political role by Julian and after realising his mistake in refusing (and ignoring) the emperor, he was writing to gain favour and present himself as worthy of public office. Indeed, Julian accused him of prostituting himself.²⁶⁰ Julian argues, forcefully, that Nilus should not be thought of as a man 'brimful of freedom of speech'. Rather, he is only 'full of insanity'.²⁶¹

Julian further dismantled Nilus's claim to be worthy of office or a philosopher by attacking his education. Julian alluded to literary and historical anecdotes throughout the

²⁵⁵ Jul. *Ep.* 50.443d.

²⁵⁶ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας φῆς προσκρούσας ἀπηλλάχθαι, Jul. *Ep.* 50.445b.

²⁵⁷ Jul. *Ep.* 50.445b. Van Hoof 2013, 401.

²⁵⁸ πλὴν οὐ μέγα ἔργον ἐστὶν ἐπιτιμᾶν ἄλλοις, ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἀνεπιτίμητον παρασχεῖν, Jul. *Ep.* 50.445b.

²⁵⁹ Jul. *Ep.* 50.446b. Van Hoof 2013, 400. Bouffartigue remarked that Nilus had made the mistake of acting like an old sage and treating the emperor as a little boy, condescendingly (1992, 585).

²⁶⁰ σεαυτὸν προαγωγεύεις, Jul. *Ep.* 50.446b.

²⁶¹ καὶ παρρησίας μεστός, ἐμβροντησίας ὦν πλήρης, Jul. *Ep.* 50.446a. Van Hoof translated ἐμβροντησίας as 'uncontrolled noise' rather than Wright's 'insanity' (2013, 401).

letter, but at points he directed Nilus to look them up and to study the texts, to learn.²⁶²

Julian was implying that he did not think Nilus had sufficient education to understand his clever references. If Nilus had, in fact, understood the references, Julian was only further insulting his intelligence by presuming he was culturally illiterate. It is more galling because they were allusions to the fables of Babrius and Homer, who, as shown, was the central figure of ancient education.²⁶³

Julian went further and used Plato to argue that Nilus was not fearless, brave or philosophical, but was, instead, guilty of ignorance and lack of knowledge.²⁶⁴ He argued, using his own philosophical knowledge, that Nilus was ignorant twice over: not only did he have no knowledge, he was unaware of his own lack of knowledge. Julian argued that this contributed to his ‘self-conceit’.²⁶⁵ Philosophically, Nilus was bankrupt and ignorant. According to Julian, he could make no valid claim to be a free-speaking philosopher; nor could he make a claim to be brave. Rather, he was ignorant and audacious.²⁶⁶ Julian referred to Nilus’s ‘excessive audacity, boldness, licence of tongue, ferocity of soul, madness of wits and perverse fury on all occasions.’²⁶⁷ Nilus and his letter did not make a good impression or endear him to the emperor.

Julian also discredited Nilus’s literary culture. Towards the end of his letter, after he again dismissed his claim to *parrhêsia*, Julian argued that he did not want Nilus to be seen as having had the advantages of education because, as far as could be gleaned from his previous letters, Nilus had not had the ‘smallest acquaintance with literature’.²⁶⁸ As an example, Julian criticised his use of the word φροῦδος: Nilus had used it to mean ‘manifest’, but the ancients (τῶν ἀρχαίων) would never have used it in this way.²⁶⁹ Rather, they would have preferred the Attic meaning, ‘vanished’. This passage is significant for a number of reasons. Although παιδεία has here been translated as ‘education’, Julian is clearly attacking Nilus’s performance of *paideia*. Julian is criticising

²⁶² Jul. *Ep.* 50.444b, 445a, 446a.

²⁶³ Van Hoof 2013, 402.

²⁶⁴ ἀμαθίαν [...] ἄγνοια, Jul. *Ep.* 50.444b.

²⁶⁵ τῆς οἰήσεως, Jul. *Ep.* 50.444c. Julian noted that he himself did not know anything either, with the implication that he was at least enough of a philosopher to recognise this.

²⁶⁶ τὴν [...] ἀμαθίαν καὶ τὸ θάρσος, Jul. *Ep.* 50.444b.

²⁶⁷ τὴν ἄγαν αὐθάδειαν καὶ τὴν θρασύτητα καὶ τὴν ἀκολασίαν τὴν τῆς γλώττης καὶ τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἄγριον καὶ τὸ μαινόμενον τῶν φρενῶν καὶ τὸ παρακεκινηκός ἐν πᾶσιν, Jul. *Ep.* 50.446a.

²⁶⁸ καὶ παιδείας μετεσχηκός, οὐδέ γὰρ λόγων ἀψάμενος, ὅσα γε εἰκός ἐστι ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς σου τεκμήρασθαι, Jul. *Ep.* 50.446a.

²⁶⁹ Jul. *Ep.* 50.446a-b. Nesselrath’s recent edition of Julian’s works notes points at which Julian himself slips from using pure Attic vocabulary (2015, xxiv-xxvii).

Nilus's ability to properly compose a letter, which, as we have seen, was a significant act and one of the ways in which a man expressed his *paideia*. Correct vocabulary was obviously important; it not only demonstrated one's rhetorical education, but that one could also allude to specific literature, another key way of demonstrating *paideia*. Indeed, Julian throughout this letter referred to classical authors and texts, explicitly and implicitly, thereby showing his cultural capital. For men of *paideia*, or those with pretensions to *paideia*, this was important. They took their choice of words seriously and tried to write in the Attic style, or at least in an Atticising style: the influence of the Second Sophistic was still palpable.²⁷⁰ The ability to write in an Atticising dialect, no matter how artificial, was part of demonstrating one's *paideia*.²⁷¹ Julian was directly undermining Nilus's *paideia* by criticising his public performance; this is worse as we can presume that Nilus took some time and effort to compose his letter to the emperor, known for his literary and philosophical interests. Thus, correct words, 'symmetry of phrases and language', mattered to Julian, despite what he claimed in the rescript, especially in the case of disobedient and desperate senators.²⁷² Julian thus shows that there is a close link between rhetorical education and *paideia*. We can see from Julian's letter that political promotion required authentic *paideia*; or, better self-presentation.²⁷³ Nilus had not played the game correctly; he was not politically astute and had failed to persuade Julian that he was still worthy of promotion or favour based on his cultural capital, which had been undermined and shown to be just a veneer. Julian had shown that he was not to be swayed by hollow philosophical pretensions and references to Alexander.²⁷⁴

It is clear that Julian's letter to Nilus was intended as a reprimand from an angry emperor. Julian referred to Nilus's abuse, and called him a cowardly and disobedient senator. It is interesting that, again, Julian chose to diffuse his anger through a composition, through words. Julian showed that he was aware of the other options open to

²⁷⁰ Van Hoof argued that Julian's criticism of Nilus's incorrect choice of words illustrated the value attached by the Second Sophistic to Atticism (2013, 402). Swain argued that in the Second Sophistic 'Attic language and literature were dominant and inescapable as the high standard', and that there was a sense of superiority over those who did not express themselves as Atticists (1996, 39). For the argument that the fourth century could represent a Third Sophistic, see Quiroga 2007 and Van Hoof 2010.

²⁷¹ Preston 2006, 89.

²⁷² Παιδειαν ὀρθὴν εἶναι νομίζομεν οὐ τὴν ἐν τοῖς ῥήμασι καὶ τῇ γλώττῃ πραγματευομένην εὐρυθμίαν, Jul. *Ep.* 36.422a.

²⁷³ Van Hoof 2013, 406.

²⁷⁴ Nilus apparently referenced Alexander in his letter to Julian. Julian responded by questioning this and referring to the murderous deeds of Alexander (*Ep.* 50.446a). Smith 1995, 12-13.

him: he wrote that those who fell under the displeasure of princes could be relieved from the cares of business, forced to pay a small fine, or, if the prince was extremely angry, be executed.²⁷⁵ He wrote that it was in his power, and within the law, to have punished him with such deeds.²⁷⁶ Julian clearly thought the behaviour of Nilus warranted some punishment. He chose to, firstly, behave in an irreproachable way, so as to give Nilus nothing to slander him with, and secondly, to punish Nilus with a letter: again, he turned to words rather than to violence.²⁷⁷ However, like the *Misopogon*, the letter was made public. Julian argued that this was because it was needed by many besides Nilus, but it was also meant, explicitly, to shame Nilus: ‘for when men see you more haughty and more insolent than befits your past life, they resent it.’²⁷⁸ In this way, Julian was acting with *philanthropia*. It is not clear exactly how the letter was made public, whether it was posted up somewhere or if copies were sent to select people; who exactly those people were is also to be debated – Julian simply refers to ‘all’ (πᾶσιν).²⁷⁹ Libanius knew of it: in a letter to Julian, he jokingly told of a friend who had been afraid he had disturbed Julian writing and would thus be punished like Nilus.²⁸⁰ In his funeral oration for Julian, Libanius mentioned the letter in connection to the *Misopogon*: Antioch was being punished like the impudent Roman citizen.²⁸¹ Julian’s letter had been circulated so that others feared similar treatment: words were enough of a punishment and the implicit warning had been heeded.

By punishing Nilus through words rather than (violent) deeds, Julian demonstrated his own *paideia*, his reasonableness and his *sophrosyne* as an emperor. He diffused his anger and responded with a composition littered with literary allusions and references rather than violence, drawing on his education and culture. In Bourdieu’s terms, the letter to Nilus was a public demonstration of his cultural capital, like the *Misopogon* and many of Julian’s other works. Indeed, many of the strategies employed by Julian in both the *Misopogon* and the letter to Nilus can be found in other works, particularly his orations *Against Heraclius* and *On the Uneducated Cynics*. In both of

²⁷⁵ Jul. *Ep.* 50.444a.

²⁷⁶ Jul. *Ep.* 50.446a.

²⁷⁷ Jul. *Ep.* 50.445d.

²⁷⁸ σεμνότερον γὰρ ὀρῶντές σε καὶ ὀγκωδέστερον τῶν ἔμπροσθέν σοι βεβιωμένων ἄχθονται, Jul. *Ep.* 50.446b.

²⁷⁹ Jul. *Ep.* 50.446b.

²⁸⁰ Lib. *Ep.* N95.5. Libanius refers to the senator as ‘Neilus’ here, reflecting the uncertainty surrounding his name.

²⁸¹ Lib. *Or.* 18.198.

these invectives, thick as they are with literary allusions, Julian uses his own education and erudition to undermine that of his opponents. Julian insults the Cynics as culturally illiterate and unused to reading; as in the letter to Nilus, he recommends they read and study more texts. Heraclius is the subject of similar criticisms.²⁸² We see this tendency, too, in what survives of his *Against the Galileans*. Words were what Julian relied on – we only have to recall his vast literary output. His public image was in part shaped by his concern for *paideia*, his literary and philosophical leanings, his bookishness. Nilus knew this, and wrote to Julian that he knew he was not the man to resort to violence or even financial fines.²⁸³ He was right: Julian tended not to punish or express anger through deeds (though not always: the Christian community of Edessa was not so lucky),²⁸⁴ preferring to respond with *paideia*. Ammianus found this praiseworthy: he wrote that Julian acted mercifully towards those who wished him harm due to his ‘inborn mildness’.²⁸⁵ Even Gregory of Nazianzus, no fan of the emperor, wrote that Julian was free from anger.²⁸⁶ Julian’s public performances of his *paideia*, his demonstrations of his cultural capital, were successful and convincing, unlike Nilus, whose capital was undermined.²⁸⁷

These texts show the importance of *paideia* for Julian, its centrality in his imperial image and political relationships.²⁸⁸ As emperor, he demonstrated and used *paideia* as a political tool: it informed the way he dealt with, for example, communities and senators. It was important for him, then, to be seen as educated and cultured: he used his cultural capital. Part of this was in the act of writing itself, but it was also seen in his constant literary and philosophical allusions and his concern for correct, Atticising language. In this way, he was similar to local notables, *curiales* and governors, who also used their *paideia*, expressed through the right words and allusions, to gain political favour and friendship. There were definite benefits from expressing oneself with *paideia*, with using

²⁸² Jul. *Or.* 6.191c, 200b; 7.235a, 237a, 227b. Smith 1995, 70-71.

