Serving the *Patris* in the Roman Empire: Civic Patriotism in Basil of Caesarea, the Emperor Julian, and Gregory Nazianzus

Thomas Robert Langley

Peterhouse

14th August 2021

This thesis is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

This thesis is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration except as declared in the preface and specified in the text. It is not substantially the same as any that I have submitted or is being concurrently submitted for a degree or diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text. I further state that no substantial part of my dissertation has already been submitted, or is being concurrently submitted for any such degree, diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text. At 79,976 words it does not exceed the prescribed word limit for the Degree Committee of the Faculty of Classics.

Serving the *Patris* in the Roman Empire: Civic Patriotism in Basil of Caesarea, the Emperor Julian, and Gregory Nazianzus — Thomas Robert Langley, August 14th, 2021.

This thesis is a study of civic patriotism in the fourth-century Roman Empire in the East. Civic patriotism is often viewed as dead or irrelevant in late Antiquity. This thesis argues that civic patriotic language remained a powerful force, being endorsed, adapted and contested by a variety of elite thinkers, three of whom this thesis studies in detail. The thesis employs the methodology of a 'language of politics' to model this process of adaption, redefinition and contestation.

In particular, this thesis demonstrates that Julian and his Christian contemporaries addressed similar theological and political concerns and were part of the same debates – though providing different answers. At times, Julian's position on civic issues was closer to either Basil or Gregory than either of the two Christians were to each other. Religious allegiance thus did not entirely determine the intellectual positions even of committed late-antique religious reformers. Structurally, this thesis examines civic patriotism from three angles: a secular political language, a foil for religious reformers, and a way of linking local belonging and religious allegiance.

Firstly, elites adapted the language of civic patriotism to the new political circumstances of the expanded late Roman state. They refashioned service to the *patris* as participating in elite networks and promoting local men to government office, advertised in literary culture through letters, poems and panegyrics. This effort was cross-confessional. Julian's enthusiasm for civic patriotic language, rather than an anachronism that, reflected mainstream fourth-century political culture.

Secondly, however, ascetic and universalist ideas springing from contemporary philosophy offered significant challenges to the place of civic patriotic language in elite political thought. Basil and Gregory adapted civic terminology to describe heavenly, ecclesiastical, and monastic belonging. As a result, earthly *patris* had to be rejected entirely. By contrast, while Julian shared some of their theological assumptions due to his theology he did not reject the *patris* outright.

Thirdly, Basil, Julian, and Gregory attempted to combine these attitudes by elaborating a 'spiritualised' vision of civic patriotism. They claimed civic patriotism either for Christianity or for Neoplatonic paganism, redefining civic identity and rewrite elite obligations to encourage citizens to view their patriotic and religious duties as identical. This spiritualised form of patriotism had substantial later influence on the culture, politics and society of the medieval Christian world.

Overall, this thesis showcases the continuing significance of civic patriotic language in late Antiquity, and the productive tensions it fostered in political thought, practical politics, and religious culture.

Contents

Preface

‘There is no end to the making of books,’ says the Preacher of Ecclesiastes 12:12, ‘and much study is a weariness of the flesh.’ If I have been happy enough to have avoided such weariness in completing this thesis, I owe that primarily to the friends, colleagues and family members who have who have been so generous with their time and attention. It is the privilege of their company – and that of three fascinating men long dead – which has made research and writing such a pleasure.

First and foremost has been the excellent supervision of Christopher Kelly, whose attentive and incisive reading, comments and discussion have enriched my thinking and text from start to finish. His guidance has been invaluable in the fullest sense of the word. A close second has been the friendship and advice of the Impact of the Ancient City group, whose generosity, intelligence and criticism both as individuals and *in camera* made research and writing an unmitigated pleasure. The Early Medieval Citizenship Discourses Project in Utrecht were similarly generous hosts and colleagues.

As second supervisor, Dr Sophie Lunn-Rockliffe’s careful attention in my first- and second-year reviews greatly sharpened my ideas. The same is true of Andrew Wallace-Hadrill and Claudia Rapp as examiners, and I am likewise very grateful for their advice and criticism. My other academic debts are legion and it is a vain task to list them all. With that disclaimed I thank particularly Alex Abecina, Kay Boers, Eloise Davies, Marcus Ellis, George Koukouvasilis, Javi Martínez Jiménez, Sam Ottewill-Soulsby, Helen and Robert Langley, Philip Wood and Sasha Zammler-Carhart – who have read drafts, discussed points of argument, suggested new ways of understanding and offered salutary advice.

More generally, the funding provided by the AHRC’s Doctoral Training Partnership has made this project possible – supplemented by the generosity of the Faculty of Classics and of Peterhouse. The latter has truly been a second πατρίς. Finally, Robyn Summers and my family have put up with far more late Antiquity than anyone under the sun (and outside academia) rightly deserves. This thesis is dedicated to them, as a hopefully more welcome imposition.

Referencing Conventions

For Julian, I use Nesselrath's 2015 edition of the works written as emperor as my first point of reference on textual questions, followed by the Budé editions of Bidez, Lacombrade and Rocheforte. Because Julian's works are divided conventionally into sections of a few lines per section there is no need to supply page numbers. The sole exception is that of the most recently discovered letters: in that case I give a page reference to Joseph Bidez and Franz Cumont's 1922 edition. With Basil, Gregory and others I supply a page or column reference to the most modern edition alongside the conventional chapter number for greater precision, although some (usually briefer) texts are not divided by chapter. Although I endeavour to cite the most modern edition of a text this sometimes means falling back on the *Patrologia Graeca* – particularly for Gregory's poems, which with the exception of his *Vita sua, Poemata arcana* and epigrams are referred to by the numbering in Migne. When discussing texts in the body of the thesis I use an English translation of the title, with Latin in the footnotes (and abbreviations).