²⁸³ Jul. *Ep.* 50.444a, quoting Nilus’s letter.

²⁸⁴ Julian punished the citizens of Edessa for their violence by confiscating Church property, likely their valuables rather than land (Jul. *Ep.* 40).

²⁸⁵ *genuina lenitudine*, Amm. 25.4.9.

²⁸⁶ GNaz. *Or.* 5.21. Augustine, in contrast, wrote that Julian was given to acting impetuously and with zeal, which led to his death (*de Civ. Dei*, 5.21).

²⁸⁷ While writing to diffuse anger was a demonstration of *paideia*, it may also be considered unseemly or petty to publicly shame a Roman senator in such a way. We do not know what Nilus did after this letter, whether he replied to Julian in kind, or continued with his career after Julian’s death.

²⁸⁸ Julian couched his relationship with Nilus as ‘friendship’, like the notables and governors previously discussed. At the end of the letter, he ominously proclaimed their friendship over (*Ep.* 50.446b).

this cultural capital as a political tool. Gregory of Nazianzus recognised these benefits of *paideia*, and more. In his invectives against the emperor, he strongly argued that Julian had negated these benefits for Christians through his education edict and rescript. It is to a discussion of this which we now turn.

6.5 *Paideia* in Gregory's invectives against Julian

After the death of Julian on June 26, 363 whilst on campaign in against the Persians, Gregory of Nazianzus wrote two invectives against him.²⁸⁹ The dating of these two orations is debated, but they were likely written in the two years following Julian's death.²⁹⁰ Gregory made it clear in a number of speeches that he was no fan of the emperor. He continually disparaged Julian and presented him as a wicked persecutor. Already in summer 362, Gregory had reworked the story of the Maccabees so Julian was the modern Antiochus.²⁹¹ After Julian's death, Gregory was more explicit. In his funeral oration for his brother Caesarius (himself a doctor in the court of Julian), dated to 369, he referred to Julian as the 'emperor of unhappy memory' and presented the edict of toleration as a way of depriving Christians of the honour of their conflicts.²⁹² In the funeral oration for his father, he noted that Julian was the first and last evil of their day and that he had apostatised not only from God but also from reason: Julian was influenced by demons.²⁹³ In 380, Gregory described Julian's reign as the 'most inhuman of all the persecutions'; Julian blended speciousness with cruelty.²⁹⁴ In 381, he spoke of Julian as an anti-Christian darkness which had threatened to overpower Gregory had God not intervened in the form of the Persian campaign.²⁹⁵ These orations also refer to Julian's reign as one marked by artifice and subtle persecution: his subjects were persuaded by his

²⁸⁹ Julian was wounded on his side by a cavalry spear which pierced his liver; he died during the night, after apparently discussing philosophy with Maximus and Priscus, in Socratic style (Amm. 25.3.6, 23). Elm places Julian's last battle to south of Samarra, 100 miles north of Ctesiphon (Elm 2012, 336n.1).

²⁹⁰ Smith, following Bernardi 1983, dates Gregory's invectives to 'within a year of Julian's death' (1995, 219). Bernardi had suggested that they were composed during winter 363/364 (1978, 91). Elm recently argued that Gregory had planned them already in the summer of 362 but did not complete them until late 364 or early 365. Elm proposes that about a year passed before the composition of the later and shorter *Or.* 5 in late 365 or early 366 (2012, 341-343).

²⁹¹ *GNaz. Or.* 15.12. Elm 2012, 152-153.

²⁹² βασιλεύς ὁ δυσώνυμος, *GNaz. Or.* 7.11.

²⁹³ Ἦνεγκεν ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς καιρὸς πρῶτον κακόν, οἶμαι δὲ καὶ τελευταῖον, τὸν ἀποστάτην καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῶν λογισμῶν βασιλέα, *GNaz. Or.* 18.32.

²⁹⁴ καὶ διωγμὸν ἐννοεῖ τῶν πάποτε γενομένων ἀπανθρωπότατον, ὅσῳ τὸ πιθανὸν τῆ τυραννίδι μίξας, *GNaz. Or.* 21.32.

²⁹⁵ καέφαγέ με, ἐμερίσατο με, ἐκάλυψέ με σκότος λεπτόν, ἵνα μὴ ἀποστῶ, μηδὲ θρηγῶν, τῆς Γραφῆς, *GNaz. Or.* 42.3.

clever and crafty words; Julian's way with words was not be admired here. This is one of Gregory's main arguments against Julian, one necessitated by the emperor's lack of physical persecution: there were no martyrs under Julian, much to Gregory's chagrin.²⁹⁶ While these orations make clear Gregory's negative opinions of Julian, the two invectives stand apart as the fullest embodiment of these opinions – as, indeed, they are meant to. Gregory explicitly intended to damage the reputation of Julian with these two compositions.²⁹⁷ Gregory did not write the invectives with the purpose of relating the narrative of Julian's life or reign; that would be the job of historians. He meant to collect the weightiest charges against Julian and show him to be thoroughly wicked.²⁹⁸ Julian was presented as an object lesson, a divinely sent teaching tool for Christians, meant to show the threat of impiety and the victory of God.²⁹⁹ Indeed, while the invectives are obviously works of anger, they also present exultation and joy at the defeat of the emperor: they are songs of triumph.³⁰⁰ Gregory wrote that the second invective was a stele, conspicuous and meant to condemn the emperor like a criminal in the marketplace, while his first was a *stelographia*.³⁰¹ Gregory was proclaiming that Julian had been convicted by God, and he meant future generations to know of Julian in this context. As Elm argued, it was through these two pieces that the pervasive (and perverse) image of Julian the Apostate was created.³⁰²

From the beginning of the first invective, we know Gregory's agenda. He does not refer to Julian by name in the first oration, instead calling him the tyrant, the dragon, the apostate, the public and private enemy of all, the man who had raged and threatened the

²⁹⁶ GNaz. *Or.* 4.68, 84.

²⁹⁷ Elm argued that the invectives were not meant for oral delivery, pointing to the reference to writing in GNaz. *Or.* 4.53 (2012, 337n.6). It is likely that the pieces were circulated and read by others: Gregory intended it to move around and influence men (*Or.* 5.42) and we can see that they influenced other Christian portrayals of Julian, such as Socrates, Sozomen and Augustine. Elm envisages an audience of public officials and persons who advised others in doctrinal matters, with *Or.* 5 aimed at those involved in secular administration (2012, 344).

²⁹⁸ πάντα μὲν οὖν ἐκτραγοδεῖν τὰ ἐκείνου βίβλοις καὶ ἱστορίαις παρήσομεν· οὐ γὰρ ἡμῖν γε σχολὴ μακρότερα τῆς παρουσίας ὑποθέσεως ῥαψοδεῖν· αὐτοὶ δὲ ὀλίγα ἐκ πολλῶν διελθόντες, στηλογραφίαν ὥσπερ τινὰ τοῖς μεθ' ἡμᾶς καταλείβομεν ἐπὶ τὰ κυριώτατα καὶ περιφανέστατα τῶν κατ' ἐκεῖνον τῷ λόγῳ χωρήσαντες, GNaz. *Or.*

²⁹⁹ Elm 2010, 174.

³⁰⁰ GNaz. *Or.* 4.12, 14-15. Bernardi referred to the invectives as a 'danse allègre du scalp' (1978, 91).

³⁰¹ GNaz. *Or.* 5.42. Gregory explicitly did not mean to write invectives (*Or.* 4.79), though he follows the rules of the genre; rather, he meant to write a *stelographia*, στηλογραφίαν (*Or.* 4.20; Elm 2010, 179; 2012, 346-347).

³⁰² Augustine was already referring to Julian as the apostate in his *City of God* (5.21) and Julian's apostasy was described by Christian historians such as Socrates and Sozomen (Socr. *HE.* 3.1; Soz. *HE.* 5.1). His status as 'apostate' is also endlessly fascinating to modern scholars.

earth.³⁰³ Throughout he referred to Julian as a tyrant or simply as ‘that man’.³⁰⁴ Indeed, he only referred to Julian once by name in the second invective.³⁰⁵ He described the events leading up to Julian’s accession as emperor, casting him as the ungrateful nephew of the great Constantius. Gregory favours Constantius and even Gallus by virtue of their Christianity: Constantius is only really criticised for allowing Julian to hold power as Caesar.³⁰⁶ Throughout he describes Julian as mad and wicked,³⁰⁷ and compares him to Herod, Judas, Pontius Pilate and the Jews,³⁰⁸ but also to Diocletian, Maximian and Maximinus Daia. Gregory argues that Julian would have been a similar persecutor but was held back by God.³⁰⁹ Gregory constantly criticises the lack of martyrs during Julian’s reign; it was a purposely sly way of dealing with the Christians and caused them dishonour and pain.³¹⁰ Julian instead attacked the Christians through the ‘traps and snares concealed in arguments’; this was his form of persecution.³¹¹ Gregory argues that Julian ‘forced with gentleness’.³¹² He thus attacked Julian’s religious outlook and policy.³¹³

As discussed in chapter five, in the first invective Gregory also took issue with Julian’s conception of Hellenism: Julian saw it as something explicitly pagan; it was the sum of everything it meant to be a Greek and a pagan. Gregory argued that this was illogical.³¹⁴ For Gregory, Hellenism was not a religious category or a synonym for paganism; Hellenes were those who spoke Greek, which was the property of all those who mastered it. In the course of this argument, Gregory touched on styles of Greek, to ask which one Julian would have the Christians and therefore non-Hellene speak:

³⁰³ ἄλλα τὸν δράκοντα, τὸν ἀποστάτην, τὸν νοῦν τὸν μέγαν, τὸν Ἀσπύριον, τὸν κοινὸν ἀπάντων ἐχθρὸν καὶ πολέμιον, τὸν πολλὰ μὲν ἐπὶ γῆς μανέντα καὶ ἀπειλήσαντα, πολλὴν δὲ ἀδικίαν εἰς τὸ ὕψος λαλήσαντά τε καὶ μελετήσαντα, GNaz. *Or.* 4.1.

³⁰⁴ Gregory used forms of ἐκεῖνος eleven times throughout *Or.* 4. For example, κάκεινω, GNaz. *Or.* 4.4; ἐκεῖνου, *Or.* 4.3, 29, 40; ἐκεῖνον, *Or.* 4.36.

³⁰⁵ GNaz. *Or.* 5.38.

³⁰⁶ GNaz. *Or.* 4.34, 39-40. Gregory wrote that while Gallus was hasty in his temper, his piety was due respect (*Or.* 4.24, 33).

³⁰⁷ Gregory called Julian wicked (κακὸς) at *Or.* 4.21, and referred to his wickedness (κακίας) throughout, for example *Or.* 4.20, 27, 29. He also referred to his madness (ἀπονοΐας, *Or.* 4.26, 46) and said he had a mad soul (ὦ τῆς μανιώδους ἐκείνης ψυχῆς! *Or.* 4.46).

³⁰⁸ GNaz. *Or.* 4.68.

³⁰⁹ GNaz. *Or.* 4.96.

³¹⁰ GNaz. *Or.* 4.58, 68, 84.

³¹¹ καὶ τὰς περὶ τοὺς λογισμοὺς πλοκάς καὶ διπλόας τῶ καθ’ ἡμῶν διωγμῶ φέρων ἐπεισήγαγε, GNaz. *Or.* 4.61. Socrates later redefined persecution as ‘any measures adopted to disquiet and molest’ to prove that Julian was such a persecutor (*HE.* 3.12).

³¹² ἐπιεικῶς ἐβιάζετο, GNaz. *Or.* 4.79. Marcos 2009, 193.

³¹³ Marcos 2009, 192.

³¹⁴ GNaz. *Or.* 4.104. Bouffartigue 1992, 601.

Atticising Greek or plain Greek, the *koine*?³¹⁵ In the course of this argument, Gregory also touched on *paideia*: he mentioned the Atticising Greek of the well-educated, and rhetorically asked if Julian intended to debar Christians from speaking this style of Greek.³¹⁶ As we have seen in the discussion of Julian's letter to Nilus, the use of correct, Atticising Greek was a significant way of demonstrating one's education and culture: it was a way of performing *paideia*. So, we see that for Gregory, as it was for Julian, one's culture was expressed through a specific style of Greek. Gregory's argument against Julian's conception of Hellenism is therefore part of a broader theme and argument against Julian: his actions against words and *paideia*.

While Gregory is scathing about Julian's reign and his person (the unflattering description of Julian as a student in Athens is particularly memorable),³¹⁷ the focus in the invectives, particularly in the more vibrant first invective, is on words, *logoi*, and Julian's perceived actions against them.³¹⁸ As discussed in chapter three, Gregory's attitude towards Greek rhetorical education and its place in Christian life was somewhat complicated (as it was for many Christians in the fourth century), but we can see that he valued his education and relied on his rhetorical abilities: as he wrote, 'words alone did he cleave to'.³¹⁹ We can see clearly how much value Gregory placed on his *paideia*. He took pains to demonstrate and celebrate his *paideia*: the invectives themselves are demonstrations of this capital, as Elm has shown.³²⁰ In the invectives, Gregory argues against Julian's actions against words in defence of this *paideia*. This is what Gregory is most upset about, and the first invective is primarily concerned with this; he returns to the subject of *logoi* throughout the first oration and again in the second. The first invective opens with a condemnation of Julian's actions against *logoi*: Gregory argued that it was fitting that Julian be punished by words for his transgressions against *logoi*. He argues that Julian tried to begrudge the Christians the use of words, 'as though they were his own

³¹⁵ GNaz. *Or.* 4.105.

³¹⁶ GNaz. *Or.* 4.105, 107.

³¹⁷ Gregory observed Julian as one who behaved inconsistently and given to extreme excitability; he wrote that Julian's shoulders were constantly moving up and down, that his eyes were shifty, his speech interrupted and that his laughter was unrestrained. Apparently, he knew then that the emperor was evil (*Or.* 5.23-24).

³¹⁸ Gregory wrote (*Or.* 5.1) that the first invective was concerned to show the wickedness of Julian while the second was more focused on God's justice, though he still wrote about Julian's perceived transactions against words. Elm argued that *Or.* 5 was Gregory's side in a debate about Julian's divinity and imperial legitimacy, prompted by Libanius's *Monody* and *Epitaphios*, and the usurpation of Procopius (2012, 343).

³¹⁹ GNaz. *Or.* 4.100.

³²⁰ The invectives are modelled on Demosthenes' *Philippics* and Elms considers them a 'tour de force of classical learning' (Elm 2012, 341).

exclusively'.³²¹ Julian meant to rob Christians of a 'benefit of the first class': the use of Greek words and *paideia*.³²² This culminates with a vivid discussion at the end of the first invective of not only Julian's perceived actions against words but also their importance for Gregory. He argues that in no other matter did Julian act more illegally: he exerted tyranny over words and tried to deprive the Christians of words.³²³

Gregory is referring to Julian's education edict and rescript here, which, as discussed in chapter five, reasserted the centrality of pagan texts and the gods in Greek education and offered both Christians and 'grey' pagans the choice of taking these religious texts seriously or teaching something else, such as Scripture.³²⁴ However, Gregory has interpreted Julian's choice as no choice at all (much like some modern scholars); rather, he views Julian's measures as a complete ban on Christians teaching rhetoric or attending rhetorical education.³²⁵ That Julian explicitly did not ban Christian students from attending rhetorical education or intend a large-scale ban on Christian teachers is not the issue here: Julian's measures were presented, almost immediately, by contemporaries as a ban on Christians teaching or receiving a rhetorical education. Gregory's invectives are discussed here not because they help us get to the objective truth of Julian's education measures but since they constitute significant documents which demonstrate how the education measures were understood by an elite Christian; they reveal the perceived effects of Julian's edict and rescript, and are explicit about the benefits of *paideia* for elites in public life.

Gregory described the devastating effect a ban on Christian education would have on the Christian population – and for Gregory it was only the (elite) Christian population – and through this we see him also describe the very real benefits of *paideia*, the common culture and capital which resulted from a rhetorical education. According to Gregory, Julian meant to exclude all Christians from all freedom of speech, from all meetings, markets, public assemblies and the law courts: that is, from the social and political life of

³²¹ ὧν κοινῶν ὄντων λογικοῖς ἅπασιν, ὡς ἰδίων αὐτοῦ, Χριστιανοῖς ἐφθόνησεν, ἀλογώτατα περὶ λόγων διανοηθεῖς, ὁ πάντων, ὡς ἦετο, λογιώτατος, GNaz. Or. 4.4.

³²² ἀγαθοῦ τινοῦ τῶν πρώτων ἀποστερήσειν μέλλων, GNaz. Or. 4.5. Bouffartigue 1992, 602.

³²³ GNaz. Or. 4.6, 100, 101.

³²⁴ The ideas which Gregory responded to in the invectives are mainly those from the rescript rather than the edict, however. Elm has argued that a letter to the governor Candidianus from summer 362 referenced Julian's education measures: Gregory wrote (*Ep.* 10) that he had given up teaching, possibly due to a new *nomos*. Elm thus argues that Gregory gave up teaching primarily because of Julian's measures, though his ordination as presbyter also played a part (2012, 151, 341).

³²⁵ Bouffartigue 1992, 601-602.

the elite Greeks.³²⁶ Gregory has interpreted Julian's education measures as seriously impinging on the public life of Christians. The measures will affect their access to *parrhêsia*, which, as discussed above, was an important quality: the ability to freely and frankly speak was a benefit accorded to a sophist and (more often) a philosopher, and was a much-needed protective measure against an unreasonable emperor. As Brown has shown, in this period, *parrhêsia* was also becoming a virtue of Christian bishops, so Gregory's concern was rooted in the experience of one both educated and Christian.³²⁷ Julian's measures would also exclude or hinder their participation in various types of assembly: public meetings, assemblies of the people or the market-place, and general or festal assemblies.³²⁸ That Gregory lists three types of assemblies, each slightly different but each indicating public engagement and expression, is significant and stresses how harmful he views Julian's measures to be for Christians. They would also be barred from the law courts; a career as an advocate, perhaps as a result of time spent studying in Berytus, would not be possible. Thus, Julian would marginalise Christians, bar them from all public life and interaction with their fellow man.³²⁹ As far as Gregory was concerned, Julian was not only aiming at a complete and comprehensive exclusion of Christians from the public performance of *paideia* by limiting participation in assemblies and law courts, but also from potentially speaking the revered Atticising Greek of the elite. Central to the invectives were Julian's perceived actions against *paideia*. While Julian was presented as wicked and an evil for the world, it was his actions against words and culture, aimed at Christians, that Gregory most thoroughly discussed and disparaged. For Gregory, Julian was attempting to control and limit access to *paideia*, to make it a particularly pagan possession – a pagan capital. His edict and rescript was thought to ban Christians from accessing rhetorical education, through teaching or learning, and therefore from enjoying the benefits of this education. Without the experience of rhetorical education, the claim to

³²⁶ ταῦτα δὲ ἦν πάσης μὲν παρρησίας ἀποστερεῖσθαι Χριστιανούς, πάντων δὲ αὐτοῦς εἶργεσθαι συλλόγων, ἀγορῶν, πανηγύρεων, τῶν δικαστηρίων αὐτῶν, GNaz. Or. 4.96.

³²⁷ Brown 1992, 117.

³²⁸ Elm has translated these as 'all assemblies, public places and festivals' (2012, 360), while the King translation of 1888 uses 'all meetings, markets and public assemblies'. Gregory further argued that Julian had excluded Christians from the *agora* by mixing his imperial image with that of the gods, and therefore making traditional *proskynesis* difficult for Christians (Or. 4.81; Elm 2010, 180). Bouffartigue 1992, 602.

³²⁹ Gregory argued (Or. 4.76) that Julian tried to make it law that Christians would be referred to as Galileans (perhaps a reference to the rescript in which he uses the term), which Elm has argued was a way of officially marginalising Christians. His exclusion of Christians from public assemblies was an escalation of this (Elm 2012, 360).

paideia (through public demonstration) was at risk; the public life of elite Christians was limited, as was their social and political status.

6.6 Conclusion

At the beginning of this chapter, we discussed the definition of *paideia* and concluded that rather than approach it as ‘education’ or even simply ‘culture’, it should be viewed as the specific culture which resulted from a Greek rhetorical education. As such, it was literary in nature and, often, in expression. This ‘capital’ was something which was grounded in education. It was also something which needed public expression and demonstration to be realised and to be valued: its worth was in its performance. This not only included the elegant turns of phrase in Atticising Greek and literary allusions in speech, but also engagement with politics through letters to governors, interactions with emperors – frank or not – and involvement in assemblies. Gregory’s invectives show these benefits and how harmful an attempt to limit or control access to this culture would be. *Paideia* was a passport for the elite; they used it to navigate their social and political world. This is seen in the letters to governors, in which a common, literary culture was invoked. This common culture was used to, further, inspire friendship, if only for a short time and if only based on utility. Political favours were couched in these terms, and were mutually beneficial: governors gained the assistance of the local elite and the reputation of being reasonable, cooperative and wise, while the local elite helped themselves and their network, and gained a positive reputation. This reputation could be advertised on statues and inscriptions: Oecumenius continued to demonstrate his *paideia* long after his death due to the statue, as did the Aphrodisian community.

Paideia enabled relationships, personal and professional, social and political. This was true for the elite, men such as Libanius, Gregory and Basil who exercised their authority in fine letters and speeches, and for governors, who in many ways relied on their local relationships to survive their term and perhaps secure another. It was true, also, of emperors who were expected to behave according to the values of *paideia* as much as their representatives. This was reflected in the appointments the emperor made – for example, Themistius’s adlection to the Constantinopolitan senate – and the way in which he presented himself in speeches and letters. Anger was the best test of *paideia*, however, for a governor and an emperor. Those deserving of a good reputation were self-controlled

and fair; they diffused their anger effectively without resorting to violence. Floggings and executions of those of a similar status were not the marks of a man imbued or led by *paideia*. They were evidence of a failure in *paideia*, a failure to play the game correctly, as Brown would have it. Success depended on good-natured diffusion of anger through reasonable chastisement or wry acknowledgement. For an emperor, it also depended on listening to courageously outspoken advisors: *parrhêsia* remained a significant value for the elite and was a way of dealing with the emperor. A good emperor listened and acted with full knowledge rather than full emotion.

Julian demonstrated his *paideia* throughout his reign in a number of ways. Firstly, he relied on his previous training and wrote throughout his time as emperor. Each of these works, including letters, showed an emperor extraordinarily grounded in the literature of the canonical Greek authors. He also aimed to write in the Atticising style of the elite, which marked him as part of that group. As his letter to Nilus showed, Julian knew the importance of correct style and choice of words for the elite; enough to humiliate a senator for slipping up. He also relied on compositions to diffuse his anger, notably against the Antiochenes who were admonished for their ingratitude through an attempted satirical work. These works may not always be particularly successful – they vary in tone and tend to betray anger rather than disguise it – but the attempt was based on *paideia*. It was based on his commitment to education and literary culture.