I cite the vast majority of texts by the author-date footnote system. Where this would entail confusion over surnames (eg. Rowland Smith, Andrew Smith, etc), I give the author's initial (or name if necessary). Where confusion would result over dates I label one 'a', the others 'b', 'c', etc. Thus 'Elm 2012a'. Which text is which is clarified by a note after its entry in the bibliography. When citing a text from a translation (including facing translations) that is not including in the list of frequently cited texts listed below and not itself a new edition of the original text, 'trans.' is used as an indicator.

Certain very frequently cited texts are not cited by the author-date method, but rather by author, volume number (if applicable) and page number (eg. Wright 3.153). These include:

Beckby, Hermann, ed. & trans., *Anthologia Graeca: Buch VII–VIII*, Munich, 1957 (= Beckby).

Bidez, Joseph & Franz Cumont, eds., *Imp. Flavii Claudii Iulianii, Epistulae, Leges, Poematia, Fragmenta Varia*, Paris, 1922 (= Bidez-Cumont).

Courtonne, Yves, ed. & trans., *Saint Basile, Lettres*, 3 vols. Paris, 1957–1966 (= Courtonne 1/2/3).

Deferrari, trans., *Saint Basil: Letters*, 4 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1926–1934 (= Deferrari 1/2/3/4).

Foerster, ed., *Libanius. Opera Vol. X : Epistulae 1–839*, Hildesheim, 1963 and *Libanius. Opera Vol. XI : Epistulae 840–1544, etc*, Hildesheim, 1963 (= Foerster 1/2).

Gallay, Paul, ed. & trans., *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze, Correspondance*, 2 vols., Paris, 1964–1967 (= Gallay 1/2).

Jones, A. H. M. & J. R. Martindale, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1971–1992 (= PLRE 1/2/3).

Jones, A. H. M., *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602: A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1964 (= Jones 1964 1/2/3).

Wright, Wilmur C., ed. & trans., *Julian, Works*, 3 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1913–1923 (= Wright 1/2/3).

White, Carolinne N., trans., *Gregory of Nazianzus. Autobiographical Poems*, Cambridge, 1996 (= White).

When referencing Julian's letters, which are numbered differently in Wilmer Wright's translation and Joseph Bidez and Franz Cumont's edition, I provide Wright's numbering with the Bidez-Cumont numbering in parentheses. A similar situation prevails with Libanius' letters; for brevity I provide the numbering used in Foerster's Teubner. For Basil's *Regula* I follow the numbering in the PG also used in Silvas 2005.

I give the PLRE number on an individual's first appearance, if they have an entry. I provide CSLA numbers when relevant for saints considered 'historic' by the mid-fourth century but not for contemporary figures like Athanasius, Basil's sister Macrina, etc. A list of abbreviations is included with the bibliography.

Introduction

Sunt autem optimae curae de salute patriae, quibus agitatus et exercitatus animus uelocius in hanc sedem et domum suam peruolabit. 'The best concerns are those concerning the safety of the fatherland [*patria*]; the soul which is aroused and exercised by them will fly more swiftly to [heaven], its seat and home.'[1] Cicero's enthusiastic support for the patriotic *uita activa* in his *On the Commonwealth* found its natural conclusion in these final lines of the famous *Dream of Scipio*. The *Dream* was an account of the afterlife of the virtuous man reminiscent of Plato's Myth of Er, and enjoyed wide influence in the Latin Middle Ages through the commentary of the early fifth-century aristocratic antiquarian and former praetorian prefect Macrobius.[2] Stressing that law and justice were necessary to constitute a *res publica*,[3] Cicero emphasised that divine rewards were especially forthcoming for those who had served their fatherlands. 'Nothing is more pleasing to that leading god who rules the whole world than those councils and assemblages of men associated through law which are called states.'[4] Yet although it was through Macrobius' commentary that the *Dream of Scipio* survived, Macrobius was no slavish imitator of his Tusculan forebear. Although Cicero had elevated the *uita actiua* in his work, Macrobius assigned equal places in the heavens to contemplative philosopher and vigorous statesman alike.[5] In lauding the importance of philosophy, Macrobius embodied the conventional view of the late-antique elite, which held that education and philosophy were core prerequisites for a ruler effectively to serve his *patria*.

Yet even as Macrobius penned his final sentences, others were entertaining alternative visions of heaven and earth. In his monumental *City of God*, Augustine of Hippo adumbrated the impossibility of a true commonwealth existing on earth. *Uera autem iustitia non est nisi in ea re publica, cuius conditor rector que christus est*: 'true justice, however, does not exist other than in that commonwealth whose founder and ruler is Christ.'[6] Directly responding to Cicero's outline of a just commonwealth, Augustine denied that God would reward Rome's rulers in the afterlife. The Romans, Augustine explained, had already received the reward for their virtue in the possession of a great earthly empire.[7] Service to the earthly commonwealth, rather than earning a place in Heaven,

---

[1] Cicero, *De republica* 6.29 (Ziegler 1969, 136).
[2] The identity and historical position of Macrobius has been long debated; for his identification with the Praetorian Prefect of 430, which I find convincing, see Alan Cameron 2011, 231–72; see in support, Consolino 2014. For a sketch of Macrobius' subsequent medieval influence, see Lewis 1964, 60–9.
[3] Cic., *Rep.* 2.70 (Ziegler 1969, 80), cf. *Rep.* 3.43–5 (102).
[4] Cic., *Rep.* 6.13 (Ziegler 1969, 128), cf. 1.12 (9). For the priority of the active over the contemplative life, see *Rep.* 1.2–3 (3–4), 1.8–11 (6–8), 5.7 (119).
[5] Macrobius, *In somn.* 1.8.6–9 (Willis 1994, 37–9), 2.17.4–12 (151–3).
[6] Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 2.21 (Dombart, Kalb and Divjak 1993, 83).
[7] August., *De civ. D.* 5.15 (Dombart, Kalb and Divjak 1993, 221–2).

was a merely temporal duty.[8] Yet Roman devotion was nonetheless impressive. 'We [Christians] who are citizens of so great a fatherland, therefore, should not look upon ourselves as having accomplished any great thing if we have performed some good works… for the Romans performed such works and underwent such evils for the sake of a country [*patria*] which they possessed already.'[9] As such, the ancients stood as examples of civic patriotism to be admired, even if they had served the wrong *patria*.[10]

The sense of a passage from secular to spiritual patriotism, and from the earthly to the heavenly city, had a long afterlife in the study of late Antiquity.[11] In Edward Gibbon's *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, this decay of patriotism was a root cause of the transformation and disruption of the ancient world.[12] On the one hand, it reduced public support for the Empire,[13] while on the other it redirected energy and attention to the Church.[14] Almost a century later, the same concerns animated the reflections of Numa Dennis Fustel de Coulanges. In his magisterial 1864 analysis of the Classical city, Fustel de Coulanges argued that the ancient πόλις had been founded on an equation between local cult and civic pride.[15] This settlement was disturbed by the doctrinal and moral orientation of Christianity. 'Les sentiments et les moeurs se sont alors transformés… toutes les vertus n'ont plus été comprises dans le patriotisme ; car l'âme n'avait plus de patrie.'[16] Though Fustel was not necessarily condemnatory, viewing the *polis* as a social formation whose natural life was at an end,[17] his analysis nonetheless propounded a substantial gulf between Christianity and what had come before.

Though sharing with Fustel the sense that religion, civic consciousness and urban identity were deeply linked, Max Weber's account of the city took a distinctive direction. Despite Finley's emphasis on the consumer/producer city paradigm,[18] the distinction between consuming and producing cities is not the only element in Weber's analysis.[19] Rather, Weber also emphasised the

---

[8] Markus 1970, 53–6.
[9] August., *De civ. D.* 5.17 (Dombart, Kalb and Divjak 1993, 223).
[10] Markus 1970, 56–8.
[11] For a survey of other classic treatments of Roman patriotism, see Kapust 2020.
[12] For an exposition of Gibbon's theory of virtue and decline and its wider eighteenth-century context, see Pocock 1976.
[13] Gibbon 1781, vol. III, 635–6. For Womersley's modern edition, see Gibbon 1996, 513.
[14] Gibbon 1781, vol. III, 632–3; Gibbon 1996, 510–11. Gibbon did view early Christianity as reflecting 'a spirit of patriotism, such as the first of the Romans had felt for the republic' (487) – see further 490, 491, 493.
[15] Ch. 3.13–14 Fustel de Coulanges 1866, 251–61 (See also Fustel de Coulanges 1980, 190–7).
[16] 'Feelings and behaviours were now transformed… all the virtues were no longer encompassed by patriotism, because the soul no longer had a homeland.' Ch. 5.3 Fustel de Coulanges 1866, 518 (Fustel de Coulanges 1980, 387). This interpretation has been echoed as recently as Stroumsa 2005, 156–7. For the importance of *caritas* to patriotism generally, see Viroli 1997, 19–24.
[17] Ch. 5.3 Fustel de Coulanges 1866, 510–12 (Fustel de Coulanges 1980, 381–20). Compare Runciman 1990.
[18] For discussion, see Finley 1977, 317–27.
[19] Weber 1922, 589–92, 595–7. *The City* was published posthumously both separately and as part of *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* – for the modern Max Weber-Gesamtausgabe edition, see Weber 1999. Weber however stressed that cities always blended consuming, producing and trading elements: Weber 1922, 515–16.

common characteristics of occidental cities compared to oriental ones. Weber believed that occidental cities possessed a civic corporate identity lacking elsewhere, accompanied by a mix of political, legal and institutional autonomy.[20] 'Eine Stadtgemeinde im vollen Sinn des Wortes hat als Massenerscheinung vielmehr nur der Okzident gekannt.'[21] This distinct civic consciousness created the category of 'citizens', whose definition in such terms had significant social effects.[22] For Weber, Christianity also promoted abstracted civic identity, dissolving alternatives based on clan or ritual uniqueness which dominated social formations in China and the Middle East.[23] Weber turned Fustel's vision on its head: the universalism of Christianity was a necessary prerequisite for the city's full realisation.[24]

This sense of the intimate relation between religious change, civic flourishing and imperial power continued to drive scholarship on the late Roman period during the twentieth century. In Mikhail Rostovtzeff's narrative, the decline of the urban bourgeoisie and the fevers of class warfare resulted in the creation of an oppressive, anti-civic imperial regime – with Christianity's rise a symptom rather than a cause of decline.[25] Ironically, Rostovtzeff shared the conviction that social forces were paramount with the Marxist scholars he opposed – though in their retelling it was end of the slave mode of production and the rise of the colonate that undermined the exploitative system of ancient urbanity.[26] For other historians such as Francis Dvornik, early Christian and Byzantine political thought was centred on the idea of the king as an absolute and divinely-inspired monarch, whose remit exceeded the limits of Roman law and local *polis* identity alike.[27] In a similar long-term study of history of ideas Shmuel Eisenstadt described the turn of the millennium as an 'Axial Age' – a period in which monotheistic religions arose which rationalised the increasing inter-connection of different parts of the ancient world.[28] As this larger world developed, civic patriotic ideas were rendered increasingly irrelevant.

---

[20] A major theme of *Die Stadt* but see, for example, Weber 1922, 522–7. For a similar observation of the outsize importance of the consumer city debate in scholarship on the Ancient world, see Lomas 1997, 21–22; critiquing Weber's emphasis on institutions, Zubaida 2006.

[21] 'A municipality, in the fullest sense of the word, was known as a mass phenomenon only in the West.' Weber 1922, 522.

[22] Weber 1922, 527–39.

[23] Weber 1922, 531–2. Contrast later conflicts between ecclesiastical and lay interests: Weber 1922, 581–2.