This culture influenced governance as well as social relationships (often related) and was a real, practical force in late antique politics. It was not something false or superficial. While it did express itself in polite phrases, it also showed one to be culturally literate and courteous. *Paideia* was thus an important aspect of elite society and interaction. It also formed part of the elite identity: the educated elite marked themselves as one of a select band through possession and demonstration of their specific culture.³³⁰ While it is true that identity was not static or identical – it was something ‘actively constructed and contested’, often in opposition to other identities³³¹ – the role which *paideia* played in the construction of identity can clearly be seen. The behaviour and attitudes common to *paideia* marked one as a member of the educated Greek elite.³³² A significant factor in *paideia* and its expression was, thus, social status. Gregory of

³³⁰ Bouffartigue 1993, 588; Whitmarsh 2005, 33.

³³¹ Preston 2001, 87-88.

³³² Swain 1996, 68, 89. Bouffartigue stated that *paideia* was the equivalent of a title of nobility (1992, 589).

Nazianzus reflected this in his invectives when he expressed his anger at Julian for attempting to control or limit access to the level of education most closely bound to *paideia*: this education formed the basis of the expression of *paideia*, which, in turn, was demonstrated publicly in markets, assemblies, and law courts. For Gregory, at least, *paideia* was a vital component of public life and of identity, regardless of religion. *Paideia* was a vital element in elite society and was closely linked to education: if education was aimed at perfecting the character of a student, *paideia* was the public expression of this character.

Chapter seven: Conclusion

“I hold that a proper education [or, correct *paideia*] results, not in laboriously acquired symmetry of phrases and language, but in a healthy condition of mind...” - Julian¹

Julian died on 26 June, 363, whilst on campaign in Persia, after only nineteen months as emperor. He had been stabbed in the side with a spear which had pierced his liver in the Battle of Samarra.² He died of his wounds and was buried in Tarsus, the city he would have preferred as capital to Antioch, had he survived.³ The Christian Jovian was named his successor, and Julian would be the last pagan emperor. Reactions to Julian’s death varied, from joy to genuine grief. Antioch rejoiced, while another city stoned the messenger carrying news of the emperor’s death.⁴ Libanius reported suicidal feelings and writer’s block following the death of Julian, while, as we have seen, Gregory completed his invectives, *stelographia* meant to harm Julian’s reputation.⁵ Ammianus memorialised him as the hero of his history and Marinus of Samaria in the late fifth century used the accession of Julian as a new dating system.⁶

Julian’s education edict and rescript were null and void following his death, in practice, if not legally.⁷ However, the measures were put to good use by Christian writers: as discussed, Gregory created the ‘Apostate’ in his invectives and his extended discussion on Julian’s actions against *logoi* have had a lasting influence. Christian sources followed in naming Julian among the persecutors and pointed to the edict and rescript as proof that the Apostate emperor wished to bar Christians from learning, disregarding evidence to the

¹ Παιδείαν ὀρθὴν εἶναι νομίζομεν οὐ τὴν ἐν τοῖς ῥήμασι καὶ τῇ γλώττῃ πραγματευομένην εὐρυθμίαν, ἀλλὰ διάθεσιν ὑγιᾶ νοῦν, Jul. *Ep.* 36.422a.

² Amm. 25.3.3-8. Julian forgot his armour in his haste to join the battle. The identity of the spear-thrower is unclear. Gregory of Nazianzus reported a number of rumours: he was a Persian, a barbarian camp-follower, a Saracen, or a Roman soldier (*Or.* 5.13). Libanius suggested the spear was thrown by a Roman Christian, followed by Sozomen (*Lib. Or.* 18.274; *Soz. HE.* 6.2), though in 378 Libanius blamed a Saracen (*Or.* 24.6). Bowersock 1978, 116-117.

³ Amm. 25.9.12; *Lib. Or.* 18.306; *Zos.* 3.34.3.

⁴ Theodoret, *HE.* 3.22; *Lib. Ep.* N120. *Lib. Or.* 18.304; *Zos.* 3.33.

⁵ *Lib. Or.* 1.135; 17.38; *Ep.* 111.2-3. Στηλογραφίαν, GNaz. *Or.* 4.20; Elm 2012, 346-347.

⁶ Amm. 15.9.1; Smith 1999, 90. Marinus, *V. Procl.* 36. Marinus’s use of the accession of Julian as a dating system suggests that for some, Julian reign represented the start of a new era. For us, it is reminiscent of using the birth of Jesus as a new dating system.

⁷ *CTh.* 13.3.6, issued on January 11, 364 under Jovian (though the *inscriptio* records Valentinian I and Valens; see Germino 2004, 193-195) has been interpreted by some as revoking Julian’s edict: Watts 2012, 477. This is debated, though (Elm 2012, 342n.27).

contrary.⁸ The criticisms of Ammianus and the silence of Libanius concerning his education measures only aided in the construction of Julian as a persecutor, with the edict and rescript bearing much of the weight of this.⁹ Julian was portrayed as anti-Christian and a persecutor, an image that has proved pervading as modern historians continue to couch his reign in terms of persecution.¹⁰

It has been a specific task of this thesis to re-evaluate Julian's edict and rescript, and Gregory's response, from the perspective of education and culture, rather than solely religion. We have argued that *paideia* was integral to the political and social world of the elite in the fourth century, and highlighted the significance of rhetorical education in this. *Paideia* was grounded in rhetorical education, and the elite relied on this training in their expression and use of *paideia* as a form of capital. This is why rhetorical education remained a core elite experience.

Chapter two revealed that the methods and content of rhetorical education remained consistent in the fourth century. It was a system based on the memorisation of a fixed curriculum, which consisted of key authors and texts, selected largely for their moralising content and prominent status. The first books of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were central, as were Hesiod, Euripides, Thucydides, Demosthenes and Plato (discussed in chapter 2.4). Students would copy and recite sections of poems and speeches, both old and new, likely using *florilegia*, which by the fourth century had become routine, before composing and practising their own declamations (2.3.2). They were aided by *progymnasmata*, graded exercises which taught a student to construct and deliver an argument and relied on their knowledge of the classical texts and authors, by then familiar (2.3.1). In this way, elite boys of the empire experienced similar educations. They learned the same material, in the same way. Often, they travelled away from home for this experience, occasionally with a pedagogue who would provide extra support and a link to home (discussed in chapter 2.2.2). These pedagogues also doled out punishments, as did many of the rhetors and sophists: corporal punishment was another shared experience for students across institutions (discussed in chapter 2.2.1).

⁸ GNaz. *Orr.* 4.61, 79; 5.23-24; Socrat. *HE.* 3.12, 16; Soz. *HE.* 5.5, 17-17; August. *Civ. Dei.* 18.52.

⁹ Amm. 22.10.6. Cribiore 2013, 24, 233.

¹⁰ Bidez 1930, 263; Downey 1957a, 98; Bowersock 1978, 91.

In chapters three and four, we reconsidered two main challenges to rhetorical studies in the fourth century, in the form of the Christian debate and the increasing status of Latin and law studies. The Christian debate questioned the appropriateness of an education based on pagan material for Christian students, but also recognised the importance of rhetorical studies for elite, public life. This is why it remained a largely intellectual debate, despite the continuing discussion of the tension between faith and literature. Few, if any, of the elite would have substituted rhetorical education for a purely Christian training – and, indeed, they did not. Those figures discussed in chapter three who involved themselves in the debate, such as Tertullian, Basil, Gregory and Jerome, were well-educated in rhetoric and displayed this in everything they wrote, including their contributions to the Christian debate: they used their education even while questioning it. Thus, it remained an academic discussion, not a practical alternative. The debate was not intended to create a movement in which students abjured from rhetorical education based on Homer, Hesiod and Demosthenes. It was a debate between elite scholars, which continued as Christian children attended studies with a rhetor, perhaps approaching the texts with some discrimination.

The centrality of rhetorical studies was maintained despite this Christian debate but also in spite of the increasing status of rival subjects, which threatened the primacy of rhetorical studies in the fourth century. This threat was felt keenly by Libanius, who perceived a decline in his subject, as the enlarged administration offered more opportunities for those with a less extensive background in rhetoric and new positions encouraged more knowledge of shorthand, Latin and, particularly, law. This preference affected the health of city councils, which in the fourth century seemed to be in a perpetual state of decline, as evidenced by the sheer number of laws from succeeding emperors, including Julian, who attempted to curtail curial leakage (discussed in chapter 4.4.1). Latin and law studies supplemented rhetoric and offered access to the administration, but they did not supersede rhetoric in the fourth century. While Latin and law studies remained attractive, rhetoric maintained its status well into the sixth century. This was because it was the process by which one acquired *paideia*, too central to social and political relationships, and thus the governance of the empire, to be replaced.

This was the context in which Julian wrote and distributed his education edict and rescript. The Spoletium edict of June 17, 362, stated that all teachers, public and private alike, must excel first in character, then in eloquence. This was to be confirmed first by

the decurions and then by the emperor himself.¹¹ Julian, thus, reasserted the role of decurions and city councils as key contributors to the health of the empire. Julian's edict should also be viewed as a political act and an extension of his other, numerous laws on the councils, aimed at preventing evasion and establishing their responsibilities.

A rescript followed the edict by late summer 362 in which Julian stated that 'proper education' (παιδείαν ὀρθήν) meant holding true opinions (ἀληθεῖς δόξαι).¹² He argued that teachers must only teach what they truly believe. Thus, he offered a choice: either do not teach what you do not believe, or persuade your students that the canonical authors were wrong about the gods. He suggested that Christians who did not feel comfortable teaching Homer should, rather, teach the Scripture.¹³ In this way, he demonstrated his awareness of the Christian debate and inserted himself into it (discussed in chapter 3.6). A coda followed, in which he stated Christian children were encouraged to continue to attend traditional rhetorical studies.¹⁴

Chapter five reassessed these documents and argued that in both Julian showed himself to be primarily concerned with morality rather than with religion: these texts should not be used as evidence of a persecution. While Julian did discriminate and openly prefer paganism by limiting Christian privileges and encouraging the restoration of pagan temples and practice, he did not embark on a bloody persecution, a fact which was recognised by Christian writers.¹⁵ Julian instead restated the importance of morality in education: texts were morally instructive – this was part of their attraction and the reason they had remained at the core of rhetorical studies – and teachers, particularly sophists, acted as guides. Neither the edict nor the rescript were inherently religious, being aimed at both pagan and Christian teachers, though in the rescript Julian did reassert the place of the gods in education, and therefore, in society. He argued that the canonical texts revealed the truth about the gods, as well as providing models of behaviour and thought, and should be treated as such. In this way, the edict and rescript were part of Julian's efforts to restore the place of paganism in the empire. With his edict and rescript, Julian

¹¹ *CTh.* 13.3.5.

¹² *Jul. Ep.* 36.422a.

¹³ *Jul. Ep.* 36.423b.

¹⁴ *Jul. Ep.* 36.423d-424a.

¹⁵ *GNaz. Or.* 4.58, 79; *Socrat. HE.* 3.12.7.

maintained that education was a vital part of Hellenism: rhetorical education conveyed a moral character and taught the truth about the pagan gods.

This thesis has argued that Julian's educational measures also touched on the concept of *paideia* by asserting the essential religiosity of the curriculum. Julian emphasised not only the pagan element of education, but also of culture, which dictated social and political interactions. Gregory's invectives reveal the perceived effects of Julian's edict and rescript and the benefits of *paideia* for Christians. His concern was that Julian would limit Christian participation in public life by making rhetorical education – through which one learned Attic phrasing, correct deportment and morality, and gained access to *paideia* – primarily pagan in nature and the possession of a narrowly defined group of 'Hellenes'. There was a fear that Christians would have a limited role in high office, in sharp contrast to their position under Julian's Christian predecessors.

Although rhetorical education was expensive and time-consuming, it was a necessary training and experience for elite boys. It provided one with an ability in rhetoric, a literacy, but also allowed access to the cultural capital of *paideia*. In this way, they accessed a different type of literacy – a social and cultural literacy. Rhetorical education created gentlemen. It was at the centre and the start of the becoming a man of *paideia*. Attending school with a rhetor or sophist, even for a short time, opened doors and gave one the grounding required for adult and political life, in which *paideia* was ever-present and essential, if unspoken. *Paideia* operated as a code of conduct, which enabled and enforced social and political relationships and allowed one to navigate public life with the impression of ease. It was grounded in rhetorical education and relied on the knowledge gleaned from this training: how to speak well, and when; how to compose speeches and letters, and argue one's case. It privileged *philanthropia*, self-control and eloquence. Friendship was a vehicle for *paideia* and favours were often couched in these terms: one could gain office and escape punishment through the reciprocal, and often public, demonstration of a friendship based on a shared culture (discussed in chapters 6.3.1 and 6.3.2). The interactions that constituted the daily political wrangling of the empire were composed in fine phrases, peppered with classical allusions from the canonical texts, which also provided moral instruction and models of behaviour and deportment. It was this which marked one out as a member of a certain class or culture – as one who possessed a cultural capital, in Bourdieu's terms. This is why rhetorical education remained consistent: it was proven to be the best training and was necessary

for imbuing the elite with the virtues and ideals of behaviour central to *paideia* and, thus, public life.

This thesis has demonstrated that *paideia* was *the* culture, it set one apart as a natural leader; it conferred a prestige. Rhetorical education was integral in this. This training initiated one into a specific culture that was vital to the function of the empire, politically and socially. As much as sheer power was vital, so was *paideia*. In a changing and often violent world, *paideia* was needed to mitigate the harsh realities of governance. It was not superficial: *paideia*, in many ways, was power, albeit civilian or internal. It was through the operation of *paideia* that the empire thrived – or how the elite thought it thrived. *Paideia* aided the function of high politics: it was through tapping into this and its attendant values that those in office, including emperors, demonstrated their competence and courtesy, their ability to rule effectively, rather than their wrath and unsuitability to public life. By demonstrating *paideia*, one showed one's cultural and political literacy. It could open doors, provide opportunities and dictate one's career. Constantius recognised this and issued an edict to that effect: literature and learning were held in high esteem by the emperor and the empire.¹⁶ Power and *paideia* were connected, and indeed continue to be: *paideia* remains relevant as politicians reflect elite education and culture.

At the close of this project, it is appropriate to point to further areas of research stemming from this work. This thesis has offered a reconsideration of *paideia* as a political force, and this is something which could be developed and examined in greater detail. One might further explore the role of *paideia* in Julian's reign, focusing on his interactions with different communities such as Athens, Alexandria and Antioch, but one could also look at the influence of *paideia* on other emperors. We touched on Constantius and his approach to rhetorical education and *paideia*, particularly in reference to the adlection of Themistius, but his relationship with *paideia* could be extended and considered more fully. Likewise, one could explore more instances of the influence of *paideia* in politics, focusing on the interactions between governors, decurions and the local elite. In chapter 6.3.3, we examined the breakdown of relationships between governor and local elite, exploring the failure of *paideia* and the resulting violence. This breaking point is an area ripe for further study. The point at which *paideia* is pushed aside in favour of absolute power and often violence, when cooperation between imperial

¹⁶ *CTh.* 14.1.1.

representatives, including the emperor, and the elite is considered unsuitable or unnecessary, is intriguing and worth further investigation.

This thesis has focused on literary evidence for the *paideia* in action, but the significance of literary allusions in visual sources, such as mosaics, would be beneficial and give a broader understanding of *paideia*. How visual representations of elite culture operate and come to bear in the political and social realm, and their link to the literary evidence of *paideia* in action, could be further explored. Similarly, the focus here has been on men, particularly ‘culture heroes’, and the influence of education on their public lives. A natural next step would be to consider the possibility of *paideia* as possessed and performed by women. A study of the education of women in late antiquity and their involvement in public life, determining to what extent this was influenced by *paideia*, is an interesting prospect.

This thesis has offered a new perspective on Julian’s reign and his education edict and rescript, and Gregory’s invectives, and re-evaluated the concept of *paideia*. We have demonstrated that rhetorical education and the deriving cultural capital of *paideia* were the ties that bound the elite and influenced their social and political relationships. Rhetorical education was always valued in the Roman empire. This is why it remained consistent and its prominent status was upheld. It remained central because it taught eloquence and conferred a moral character, important for the elites who would wield power. Julian, with his education edict and rescript, reasserted and confirmed the importance of moral character, rhetorical education and the role of the councils as functionaries of government, but he also made education more explicitly pagan than it previously had been. For Gregory, this constituted a threat to elite Christians and their position as possessors and beneficiaries of *paideia*, which, as we have seen, was a crucial capital for the educated elite that secured their position in public life and aided in the function of politics.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Ambrose, 'Letters', trans. H. de Romestin, E. de Romestin and H.T.F. Duckworth, in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.) *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, series 2, volume 10* (Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans, 1896)

Ammianus Marcellinus, *History*, trans. J.C. Rolfe, 3 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939-1950)

Ammianus Marcellinus, *The Later Roman Empire (AD 354-378)*, ed. and trans. Walter Hamilton (London: Penguin Books, 2004)

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. H. Rackham (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989)

Arnobius, 'Adversus Nationes' in Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (eds.) *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Fathers down to AD 325, vol.6* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1951)

Athanasius, 'Against the Arians' in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.) *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, series 2, volume IV* (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1892)

Athanasius, 'Apology to Constantius', trans. M. Atkinson and Archibald Robertson, in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. 4.* (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1892)

Augustine, 'City of God', trans. Marcus Dods, in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.), *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Series 2, Volume II* (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1887)

Augustine, 'Letters', trans. J.G. Cunningham, in Philip Schaff (ed.) *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series volume 1* (Michigan: W.R. Eerdmans, 1956)

Augustine, 'On the Soul and its Origin', trans. Peter Holmes and Robert Ernest Wallis, in Philip Schaff (ed.) *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series volume 5* (Michigan: W.R. Eerdmans, 1956)

Augustine, *Confessions*, ed. and trans. R.S. Pine-Coffin (Harmondsworth: Penguin Classics, 1961)

Augustine, *Contra Academicos, De Beata Vita, De Ordine, De Magistro, De Libero Arbitrio*, trans. W.M. Green and K. D. Daur (Turnholt: Brepols, 1970)

Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, ed. and trans. R. P. H. Green (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995)

Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights*, trans. J.C. Rolfe, 3 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927)

Aurelius Victor, *Liber De Caesaribus*, ed. and trans. H. W. Bird, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1994)

Ausonius, *Works*, ed. and trans. Hugh G. Evelyn-White, vol.2 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921)

Basil, 'On Greek Literature' in *Letters, vol. 4*, trans. Roy J. Deferrari (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934), 378-436

Basil, *Letters*, ed. and trans. Roy J. Deferrari, 4 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928-1934)

Cassiodorus, 'An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings' as cited in Michael Maas, *Readings in Late Antiquity, A Sourcebook*, Second Edition (London: Routledge, 2010), 74

Cassiodorus, *Institutions of Divine and Secular Learning and On the Soul*, ed. and trans. James W. Halporn, and Mark. Vessey (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004)

Cassius Dio, *Roman History*, ed. and trans. Earnest Cary, 9 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927)

Claudius Mamertinus, 'Gratiarum Actio Juliano Augusto' in J.P. Migne (ed. and trans.), *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, vol. 18 (Turnholt: Brepols, 1848)

Claudius Mamertinus, 'Speech of Thanks to Julian' in: C.E.V. Nixon and Barbara Saylor (eds. and trans.), *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 386-436

Clement, 'Opera Omnia' in J.P. Migne (ed. and trans.), *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, vol. 8 (Turnholt: Brepolis, 1857)

Clement, 'The Stromata, or Miscellanies', trans. William Wilson, in Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (eds.) *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Fathers down to AD 325, vol.2* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1951)

Cyprian, 'Epistles', trans. Robert Ernest Wallis, in Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (eds.) *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Fathers down to AD 325, vol.5* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1951)

Cyril, *Against Julian* <accessed via

http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/cyril_against_julian_02_book2.htm > 16/12/16

Demegoria Constantii, in Themistius, *Politics, Philosophy, and Empire in the Fourth Century: Select Orations of Themistius*, trans. Peter Heather and David Moncur (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2001), 108-114

Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses*, ed. and trans. J.W. Cohoon, 5 vols., (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939)

Epictetus, *Discourses*, trans. W. A. Oldfather, 2 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925-1928)

Eunapius, *Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists*, ed. and trans. Wilmer Cave Wright (London: W. Heinemann, 1921)

Eusebius, 'Church History', trans. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.), *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Series 2, Volume 1* (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1890)

Eusebius, 'Life of Constantine', trans. Ernest Cushing Richardson, in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.) *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, series 2, volume I* (Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans, 1952)

Eusebius, *Demonstratio Evangelica*, trans. W. J. Ferrar (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1981)

Firmicus Maternus, *The Error of the Pagan Religions*, ed. and trans. Clarence A. Forbes (New York: Newman Press, 1970)

Gregory of Nazianzus, 'Carmina ad Seleucum' as cited in Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Gregory of Nazianzus, Rhetor and Philosopher* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969; reprint 2003), 165

Gregory of Nazianzus, 'Epistulae' in J.P. Migne (ed. and trans.), *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, vol. 37 (Turnholt: Brepolis, 1862)

Gregory of Nazianzus, 'Letters', trans. Charles Gordon Browne and James Edward Swallow, in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.) *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, series 2, volume VII* (Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans, 1953)

Gregory of Nazianzus, 'Opera Omnia' in J.P. Migne (ed. and trans.), *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, vol. 35 (Turnholt: Brepolis, 1857)

Gregory of Nazianzus, 'Opera Omnia' in J.P. Migne (ed. and trans.), *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, vol. 36 (Turnholt: Brepolis, 1858)

Gregory of Nazianzus, 'Oration 4: First Invective Against Julian' in C.W. King (ed. and trans.) *Julian the Emperor* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1888), 1-85 <accessed via http://www.ccel.org/ccel/pearse/morefathers/files/gregory_nazianzen_2_oration4.htm> 16/12/16

Gregory of Nazianzus, 'Oration 5: Second Invective Against Julian' in C.W. King (ed. and trans.) *Julian the Emperor* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1888), 86-121 <accessed via http://www.ccel.org/ccel/pearse/morefathers/files/gregory_nazianzen_3_oration5.htm> 16/12/16

Gregory of Nazianzus, 'Orations', trans. Charles Gordon Browne and James Edward Swallow, in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.) *A Select Library of the Nicene and*

Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, series 2, volume VII (Michigan: W.B. Eerdmans, 1953)

Gregory of Nazianzus, *Autobiographical Poems*, ed. and trans. Carolinne White (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Gregory of Nazianzus, *The Fathers of the Church, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, Select Orations*, trans. Martha Vinson (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2003)

Gregory of Nyssa, *Gregory of Nyssa: the Letters*, trans. Anna M. Silvas (Leiden: Brill, 2006)

Gregory the Great, 'Epistulae' in J.P. Migne (ed. and trans.), *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*, vol. 77 (Turnholt: Brepolis, 1862)

Gregory the Great, 'Letter 2 to Bishop Desiderius of Vienne' as cited in Michael Maas, *Readings in Late Antiquity, A Sourcebook*, Second Edition (London: Routledge, 2010), 71

Himerius, *Man and the Word, the Orations of Himerius*, ed. and trans. Robert J. Penella (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007)

Historia Augusta, trans. David Magie, vol. 1 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921)

II Maccabees, ed. and trans. Jonathan A. Goldstein (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983)

Jerome, 'Apology for Himself Against the Books of Rufinus', trans. W.H. Fremantle, in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.) *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, series 2, volume III* (Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans, 1953)

Jerome, 'Epistulae' in J.P. Migne (ed. and trans.), *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, vol. 30 (Turnholt: Brepolis, 1865)

Jerome, 'Letters', trans. W.H. Fremantle, G. Lewis and W.G. Martley, in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.) *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, series 2, volume VI* (Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans, 1953)

Jerome, *Commentary on Galatians*, trans. Andrew Cain (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2010)

John Chrysostom, 'On Vainglory' in M.L.W. Laistner, *Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967), 85-122

John Malalas, *The Chronicle of John Malalas*, ed. and trans. Elizabeth Jeffreys, Michael Jeffreys, Roger Scott and Brian Coke (Melbourne: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1986)

Julian, *The Works of the Emperor Julian*, ed. and trans. Wilmer Cave Wright, 3 vols. (London: William Heinemann, 1913)

Justin Martyr, 'Apology', trans. Marcus Dods and George Reith, in Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (eds.) *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Fathers down to AD 325, vol. 1* (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885.)