[24] Weber thus finds it somewhat difficult to account for the existence of local spiritual patrons in Ancient or Chinese cities given the importance of local civic saints in Christianity: Weber 1922, 532–4.

[25] Rostovtzeff 1926, 452–3, 459–63, on Christianity 486. For comment, see Bowersock 1974.

[26] Classically in Anderson 1974, 90–100; de Ste. Croix 1981, 465–74. More modern historiography in this tradition no longer connects the growth of large estates and semi-servile peasantries to the decline of towns, though seeing this process in terms of the formation of a trans-imperial aristocracy of service – Banaji 2016, 54; Sarris 2004, 290–4, 303. For the relationship between aristocratic *oikoi* and urban notables, see Haarer 2015.

[27] Dvornik 1955; 1966, 659–723, esp. 683–92. For Byzantine rulers as possessing 'absolute power', see also Dagron 2003, 156; contrast Kaldellis 2015, 2018, who argues that Byzantium can be understood in 'republican' terms.

[28] Eisenstadt 1982; somewhat anticipated in Eisenstadt 1963, 67–8. For a more modern account emphasising these developments, see Fowden 1993; compare the 'empires of faith' model of Sarris 2011.

Yet it was A H M Jones' account that was the most influential on Anglophone scholars. Synthesising political, religious, intellectual and socio-economic factors, Jones offered a strident vision of the decline of civic sentiment which linked patterns of civic spending, administrative reforms, religious changes and the end of urban self-government.[29] Although more moderate than Rostovtzeff, Jones was still pessimistic. Civic patriotism by the fourth century decayed with municipal autonomy: 'as its object sank to be a mere organ of local government, the emotion gradually died of inanition'.[30] Christianity was merely a cry of despair against the fading of local political life: 'it had no positive political doctrine to offer and propounded no ideal of civic duty'.[31]

Jones' broader arguments did not go unchallenged. In his own time, an influential French tradition of epigraphic scholarship made arguments for significant urban continuity,[32] while Jones himself moderated (though did not reject) his conclusions in his *Later Roman Empire 284–602: A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey*, which was published two decades later.[33] Subsequently, the development of late-antique archaeology and further investigations of urban affairs would further undermine the case for monolithic views of decline.[34] Yet the view that civic patriotism decayed still informs some of the period's most important contemporary scholarship. As part of his picture of the increasing morbidity of the late-antique city, Wolf Liebeschuetz draws attention to the decline of local loyalties which occurred after the Greek *poleis* lost their independence. 'By Late Antiquity civic patriotism had become a very weak emotion, and no sense of active loyalty to the Roman state… had developed to replace it.'[35] Liebeschuetz's appraisal was founded, like that of Jones, on the belief that the expansion of the Roman state had undermined local elites' investment and opportunities in local politics. The broader thesis of the expansion of the late Roman state, at the expense of local civic autonomy, remains a fairly common one – for good reason. As I will discuss in more detail in the introduction to Part I of the thesis (and sketch here), historians debate the extent and effects of this change, but the broad picture provided by the surviving texts is reasonably well known. The imperial regime aspired to greater legislative control and governmental power, and to bind its

[29] See Jones 1940, 205–8, 248–50: revealingly, he ended his account of the Greek city with a lament for civic patriotism, thus 299–304.
[30] Jones 1940, 251.
[31] Jones 1940, 304.
[32] Robert 1948; Chastagnol 1979, 90; though see the view that late Antiquity still represented a decline in Lepelley 1979, 292; though see also Lepelley 1996b, 61.
[33] Jones 1964, 737–63, esp. 757, where civic patriotism is presented as dying rather than dead. See on this L. Lavan 2007a, 167.
[34] The literature here has exploded in the last few decades; for reviews, see L. Lavan 2001; Grig 2013; Mark Humphries 2019. Some of the more important books, articles and collections of essays on the late-antique city: Wickham 1984; Ward-Perkins 1984; papers in Dagron 1984; H. Kennedy 1985; Whittow 1990; Rich 1996; Brogiolo and Ward-Perkins 1999; Brogiolo, Gauthier, and Christie 2000; L. Lavan et al. 2001; Laniado 2002; Bowden and L. Lavan 2003; Rapp 2005; Krause and Witschel 2006; Saradi 2006; Grig and Kelly 2012; Esmonde Clearly 2013; Jacobs 2014b, 644–78; Rapp and Drake 2014; Dey 2015; Zuiderhoek 2016, 167–85; Lenski 2016; Rizos 2017; Underwood 2019.
[35] Liebeschuetz 2001, 403. For criticism of his association of Christianity with this development, see L. Lavan 2003, 708–9; Michael Whitby 2006, 456–9.

elites into trans-regional networks of power and patronage.[36] Civic patriotism, by implication, suffered a corresponding decline.

Taking the vantage point of religious and political culture, the influential historian Peter Brown has likewise argued for the replacement of Classical civic patriotic ideas of community with universal and religious visions of belonging. In Brown's model, however, this anti-worldly stance was tempered by an Old Testament rhetoric which was well suited to the increasingly hierarchical character of Roman government and society.[37] Brown seems to have drawn inspiration from Michel Foucault's thesis on the development of 'governmentality', which the French philosopher defined as a new attitude towards politics as the management of individuals who were the objects of the state's supervisory power, which he thought was absent in Greek political thought.[38] The pastoral metaphors of Christianity, inherited from biblical Israel, were a key step in creating this mindset in the West, which also signalled a transition from civic modes of thinking.[39] At the very least, this managerial paradigm of authority accords well with Brown's sense of the Roman Empire's late antique transformation.

Brown's later work captured this change in the idea of a transition from euergetism to charity, for which he drew on the more immediately significant works of Paul Veyne and Évelyn Patlagean.[40] For Brown, a city-focused paradigm of giving which expressed horizontal power relations between giver and receiver was replaced by a vertical one, founded on religious considerations. 'The bishop's pastoral love for his flock,' Brown argues, 'was no more than a specific, localised manifestation of the inexhaustible love of God Himself for all humankind. Even in his own *patria*, the bishop's love was not cramped by civic boundaries.'[41] By contrast, for the quintessential ancient North African benefactor, 'it was enough for him to love only the city of Lepcis Magna, and, within Lepcis Magna itself only the clearly defined core of the city, which consisted of his fellow-citizens'.[42] In this latest vision of late-antique transition, Christianity and imperial power are closely intertwined, producing

[36] See discussion of this historiography in Part I pp. 22–5.
[37] The argument was developed in a string of publications from the late 1980s onward: Brown 1992, 152–5; Brown 2002, 68–73, 108–12; Brown 2012. Foreshadowed in the anti-civic attitude of Christianity regarding sexuality argued in Brown 1988.
[38] Foucault 2009, 122–47.
[39] Foucault 2009, 135–56. For Foucault, indeed, Gregory Nazianzus' writings on priesthood were key in creating this new political culture – see 150–1.
[40] Patlagean and Veyne's separate formulations of the charity/euergetism split remain highly influential: see particularly Veyne 1976, 44–67; Patlagean 1977, 181–96. For Brown's acknowledgment of this lineage, see Brown 2002, 6–7.
[41] Brown 2012, 504.
[42] Brown 2012, 505. Brown's model is more subtle than Liebeschuetz's, in that he sees this as the general trend of the age rather than indicating that civic patriotic ideas were already dead, but this argument nonetheless requires him to awkwardly squeeze the vibrant civic sentiments he identifies as present even in the sixth century into this paradigm of a dying ideal.

results inimical to the civic ideas of the high Empire. The decline and fall of civic patriotism, then, remains as vital an element of Brown's account as for Gibbon and his successors.

* * * * *

There is one place, however, where scholars have noted the presence of civic patriotism in late Antiquity. It has long been recognised by scholars that the emperor Julian, called 'the Apostate' by Christian writers, was interested in the welfare of cities.[43] His attempts to revive the *curiae* and restore civic lands have in turn been linked with his more republican self-presentation, and his desire to prosper traditional Greco-Roman cult. Frequently, all of these measures have been viewed as part of reviving Classical civic patriotism in politics and religion – and therefore as anachronistic attempts to reverse the tide of history.[44] More recently, Julian has been presented as more typical of his age.[45] This argument has been made effectively by Susanna Elm, though it is telling that Julian's civic patriotism takes a backstage role even in her analyses, which concentrate on Julian's 'Vision of Rome'.[46] 'Modernising' Julian, it seems, entails stressing this universal vision, with local patriotism an awkward remnant. Meanwhile, those historians who have identified civic patriotism in Christian writers like Basil of Caesarea and Gregory Nazianzus have seen it as a classical holdover, part of an educated discourse of *paideia* unrelated to their religious convictions.[47]

As such, Julian and other pagan patriots now fit uneasily into this picture of civic patriotic decline. Current scholarship emphasises that they were very much products of their time and not struggling in vain against it, but this presentation has not been extended to their view of civic patriotism. Neither have Christian statements of civic patriotism – which often run directly against the same authors' more universalist ideas – been fully explained. As a result, civic patriotism occupies a conflicted position in late-antique historiography. Certain metanarratives of the period rely on or presume its decline, even as other more recent historiographical innovations imply in turn that it ought to be more vibrant. As such, my aims in this thesis are to document the continuing uses of

---

[43] Given the loaded connotations of apostasy I will usually refer simply to 'Julian' or 'the emperor Julian'. I term his religious beliefs 'Neoplatonic paganism' or 'traditional religion'.

[44] Cochrane 1940, 273; Dvornik 1955; Tenekrides 1958, 354; Dvornik 1966, 659–66; Liebeschuetz 1972, 12–13 (though interestingly Julian hardly features in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman City*, perhaps due to that work's focus on the fifth and sixth centuries); Browning 1975, 132–3, 150–2, 164–6; Bowersock 1978, 72–3; Bowder 1978, 103–6; Athanassiadi 1981, 98–112; Bonamente 1983, 39–43; 95–6; Millar 1983, 95–6; Van Dam 2002, 166–8; Bransbourg 2009. Less judgementally in Rosen 2006, 303. For a recent reiteration of these views in relation to the *Misopogon*, see Hartman 2017; contrast the sensitive treatment of Julian's ideas and self-presentation in Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011.

[45] Marcone 1998; Tougher 2007; papers in Schäfer 2008; papers in Tougher and Baker-Brian 2012; papers in Wiemer and Rebenich 2020; on councils specifically, see Hughes 2018, 159. For pagan elites more broadly, see Watts 2015. For influences in philosophy and religion, see A. Smith 1989; R. B. E. Smith 1995; papers in Schäfer 2008; Gassman 2020; though see the powerful critique of the 'pagan reaction' thesis in Alan Cameron 2011, 93–131. For surveys of the historiography, see Kaegi 1965; Greenwood 2021, 10–16.

[46] The most significant being her monograph, *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: The Emperor Julian, Gregory Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome* – Elm 2012b.

[47] Kopecek 1974; Forlin Patrucco 1982; 1983; 1985, 198–203.

patriotic language, to explain its function in late Antiquity, and finally to suggest how a more vibrant civic patriotic political thought changes our narratives of the period.

With that said, this thesis is firmly addressed to the study of Ancient political thought. It does not (and could not within the confines of 80,000 words) offer a more general analysis of civic patriotism as socio-economic or urban architectural phenomenon, and nor does it engage at length with epigraphic and legal evidence – though it makes observations on these elements in support of its main argument. Those materials and themes, like so many others, deserve a fuller treatment of their own.