Justinian, 'The Whole Body of the Law' in *The Digest of Justinian*, ed. and trans. Alan Watson (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998)

Lactantius, 'Divine Institutes' in Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (eds.) *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Fathers down to AD 325, vol.7* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1951)

Libanius, *Antioch as a Centre of Hellenic Culture as Observed by Libanius*, ed. and trans. A. F. Norman (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000)

Libanius, *Autobiography and Selected Letters*, ed. and trans. A.F. Norman, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992)

Libanius, *Between City and School, Selected Orations of Libanius*, ed. and trans. Raffaella Cribiore (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015)

Libanius, *Libanii Opera*, ed. and trans. Richard Foerster, 12 vols. (Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1903-1927)

Libanius, *Libanius's Progymnasmata: Model Exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, ed. and trans. Craig A. Gibson (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008)

Libanius, *Selected Letters* in Raffaella Cribiore, 'Appendix One' in *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 233-321

- Libanius, *Selected Letters of Libanius, from the age of Constantius and Julian*, ed. and trans. Scott Bradbury (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004)
- Libanius, *Selected Works with an English Translation*, ed. and trans. A.F. Norman, 2 vols. (London: William Heinemann, 1969)
- Lucian ‘The Dream, or Lucian’s Career’ in A.M. Harmon (ed. and trans.) *Lucian, volume 3* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921)
- Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, ed. and trans. Robert A. Kaster, 3 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011)
- Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*, trans. C. R. Haines (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1916)
- Marinus of Samaria, *The Life of Proclus, or Concerning Happiness*, trans. Kenneth S. Guthrie (Grand Rapids, MI.: Phanes Press, 1986)
- Menander, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, ed. and trans. John Maxwell Edmonds, vol. IIIB (Leiden: Brill, 1961)
- Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, trans. T. R. Glover and Gerald H. Rendall (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931)
- Origen, ‘Contra Celsum’, trans. Frederick Crombie, in Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (eds.) *Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. 4* (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885)
- Origen, ‘Letter to Gregory’, ed. and trans. Allan Menzies, *Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 9* (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1896)
- Orosius, *Seven Books of History Against the Pagans*, trans. Andrew Fear (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2010)
- Philostorgius, *Ecclesiastical History*, trans. Edward Walfrod (London: Bohn, 1855)
- Philostratus, *Lives of the Sophists*, ed. and trans. Wilmer Cave Wright (London: W. Heinemann, 1921)

Plato, *Laws*, ed. and trans. R.G. Bury, 2 vols., (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984)

Plato, *Republic*, ed. and trans. Paul Shorey, 2 vols. (Cambridge, MA: William Heinemann Ltd, 1969)

Plutarch, 'How the Young Man Should Study Poetry', in Frank Cole Babbitt (ed.), *Moralia, volume 1* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927)

Plutarch, 'How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend', in Frank Cole Babbitt (ed.), *Moralia, vol. 1* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927)

Plutarch, *Roman Lives, A Selection of eight Roman Lives*, trans. Robin Waterfield, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

ps-Justin, 'Exhortation to the Greeks', trans. Marcus Dods. in Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (eds.) *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Fathers down to AD 325, vol. 1* (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885.)

ps-Justin, *Cohortatio ad Graecos, De Monarchia, Oratio ad Graecos*, ed. and trans. Miroslav Marcovich (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1990)

Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, ed. and trans. H.E. Butler, 4 vols. (London: Heinemann, 1933)

Rufinus, 'The Apology of Rufinus', trans. W.H. Fremantle, in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.) *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, series 2, volume III* (Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans, 1953)

Salvian, 'Opera Omnia' in J.P. Migne (ed. and trans.), *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, vol. 53 (Turnholt: Brepolis, 1847)

Salvian, *De gubernatione Dei*, as cited in Brown, Peter, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity, Towards a Christian Empire* (Wisconsin: Wisconsin University Press, 1992), 27

Seneca, *Epistles*, ed. and trans. Richard M. Gummere, 3 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1917)

Socrates, 'Church History from AD 305-439', trans. A.C. Zenos, in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.) *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, series 2, volume II* (Michigan: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1957)

Sophronius, *Los Thaumata de Sofronio: contribución al estudio de la incubatio cristiana*, trans. Fernandez Marcos (Madrid: Instituto Antonio de Nebrija, 1975)

Sozemenus, 'Church History from AD 323-425', trans. Chester D. Hartranft, in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.) *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, series 2, volume II* (Michigan: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1957)

Suetonius, *Lives of the Caesars, vol. 1*, trans. J. C. Rolfe (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914)

Synesius, *The Essays and Hymns of Synesius of Cyrene Including the Address to the Emperor Arcadius and the Political Speeches, 2 vols.*, trans. Augustine Fitzgerald (London: Oxford University Press, 1930)

Tertullian, 'On Idolatry', trans. S. Thelwall, in Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (eds.) *Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 3* (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885)

Tertullian, 'On the Pallium', trans. S. Thelwall, in Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (eds.), *Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 4* (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885)

Tertullian, 'Prescription against Heretics', trans. Peter Holmes, in Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (eds.) *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Fathers down to AD 325, vol.3* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1951)

The Greek Anthology, ed. and trans. W.R. Paton, vol.1 (London: W. Heinemann, 1916)

The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, Authorised King James Version (Edinburgh: William Collins, 1958)

The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, ed. and trans. AHM Jones and JR Martindale, vol.1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971)

The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions, trans. Clyde Pharr (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952)

Themistius, *Politics, Philosophy, and Empire in the Fourth Century: Select Orations of Themistius*, trans. Peter Heather and David Moncur (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2001)

Themistius, *The Private Orations of Themistius*, ed. and trans. Robert J. Penella (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000)

Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History*, trans. Bloomfield Jackson, in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.) *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, series 2, volume III* (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1892)

Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, trans. Johann Raeder (Stuttgart: B.G. Teubneri, 1969)

Zosimus, *New History*, trans. Ronald T. Ridley (Sydney: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1982)

Secondary sources

Adams, J. N., *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

Anderson, Graham, 'Lucian's Classics: Some short cuts to culture' in *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 23 (1976), 59-68

Armstrong, A.H., 'The Way and the Ways: Religious Tolerance and Intolerance in the Fourth Century A.D.' in *Vigiliae Christianae*, 38.1 (1984), 1-17

Athanassiadi, Polymnia, *Julian, An Intellectual Biography* (London: Routledge, 1992)

Athanassiadi, Polymnia, 'From polis to Theoupolis: school syllabuses and teaching methods in late antiquity' in *Thymiama, stê mnêmê tês Laskarina Bouras, vol. I* (Athens: Benaki Museum, 1994), 9-14

Athanassiadi, Polymnia, 'Hellenism: a theological *koine*' in V. Karageorghis (ed.), *The Greeks beyond the Aegean: from Marseilles to Bactria*, papers presented to an International Symposium held at the Onassis Cultural Centre, New York, 12 October 2002 (New York: Alexander S. Onassis Public Benefit Foundation, 2003), 189-207

Athanassiadi, Polymnia, 'Christians and others: the conversion ethos in late antiquity' in A. Papaconstantinou, N. McLynn and D.L. Schwartz (eds.), *Conversion in Late Antiquity: Christianity, Islam, and Beyond* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), 23-47

Baker-Brian, Nicholas, and Shaun Tougher, 'Introduction', in Baker-Brian, Nicholas, & Shaun Tougher (eds.), *Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate* (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2012), xiii-xxi

Banchich, Thomas M., 'On Goulet's Chronology of Eunapius' Life and Works' in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 107 (1987), 164-167

Banchich, Thomas M., 'Julian's School Laws: *Cod. Theod.* 13.3.5 and *Ep.* 42' in *Ancient World* 24.1 (1993), 5-14

Banchich, Thomas M., 'Eunapius in Athens' in *Phoenix*, 50.3 (1996), 304-311

Barnes, Timothy David, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971)

Barnes, T.D., 'Himerius and the Fourth Century' in *Classical Philology*, 82.3 (1987), 206-225

Barnes, Timothy D., *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981; repr. 1996)

Barnes, Timothy D., *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998)

Barns, John, 'A New Gnomologium: With Some Remarks on Gnomonic Anthologies (I)' in *CQ*, 44 (1950), 126-137

Barns, John, 'A New Gnomologium: With Some Remarks on Gnomonic Anthologies (II)' in *CQ*, New Series vol.1 (1951), 1-19

Bernardi, J., 'Un réquisitoire: Les *Invectives contre Julien* de Grégoire de Nazianze' in R. Braun and J. Richer (eds.), *L'Empereur Julien, De l'histoire à la légende* (Paris: Les Belles-Lettres, 1978), 89-98

Bidez, J., *La Vie de l'Empereur Julien* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1930)

Bidez, J., and F. Cumont, *Epistulae, leges, poematia, fragmenta varia* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1922)

Birley, Anthony, *Marcus Aurelius, A Biography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987)

Bouffartigue, Jean, *L'Empereur Julien et la culture de son temps* (Paris: Collection des Etudes Augustiennes, 1992)

Bouffartigue, Jean, 'L'authenticité de la Lettre 84 de l'empereur Julien' in *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes*, 79 (2005), 231-242

Bourdieu, Pierre, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977 [2013 reprint])

Bowersock, G.W., *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)

Bowersock, G.W., *Julian the Apostate* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978)

Bowersock, G.W., 'Julian', in *The Classical Review*, 33 (1983a), 81-83

Bowersock, G.W., 'Review of Polymnia Athanassiadi-Fowden *Julian and Hellenism: An Intellectual Biography*', in *The American Historical Review*, 88.1 (1983b), 90-91

Bowersock, G.W., *Hellenism in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)

Bowie, E.L., 'Hellenes and Hellenism in Writers of the Early Second Sophistic' in S. Said (ed.), *ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΜΟΣ: quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 183-204

Bradbury, Scott, 'Constantine and the Problem of Anti-Pagan Legislation in the Fourth Century' in *Classical Philology*, 89.2 (1994), 120-139