I will begin, however, with a definition. Put simply, what was civic patriotism? Fundamentally, it was a simple ideology, focused around the related but distinct terms πόλις and πατρίς – "city" and "fatherland" or "native land". Firstly, it was 'civic': it held that life in cities, as residents of a πόλις, was in some way the normative condition for human beings. As Aristotle had famously posited, humans were social beings and created associations beyond the family in order fully to realise their humanity; they were rational beings and the arts, crafts, services and architecture of cities were the natural products of their rationality.[48] I do not intend by this designation the narrower sense of 'civic' as an autonomous political formation governed by citizen participation, though that narrower meaning does also apply to a limited extent. By 'civic', I refer to the commitment to the city as a social formation which nucleated core social functions – economic production and exchange, mass habitation and entertainment, governance justice and minting, religious cult and organisation – and which was theorised to be a natural and superior arena for human activity. This is essentially a hybrid of economic/demographic and cultural/political definitions of civic status. Though cities were the Ancient world's paradigmatic unit, this status was not a given. The aristocratic estate, the palace, the monastery or the emporium emerged as distinct types of centres in the post-Roman West and in frontier societies like Armenia, while in the East Constantinople became so significant at the expense of lesser urban centres that Byzantium has been likened to an 'imperial city-state'.[49] The aggregation of political, social and economic functions to a single type of settlement is thus not a given.[50] Neither has been idea of the city only been applied to such settlements in historical societies. The language of πόλις was turned to embrace scholarly communities, churches and monasteries, posing both abstract and concrete challenges to the dominance of traditional understandings of the city.[51] While the city ultimately maintained its place

[48] Arist., *Pol.* 1.2. 1252A–53A (Aubonnet 1960, 13–15).
[49] For Constantinople and civic identity in middle Byzantium, see Haldon 1999; Magdalino 2011, 43. On urbanism and new settlement types in the post-Roman West, see Barnish 1989; see also on emporia Wickham 2005, 681–92. Compare definitions of urban status in early medieval scholarship as discussed in Biddle 1976, 100.
[50] Thus in the fifth century, fortress-towns and villages expanded at the expense of the traditional πόλις – see Dagron 1987; papers in Rizos 2017.
[51] Schofield 1991, 57–92; Rapp 2014.

in the thought-world of post-Roman and Byzantine society, this was not for lack of challengers.[52] Its survival requires explanation.

Secondly, it was 'patriotic'. This meant that one owed a special duty to the place of one's birth – the πατρίς, or *patria* in the example from Cicero quoted above.[53] This term connoted both native city and native land, as in both Greece and Rome a city and its territory formed part of the same unit.[54] Although it was possible to employ πατρίς to refer to a territory without a city, even when it was used in this more limited sense πατρίς was nonetheless replete with associations to city and civility. Patriotism did not need to be directed at the town of one's birth – people might develop bonds of affection for places in which they had spent significant time and come to treat them as their πατρίδες. Nonetheless, the link to birthplace was pre-eminent, exhibited by the frequently casting of the πατρίς as a parent (particularly a mother), demanding the same standard of instinctive, natural devotion from its citizen children.[55] The πόλις-πατρίς was paradoxically both strong and weak. Theoretically, its corporate longevity could far exceed that of the individuals who comprised it, yet it was incapable of acting for itself, requiring the human agency of its sons and daughters.[56] If πόλις belonging was the rational, intellectual mechanism of the ideology, πατρίς was thus its emotional core. The attraction of πατρίς was the gut and instinctive affection for the familiar, compared to the intellectual endorsement of urban living as the arena of human flourishing and the gallery of mankind's technical, artistic and scientific accomplishment.[57]

As such, though πόλις and πατρίς were usually allied (and often synonymous) in Classical discussion and in late Antiquity, this was not a logically necessary conjuncture.[58] The approval of city life is possible without patriotism for any particular town, while one can display patriotic affection for a country, a sports team or a university without needing to involve a city.[59] The late-antique rhetor Libanius, for instance, wrote of a governor's task as 'aiding the cities' without thereby invoking patriotic affection for other urban centres.[60] Nonetheless, πόλις and πατρίς seem to have broadly held

---

[52] On post-Roman urban ideals, see Lepelley 1996a; Callu 1996; papers in Brogiolo and Ward-Perkins 1999; extensive discussion in Saradi 2006, 49–146; papers in Speed and Sami 2010; on the Roman ideology of urbanism, see Lomas 1997; Revell 2009, 44–54. Grig 2013, 566 notes late-antique urban ideals as a relative gap in historiography.

[53] For discussion of the idea of the πατρίς before late Antiquity, see Sebillotte 1999; papers in Berns 2002; Heine Nielsen 2004; Muccioli 2006.

[54] Finley 1977, 306–7.

[55] Van Nijf 2014.

[56] Plut., *Mor. an seni* 792E–F (Hubert 1957, 45). Tenekrides 1958 discusses two examples of the idea of the city's immortality, one from Isocrates and one supposedly from Julian (*Ep.* 28, Bidez-Cumont 198), though as I note in ch. 1 n. 8, this letter is probably misattributed.

[57] On *caritas patriae* in the Roman context, see Viroli 1997, 19–21; on the emotive character of the Greek civic ideology, see Van Nijf 2014.

[58] Ando 1999, 9–10; Heine Nielsen 2004, 70–4.

[59] Compare Haldon's characterisation of Middle Byzantine provincial identity as unconnected with local civic identity – Haldon 1999, 19–20.

[60] See for instance Lib., *Ep.* 438 (Foerster 1.431–2), 549 (1.512–13), 779 (1.702–3), 1188 (2.273–4).

together in much late-antique discussion. Indeed, so useful a model was it that it begged for pious emendation, with Augustine's injunctions to the 'citizens of so great a fatherland [*ciues tantae patriae*]' that they prove themselves worthy of the heavenly *civitas Dei* its enduring result.

* * * * *

Given the manipulation and redefinition of civic patriotic concepts alongside their outright rejection or straightforward adoption, I intend broadly to apply the methodology of 'political language' as developed by the "Cambridge school" of the history of political thought.[61] Rather than focusing on the history of ideas as trans-historical phenomena essentially constant though time, this approach prefers to concentrate on the expression and redefinition of terms like liberty, justice and so on in an attempt to recover their meanings in particular historical contents.[62] In one notable example, the historian Quentin Skinner charted the change in the referents of the term 'liberty' in early modern English thought, to argue for prevalence in the seventeenth century of a 'republican' notion of liberty defined by an attachment to personal virtue, non-domination by superiors and the safety of the 'common weal' that was subsequently eclipsed by new, classical liberal definitions of liberty.[63] As a result of this emphasis on the historical and contingent definitions of concepts such as liberty, 'what was formerly known as the history of political thought… is now more accurately described as the history of political discourse'.[64]

Such an approach offers several advantages when applied to late Antiquity. As historians of the period know all too well, continuity of terms can often mask real change in their meanings. Particularly in a conservative political culture, innovations are best introduced by using existing terms in new ways rather than by propounding new, unfamiliar ones,[65] although contesting the terms may also be an important element in political debate.[66] This is particularly useful in the civic patriotic case when considering that the basic vocabulary of the πόλις and πατρίς dated back at least to the Classical era.[67] These redefinitions are best effected by justifying innovation by reference to those elements of

[61] Pocock 2009b; Q. Skinner 2002; see the summary in Tully 1988b. Pocock notes that historians more properly might refer to 'sub-language' 'register' or 'discourse' – nonetheless, 'language' as the prevalent and understood term in this field has the advantage of convention and common understanding.
[62] Expressed in an extreme form in Quentin Skinner's denial that 'perennial problems of philosophy' even existed in Q. Skinner 1969, 50; a view moderated in Q. Skinner 1988a, 283. Compare Pocock 2009a. A more moderate focus on the historical context of ideas' expression, rather than timeless 'great ideas' themselves, is relatively uncontroversial among historians – Skinner has been criticised for merely stating the obvious in Minogue 1981, 538–44. This stance however has generated opposition from political philosophers – see for instance Femia 1981. Most of Skinner's critics focus either on his criticism of traditional 'great ideas' schools of political history or his emphasis on authorial intention: see more broadly pieces in Tully 1988a.
[63] Q. Skinner 2012.
[64] Pocock 2009b, 87.
[65] These sorts of terms (modern examples being 'democracy', 'efficiency', 'tolerance') have an evaluative force: that is, they carry a moral import which informs and limits their use and thus makes claiming them an important part of political debate. Q. Skinner 1988b, 122; cf. Tully 1988b, 13.
[66] Pocock 2009d, 73–4.
[67] G. Kennedy 1985, 505.

the ideological context the 'innovating ideologist' wishes to retain. As Skinner memorably put it, 'every revolutionary is to this extent obliged to march backward into battle'.[68]

Connected with this model of how and why terms can be substituted or altered, another significant advantage of political language methodology is the explanation it offers for why thinkers sometimes employed ideas and assumptions in certain contexts that they rejected in others. The works of Christian authors, in particular, often evince a conflicted attitude toward civic patriotic ideas – they were content to endorse them in essentially secular contexts but extremely critical of them in writings addressed to more ascetic Christian audiences. This conflict has occasionally prompted comment, with historians observing the contradiction between lavish statements of concern for the πατρίς on the one hand, and attempts to exempt oneself and one's friends from curial service on the other.[69] In the case of pagans like Julian and most famously Libanius, too, one sees this adaptability.[70] Political language methodology offers a convincing explanation of these contradictions. If a discourse is sufficiently hegemonic or prestigious, social actors often employ it even if they do not entirely agree with it. They must also be seen to follow its dictates: in our case, to act like civic patriots even without necessarily agreeing with civic patriotism.[71] They can do this even while working to redefine the terms of discussion (for example, defining monasteries as πόλεις and Heaven as the πατρίς), because different definitions of the same terms may be important in different social settings. Hence the difference in attitude toward civic patriotic ideas across different media directed to different audiences.

The third useful feature of a 'political language' methodology is its ability to encompass non-theorised political discussion. Late Antiquity produced few texts that could be described as straightforward treatises in political philosophy by modern standards, and fewer still dedicated to civic patriotism. Yet political ideas and terms do need to be expressed in a systematic form to be worth studying.[72] Just because an individual or school did not express a political philosophy by composing a treatise does not mean that their activity was apolitical or that their political ideas did not relate in a systematic way.[73] Neither does it mean that their ideas lacked influence. 'Political thought' thus suits the loose collection of ideas characteristic of late-antique civic patriotism, and 'political language' its terminology. I use these two labels more or less interchangeably, though like πόλις and πατρίς themselves there are times when it makes sense to use one or the other in particular – such as when referring to the long-running Christian theological project to dissociate civic patriotic

[68] Q. Skinner 1974, 294–5.
[69] Vogler 1992, 459–60; McLynn 2006.
[70] For the political reasons for Julian's religious inconsistencies, see Greenwood 2021, 8–9; on Libanius, see conclusion pp. 148–9.
[71] Q. Skinner 1988b, 132; 2002, 148–55. Cf. Tully 1988b, 14–15.
[72] Pocock 2009c, 15.
[73] Thus Dominic O'Meara's argument for the existence of a 'Neoplatonic political philosophy' despite the absence of any surviving sustained discussion – O'Meara 2003.

terms (πόλις and πατρίς) from civic patriotic ideas (the importance of civilised urban living, the need to be loyal to one's earthly homeland), instead applying them to the city of God and the homeland of Heaven.[74]