- Bradbury, Scott, 'Julian's Pagan Revival and the Decline of Blood Sacrifice' in *Phoenix*, 49.4 (1995), 331-356
- Bradbury, Scott, 'Libanius' Networks' in Lieve Van Hoof (ed.), *Libanius: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 220-240
- Brauch, Thomas, 'Themistius and the Emperor Julian' in *Byzantion: revue internationales des etudes Byzantines*, 63 (1993), 79-115
- Braun R., and J. Richer (eds.), *L'Empereur Julien, De l'histoire à la légende* (Paris: Les Belles-Lettres, 1978)
- Bregman, Jay, 'Julian the Byzantine and Synesius the Hellene' in *The Ancient World*, 29.2 (1998), 127-138
- Brown, Peter, *The Making of Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978)
- Brown, Peter, 'The Last Pagan Emperor: Robert Browning's *The Emperor Julian*' in Peter Brown (ed.), *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 83-102
- Brown, Peter, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity, Towards a Christian Empire* (Wisconsin: Wisconsin University Press, 1992)
- Brown, Peter, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967 [2000 reprint])
- Brown, Peter, 'SO debate: The World of Late Antiquity revisited' in *Symbolae Osloenses* 72.1 (1997), 5-30
- Browning, Robert, *The Emperor Julian* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1975)
- Cabouret, Bernadette, 'Libanius' Letters', in Lieve Van Hoof (ed.), *Libanius: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 144-159
- Cameron, Alan, 'Julian and Hellenism', in *The Ancient World*, 24 (1993a), 25-29
- Cameron, Alan, *The Greek Anthology, from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993b)

- Cameron, Alan, *The Last Pagans of Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Cameron, Averil, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire, The Development of Christian Discourse* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991)
- Cameron, Averil, 'Education and literary culture' in Cameron, Averil and Peter Garnsey (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History Volume 13: The Late Empire, AD 337–425* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 665-707
- Canfora, Luciano, 'Ideologies of Hellenism' in George Boys-Stones, Barbara Graziosi, and Phiroze Vasunia (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Hellenic Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 173-179
- Castrén, Paavo, 'General Aspects of Life in Post-Herulian Athens', in Paavo Castrén (ed.), *Post-Herulian Athens, Aspects of Life and Culture in Athens A.D. 267-529* (Helsinki: Suomen Ateenan-instituutin säätiö, 1994), 1-14
- Chadwick, Henry, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition, Studies in Justin, Clement, and Origen* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966)
- Chadwick, H., 'Florilegium' in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 7 (1969), 1131-59
- Clark, Donald Lemen, *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education* (New York: Columbia University, 1957)
- Clark, Gillian, *Christianity and Roman Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)
- Corke-Webster, James, 'A Man for the Times: Jesus and the Abgar Correspondence in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Ecclesiastical History*' in *The Harvard Theological Review*, forthcoming 2017
- Cribiore, Raffaella, 'Review of Teresa Morgan *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*', in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, (May 22 1999)
- Cribiore, Raffaella, 'The Grammarian's Choice: The Popularity of Euripides' *Phoenissae* in Hellenistic and Roman Education' in Y.L. Too (ed.), *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 2001a), 241-259

- Cribiore, Raffaella, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001b)
- Cribiore, Raffaella, 'Lucian, Libanius, and the Short Road to Rhetoric' in *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, 47 (2007a), 71-86
- Cribiore, Raffaella, *The School of Libanius* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007b)
- Cribiore, Raffaella, 'The Value of a Good Education: Libanius and Public Authority' in Philip Rousseau (ed.), *A Companion to Late Antiquity* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 233-245
- Cribiore, Raffaella, *Libanius the Sophist: rhetoric, reality and religion in the fourth century* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013)
- Cribiore, Raffaella, *Between City and School, Selected Orations of Libanius*, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015)
- Curta, Florin, 'Language, Ἔθνη, and National Gods: A Note on Julian's Concept of Hellenism' in *The Ancient World*, 33.1 (2002), 3-19
- Demoen, Kristoffel, *Pagan and Biblical Exempla in Gregory Nazianzen, A Study in Rhetoric and Hermeneutics* (Turnholt: Brepolis, 1996)
- Downey, Glanville, 'Julian the Apostate at Antioch' in *Church History* 8.4 (1939), 303-315
- Downey, Glanville, 'The Emperor Julian and the Schools' in *The Classical Journal*, 53.3 (1957a), 97-103
- Downey, Glanville, 'Education in the Christian Roman Empire: Christian and pagan theories under Constantine and his successors' in *Speculum*, 32 (1957b), 48-61
- Drinkwater, John, 'The "Pagan Underground", Constantius II's "Secret Service", and the Survival, and the Usurpation of Julian the Apostate' in Carl Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History III* (Bruxelles: Latomus, 1983), 348-387

- Droge, A.J., 'Self-Definition vis-à-vis the Graeco-Roman World' in Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young (eds.), *Cambridge History of Christianity, vol. I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 230-244
- Droge, Arthur J., 'Justin Martyr and the Restoration of Philosophy' in *Church History*, 56.3 (1987), 303-319
- Eilers, C., *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Elm, Susanna, 'Orthodoxy and the True Philosophical Life: Julian and Gregory of Nazianzus' in *Studia Patristica*, 37 (2001), 69-85
- Elm, S., 'Hellenism and Historiography: Gregory of Nazianzus and Julian in Dialogue' in *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 33.3 (2003), 493-515
- Elm, Susanna, 'Gregory of Nazianzus's *Life of Julian* revisited (*Or.* 4 and 5): the art of governance by invective' in Scott McGill (ed.), *From the Tetrarchs to the Theodosians, Later Roman History and Culture 284-450 CE* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 171-182
- Elm, Susanna, *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus and the Vision of Rome* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012)
- Elsner, Jaś, 'Sacrifice in late Roman art' in Christopher A. Faraone and F.S. Naiden (eds.), *Greek and Roman Animal Sacrifice, Ancient Victim, Modern Observers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 120-163
- Elsner, Jaś, 'Paideia: Ancient Concept and Modern Reception' in *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 20.4 (2013), 136-152
- Faraone, Christopher A, and F.S. Naiden, 'Introduction' in Christopher A. Faraone and F.S. Naiden (eds.), *Greek and Roman Animal Sacrifice, Ancient Victim, Modern Observers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 1-10
- Farkas, Zoltán, 'Socrates Scholasticus on Greek *Paideia*' in *Acta Antiqua*, 45 (2005), 187-192

- Festugière, A.J., *Antioche païenne et chrétienne, Libanius, Chrysostome et les moines de Syrie. Avec un commentaire archéologique sur l'Antiochikos* (Paris: Boccard, 1956)
- Fowden, Garth, 'The Pagan Holy Man in Late Antique Society' in *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 102 (1982), 33-59
- Fowden, Garth, 'The Athenian agora and the progress of Christianity' in *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 3 (1990) 494-501
- Frantz, Alison, 'A Public Building of Late Antiquity in Athens (IG² 5205)' in *Hesperia*, 48.2 (1979), 194-203
- Gane, Jennifer *Fourth Century Christian Education: An Analysis of Basil's Ad Adolescentes* (unpublished doctoral thesis, Newcastle University, 2012)
- Gemeinhardt, Peter, 'In Search of Christian Paideia, Education and Conversion in Early Christian Biography' in *Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum*, 16 (2012), 88-98
- Germino, Emilio, *Scuola e cultura nella legislazione di Giuliano l'Apostata* (Napoli: Eugenio Jovene, 2004)
- Gibson, Craig A., *Libanius's Progymnasmata: Model Exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008)
- Gibson, Craig A., 'Libanius' *Progymnasmata*' in Lieve Van Hoof (ed.) *Libanius: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 128-143
- Gleason, Maud W., 'Festive Satire: Julian's Misopogon and the New Year at Antioch' in *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 76 (1986), 106-119
- Gleason, Maud, *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995)
- Goldhill, Simon, 'Introduction, Setting an agenda: "Everything is Greece to the Wise"' in Simon Goldhill, (ed.) *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 1-25

- Goulet, R., 'Sur la chronologie de la vie et des oeuvres d'Eunape de Sardes' in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 100 (1980), 60-72
- Greenwood, David Neal, 'Five Latin Inscriptions from Julian's Pagan Restoration' in *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 57.2 (2014), 101-119
- Hall, Linda Jones, *Roman Berytus, Beirut in Late Antiquity* (London: Routledge, 2004)
- Hardy, B. Carmon, 'The Emperor Julian and His School Law', in *Church History*, 37.2 (1968), 131-143
- Harries, Jill, 'The Roman Imperial Quaestor from Constantine to Theodosius II' in *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 78 (1988), 148-172
- Harris, William V., *Restraining Rage: the ideology of anger control in classical antiquity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001)
- Heather, Peter and David Moncur, *Politics, Philosophy, and Empire in the Fourth Century: Select Orations of Themistius* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2001)
- Heather, Peter, 'Senators and senate' in Cameron, Averil and Peter Garnsey (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History Volume 13: The Late Empire, AD 337-425* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 184-210
- Henck, Nick, 'Constantius' *Paideia*, Intellectual Milieu and Promotion of the Liberal Arts.' *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 47 (2001), 172-87
- Hunt, David, 'Julian and Marcus Aurelius' in Doreen Innes, Harry Hine and Christopher Pelling (eds.), *Ethics and Rhetoric, Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-fifth Birthday* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 287-298
- Jacobs, Andrew S., 'What Has Rome to do with Bethlehem?' Cultural Capital(s) and Religious Imperialism in Late Ancient Christianity' in *Classical Receptions Journal*, 3.1 (2011) 29-45
- Jaeger, Werner, *Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture*, trans. Gilbert Highet, vol. 1 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1939)

- Jaeger, Werner, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962)
- Jaeger, Werner, *Paideia: the ideals of Greek Culture*, trans. Gilbert Highet, vol. 2 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1943 [1976 reprint])
- Johnson, Aaron P., 'Greek Ethnicity in Eusebius' "Praeparatio Evangelica" in *The American Journal of Philology*, 128.1 (2007), 95-118
- Johnson, Aaron P., 'Hellenism and its Discontents' in Scott Fitzgerald Johnson (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 437-466
- Jones, A.H.M., *The Later Roman Empire 284-602: A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1964)
- Jones, A.H.M., *The Greek City, from Alexander to Justinian* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979)
- Kaldellis, Anthony, *Hellenism in Byzantium, The Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)
- Kaster, Robert A., *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988)
- Kelly, Christopher, 'Emperors, Government and Bureaucracy' in Cameron, Averil and Peter Garnsey (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History Volume 13: The Late Empire, AD 337–425* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 138-183
- Kelly, Gavin, *Ammianus Marcellinus, The Allusive Historian* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)
- Kelly, J.N.D., *Jerome, His Life, Writings and Controversies* (London: Duckworth, 1975)
- Kennedy, George A., *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983)
- Kennedy, George, *Quintilian* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1969)

Lamberton, Robert, *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986)

Lamberton, Robert, 'Review of Raffaella Cribiore *Gymnastics of the Mind*', in *The Classical Journal*, 100.1 (2004), 107-110

Lane Fox, Robin, *Pagans and Christians in the Mediterranean World from the Second Century AD to the Conversion of Constantine* (Harmondsworth: Viking, 1986)

Lauwers, Jeroen, 'Reading Books, Talking Culture: The Performance of *Paideia* in Imperial Greek Literature' in E. Minchin (ed.), *Orality, Literacy and Performance in the Ancient World, volume 9* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 227-244

Lepelley, Claude, 'The Use of Secularised Latin Pagan Culture by Christians', in Gwyn, David M., and Susanne Bangert (eds.) *Religious Diversity in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 475-492

Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G., *Antioch: City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972)

Limberis, Vasiliki, "'Religion" as the Cipher for Identity: The Cases of Emperor Julian, Libanius, and Gregory Nazianzus' in *The Harvard Theological Review*, 93.4 (2000), 373-400

Ludlow, Morwenna, 'Texts, Teachers and Pupils in the Writings of Gregory of Nyssa' in Lieve Van Hoof and Peter Van Nuffelen (eds.), *Literature and Society in the Fourth Century AD, Performing Paideia, Constructing the Present, Presenting the Self* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 83-102

Ma, John, *Antiochos III and the cities of Western Asia Minor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)

MacMullen, Ramsay, 'Some Pictures in Ammianus Marcellinus' in *The Art Bulletin*, 46 (1964), 435-455

Mallan, Christopher, 'Parrhêsia in Cassius Dio' in Carsten Hjort Lange and Jesper Majbom Madsen (eds.), *Cassius Dio, Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 258-275

- Marcone, Arnaldo, 'Late Roman social relations' in Cameron, Averil and Peter Garnsey (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History Volume 13: The Late Empire, AD 337–425* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 338-370
- Marcos, Mar, "'He Forced with Gentleness" Emperor Julian's Attitude to Religious Coercion' in *Antiquite Tardive*, 17 (2009), 191-204
- Marrou, Henri-Irénée, *ΜΟΥΣΙΚΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ: Etude sur les Scènes de la Vie Intellectuelle figurant sur les Monuments Funéraires Romains* (Grenoble: Didier & Richard, 1938a)
- Marrou, H-I. *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* (Paris: Editions de Boccard, 1938b)
- Marrou, H.I., *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (London: Sheed and Ward, 1956)
- Martens, Peter, *Origen and Scripture: The Contours of the Exegetical Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)
- Matthews, John, *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court, AD 364-425* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975)
- Matthews, John, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus* (London: Duckworth, 1989)
- Matthews, J.F., 'The Origin of Ammianus' in *The Classical Quarterly*, 44.1 (1994), 252-269
- Matthews, John, *Laying Down the Law: A Study of the Theodosian Code* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001)
- McLynn, Neil, 'The Manna from Uncle: Basil of Caesarea's *Address to Young Men*' in Christopher Kelly, Richard Flower and Michael Stuart Williams (eds.), *Unclassical Traditions, Volume 1: Alternatives to the Classical Past in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 106-118
- McLynn, Neil, 'Julian and the Christian Professors' in Carol Harrison, Caroline Humfress and Isabella Sandwell (eds.), *Being Christian in Late Antiquity, A Festschrift for Gillian Clark* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 120-136

McLynn, Neil, 'Gregory's Governors: *Paideia* and Patronage in Cappadocia' in Lieve Van Hoof and Peter Van Nuffelen (eds.), *Literature and Society in the Fourth Century AD, Performing Paideia, Constructing the Present, Presenting the Self* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 48-67

Millar, Fergus, *The Emperor in the Roman World, 31BC-AD337* (London: Duckworth, 1977)

Momigliano, A., 'Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century' in Arnaldo Momigliano (ed.), *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 79-99

Momigliano, Arnaldo, 'Freedom of Speech in Antiquity' in Philip Paul Wiener (ed.) *The Dictionary of the History of Ideas, Studies of Selected Pivotal Ideas, vol. 2* (New York: Scribner, 1973)

Morgan, Teresa, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

Nesselrath, Heinz-Gunther, 'Libanius and the literary tradition' in Lieve Van Hoof (ed.), *Libanius: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 241-267

Nesselrath, Heinz-Günther, *Iulianus Augustus, Iuliani Augusti Opera* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015)

Nock, Arthur Darby, *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933)

Nock, Arthur Darby, 'Conversion and Adolescence' in Zeph Stewart (ed.), *Arthur Darby Nock, Essays on Religion and the Ancient World, vol. I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 469-480

Norman, A.F., 'The Library of Libanius' in *Rheinisches museum für philologie*, 107.2 (1964), 158-175

Norman, A. F., *Antioch as a Centre of Hellenic Culture as Observed by Libanius* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000)

- Nutton, Vivian, 'Two Notes on Immunities: Digest 27, 1, 6, 10 and 11' in *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 61 (1971), 52-63
- Ogilvie, R. M., *The Library of Lactantius* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978)
- Penella, Robert J., *Man and the Word, the Orations of Himerius* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007)
- Petit, Paul, *Les étudiants de Libanius* (Paris: Nouvelles Editions latines, 1957)
- Preston, Rebecca, 'Roman Questions, Greek Answers: Plutarch and the Construction of Identity' in Simon Goldhill, (ed.) *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 86-119
- Quiroga, Alberto, 'From *Sophistopolis* to *Episcopopolis*. The Case for a Third Sophistic' in *The Journal for Late Antique Religion and Culture*, 1 (2007), 31-42
- Quiroga, Alberto, 'Julian's *Misopogon* and the Subversion of Rhetoric' in *Antiquite Tardive*, 17 (2009), 127-135
- Rives, J.B., 'The Decree of Decius and the Religion of Empire' in *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 89 (1999), 135-154
- Rives, James B., 'The Theology of Animal Sacrifice in the Ancient Greek World: Origins and Developments' in Wright Knust, Jennifer, and Zsuzsanna Várhelyi (eds.), *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 187-202
- Robert, Louis, *Hellenica IV: Epigrammes du Bas-Empire* (Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1948)
- Roueché Charlotte, *Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity* (London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, 1989)
- Rousseau, Philip, *Basil of Caesarea* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994)
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford, *Gregory of Nazianzus, Rhetor and Philosopher* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969; reprint 2003)

Saddington, Denis B., 'Paideia, politea and hegemonia: a route of social advancement in the early empire' in Basson, André F., and William J. Dominik (eds.), *Literature, art, history: studies on classical antiquity and tradition in honour of W. J. Henderson* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2003), 323-339

Sallaz, Jeffrey J. and Jane Zavisca, 'Bourdeiu in American Sociology, 1980-2004', in *The Annual Review of Sociology*, 33 (2007), 21-41

Saracino, Stefania, 'La Politica culturale dell'Imperatore Giuliano attraverso il *Cod. Th.* XIII 3,5 e l'*Ep.* 61' in *Aevum*, 76 (2002), 123-141

Seeck, Otto, *Die Briefe des Libanius* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1906)

Ševčenko, Ihor, 'A Late Antique Epigram and the So-Called Elder Magistrate from Aphrodisias' in André Grabar (ed.), *Synthronon: Art et archéologie de la fin de l'Antiquité et du moyen âge* (Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1968), 29-41

Ševčenko, Ihor, 'A Shadow Outline of Virtue: The Classical Heritage of Greek Christian Literature (Second to Seventh Century)' in Weitzmann, Kurt (ed.) *The Age of Spirituality: A Symposium* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1980)

Smith, R.R.R., 'The Statue Monument of Oecumenius: A New Portrait of a Late Antique Governor from Aphrodisias' in *JRS*, 92 (2002), 134-156

Smith, Rowland, *Julian's Gods: Religion and Philosophy in the thought and action of Julian the Apostate* (London: Routledge, 1995)

Smith, Rowland, 'Telling tales: Ammianus' narrative of the Persian expedition of Julian' in Jan Willem Drijvers and David Hunt (eds.), *The Late Roman World and its Historian: Interpreting Ammianus Marcellinus* (London: Routledge, 1999), 89-104

Smith, Rowland, 'Measures of Difference: The Fourth-Century Transformation of the Roman Imperial Court' in *American Journal of Philology*, 132.1 (2011a), 125-151

Smith, Rowland, 'The Casting of Julian the Apostate 'in the likeness' of Alexander the Great: a topos in antique historiography and its modern echoes' in *Histos*, 5 (2011b), 44-106

- Smith, Rowland, 'Serious Fun in a Potted History at the *Saturnalia*? Some Imperial Portraits in Julian the Apostate's *Caesars*, a Medallion-Image of Julian and the 'Gallienae Augustae' Aurei' in *Histos*, 7 (2013), 205-68
- Stenger, Jan R., 'Libanius and the "game" of Hellenism', in Lieve Van Hoof (ed.) *Libanius: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 268-292
- Swain, Simon, *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50-250* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)
- Swain, Simon, 'Biography and Biographic in the Literature of the Roman Empire' in M. J. Edwards and Simon Swain (eds.), *Portraits: biographical representation in the Greek and Latin literature of the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 1-38
- Swain, Simon, 'Sophists and Emperors: The Case of Libanius' in Simon Swain and Mark Edwards (eds.), *Approaching Late Antiquity, the Transformation from Early to Late Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)
- Teitler, H. C., *The Last Pagan Emperor: Julian the Apostate and the War against Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017)
- Too, Y.L., 'Introduction', in Y.L. Too (ed.), *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 1-21
- Tougher, Shaun, 'The Advocacy of an Empress: Julian and Eusebia' in *The Classical Quarterly*, 48.2 (1998), 595-599
- Tougher, Shaun, 'Ammianus and the eunuchs' in J. W. Drijvers and D. Hunt (eds.), *The Late Roman World and its Historian: Interpreting Ammianus Marcellinus* (London: Routledge, 1999), 64-73
- Tougher, Shaun, 'Ammianus Marcellinus on the Empress Eusebia: a Split Personality?' in *Greece & Rome*, 47.1 (2000), 94-101
- Tougher, Shaun, *Julian the Apostate* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007)

Tougher, Shaun, 'Reading between the Lines: Julian's *First Panegyric* on Constantius II', in Baker-Brian, Nicholas, & Shaun Tougher (eds.), *Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate* (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2012), 19-34

Van Dam, Raymond, *Kingdom of Snow, Roman Rule and Greek Culture in Cappadocia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002)

Van Hoof, Lieve, 'Greek Rhetoric and the Later Roman Empire. The Bubble of the "Third Sophistic"' in *Antiquité Tardive*, 18 (2010), 211-224

Van Hoof, Lieve, 'Performing *Paideia*: Greek Culture as an instrument for social promotion in the fourth century a.d.' in *The Classical Quarterly*, 63 (2013), 387-406

Van Hoof, Lieve, 'Libanius' Life and Life' in Lieve Van Hoof (ed.) *Libanius: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 7-38

Van Hoof, Lieve, and Peter Van Nuffelen, 'Monarchy and Mass Communication: Antioch AD 362/3 Revisited' in *Journal of Roman Studies*, 101 (2011), 166-184

Van Hoof, Lieve, and Peter Van Nuffelen "No Stories for Old Men": Damophilus of Bithynia and Plutarch in Julian's *Misopogon*' in A. J. Quiroga Puertas (ed.), *The Purpose of Rhetoric in Late Antiquity: From Performance to Exegesis* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 209-222

Van Hoof, Lieve, and Peter Van Nuffelen, 'The Social Role and Place of Literature in the Fourth Century AD' in Lieve Van Hoof and Peter Van Nuffelen (eds.), *Literature and Society in the Fourth Century AD, Performing Paideia, Constructing the Present, Presenting the Self* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 1-15

Van Nuffelen, Peter, 'Deux Fausses Lettres de Julien L'Apostat (La lettre aux juifs, ep. 51 [Wright], et la lettre à Arsacius, ep. 84 [Bidez])' in *Vigiliae Christianae*, 55 (2002), 131-150

Vanderspoel, John, *Themistius and the Imperial Court: Oratory, Civic Duty, and Paideia from Constantius to Theodosius* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995)

- Ward-Perkins, Bryan, 'The Cities', in Cameron, Averil and Peter Garnsey (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History Volume 13: The Late Empire, AD 337–425* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 371-410
- Watts, Edward, *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006)
- Watts, Edward, 'Education: Thinking, Speaking and Socializing' in Scott Fitzgerald Johnson (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 467-486
- Watts, Edward, *The Final Pagan Generation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015)
- Wenzel, Aaron, 'Libanius, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Ideal of Athens in Late Antiquity' in *The Journal of Late Antiquity*, 3.2 (2010), 264-285
- Whitmarsh, Tim, *The Second Sophistic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)
- Wiemer, Hans-Ulrich, *Libanius und Julian: Studien zum Verhältnis von Rhetorik und Politik im vierten Jahrhundert n. Chr.* (Munich: Beck, 1995)
- Williams, Megan Hale, *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006)
- Wilson, N.G., *Saint Basil on the Value of Greek Literature* (London: Duckworth, 1975)
- Wilson, N.G., *Scholars of Byzantium* (London: Duckworth, 1983)
- Wright, Wilmer C., *Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists* (London: W. Heinemann, 1921)
- Wright, Wilmer C., *The Works of the Emperor Julian, III* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1923)