* * * * *

As for the subjects of the thesis themselves – who were they, why do they matter, and why analyse them together? In previous years grouping Basil of Caesarea, the emperor Julian and Gregory Nazianzus together might have seemed highly unorthodox. Julian, after all, is famous as the last pagan emperor, while Basil and Gregory are noteworthy as Christian theologians, reformers, ascetics, bishops and writers. If one allows that they are good sources for civic patriotism in late Antiquity, there might still be thought little in common between them. Yet many elements of their lives overlapped.[75] First, all were born and grew up in the core territories of the Greek East at around the same time. Gregory was born c. 329–330 at Nazianzus in Cappadocia, Basil c. 330 in the neighbouring province of Pontus and Julian c. 331 in Constantinople. All spent a portion of their childhood in Cappadocia and central Asia Minor – Basil and Gregory because their families were based there, Julian because he was moved from Nicomedia (or perhaps Constantinople) to the imperial estate of Macellum in his teens. Gregory's childhood was the most undisturbed, relatively speaking: both parents surviving well into his middle age. Contrast Basil, whose father died before he came of age, and the yet more traumatic experience of Julian, whose mother died while he was an infant and whose father, oldest brother and collateral male relatives were murdered in autumn 337.[76] The episode probably led Julian to despise his cousin, Constantius (337–361), who had presided over the massacre as the new ruler of the Empire's eastern provinces. It perhaps also shaped his animus against Christianity and complicated relationship with the broader imperial dynasty to which he belonged. Treatments of Julian have often been overly psychological, however, and this enquiry will avoid such speculative judgements as far as possible.[77]

Though all three were brought up as elite, Greek-speaking Christians, this did not prevent them from receiving the education in rhetoric, grammar and literature customary for elite boys. From the mid-340s on, this education would take them to various centres of Greek intellectual culture around the empire. Basil and Gregory spent some of their teens studying in Cappadocian Caesarea, where they may have met, before the former travelled to Constantinople and the latter (with his brother Caesarius) to Palestinian Caesarea and thence to Alexandria. Both however then moved to

[74] See, for instance, Philippians 3:20, Galatians 4:22–6, Hebrews 11:8–16; more broadly, Rapp 2014.
[75] For the following, I draw on the biographical reconstructions in Athanassiadi 1981; Rousseau 1994; McGuckin 2001; Van Dam's 'Cappadocian Trilogy' 2002, 2003a, 2003b; Elm 2012.
[76] On the massacre, see now Burgess 2008.
[77] See for instance Browning 1975, xi–xii; Bowersock 1978, 12–18; Athanassiadi 1981, 20; Van Dam 2002, 99–100; more sensitively in Greenwood 2021, 23–5, 52–3. Compare analyses of Gregory which see him as highly emotional (ch. 1 n. 105, ch. 6 n. 58).

Athens, where they spent an extended period together before returning to Caesarea (Basil in 355, Gregory in 356). Julian also travelled at around twenty to study in Constantinople, though transferring to Nicomedia after a year or so. Unlike the other two, however, his time at university witnessed his (secret) renunciation of Christianity, and his education was itself more disrupted by political intrigue. Julian's brother Gallus was made Caesar in 351: the emperor Constantius was preparing to confront the western usurper Magnentius and needed a subordinate to mind the east in his stead. After defeating Magnentius in 354, Constantius recalled and executed Gallus on suspicion of treason. Summoning Julian to the palace in connection with the plot, Constantius kept him there for most of the year, until Julian was released and went to Athens to study.[78] It was there that he met Basil and Gregory, whence Gregory's well-known claims of Julian's twitchy and impulsive manner derive.[79] Julian was then recalled in 355 (after less than a year in the city) to court, where he was made Caesar and sent to Gaul.

By this point, his career had diverged radically from his Cappadocian peers. Julian spent a successful period as Caesar, during which he defeated the Alamanni and the Franks and restored order to Gaul. After Constantius requested some of his men for his campaign against Persia, Julian was proclaimed *augustus* by his troops in 360. The failure of negotiations with Constantius led Julian to march against him in the spring of 361, but confrontation between the two was avoided after Constantius died in October. Julian was thus left as the sole ruler of the Roman world. The next few months saw the reversal of many hallmark Constantinian policies – ending the prohibition of sacrifices, reopening temples and restoring their lands, downsizing imperial court and ceremonial, reducing taxes and checking official excesses, and bolstering cities and their councils. Though many of Julian's measures were conventional and symbolic rather than innovative or revolutionary,[80] his reign did mark a decided shift against Christianity. Though individual Christians were prominent at court, Julian's rhetoric and decisions in office displayed a marked favour to his co-religionists, in a similar manner to Constantine's.[81] These policies occasioned a variety of reactions, many negative, though they never had the chance to be comprehensively tested: Julian died invading Persia in 363.

Basil and Gregory, meanwhile, became prominent Christian intellectuals and leaders. Basil spent a decade establishing his credentials as ascetic, polemicist and philanthropist in the 360s before attaining the metropolitan see of Caesarea in 369 or 370, spending an active and influential episcopate before dying between late 377 and early 379.[82] Gregory's moment of glory would come somewhat

[78] The circumstances of this study are debateable. Greenwood 2021, 9 suggests that Constantius II and Julian were enjoying reasonable relations although Julian remarked in his *Letter to Themistius* that 'everyone thought I was fleeing [the court]' during his study in Athens (*Ep. ad Them.* 260B).
[79] Gregory, *Or*. 5.23 (Bernardi 1983, 334–6).
[80] Schmidt-Hofner 2020.
[81] On Julian as consciously reversing the policies of Constantius and Constantine, see Greenwood 2021, 37–40.
[82] There is some controversy on the precise date of Basil's death – see Booth 1981, 251–5; Maraval 1988; Rousseau 1994, 360–3.

later. Though a significant local ecclesiastic, he was more notable as a poet, letter-writer and orator until he was backed by Meletius of Antioch and other influential moderate anti-Arians to go to Constantinople and strengthen the Nicene faction in the city.[83] Made bishop by the emperor Theodosius I, he seems to have made a number of political miscalculations and was forced from his see in 381.[84] Afterwards he spent a substantial period of time re-establishing himself in Cappadocia and polishing his legacy and reputation, both writing new works and editing older compositions, before dying some time after 389.

From this brief summary of their lives, several reasons for comparison emerge. As their circumstances suggest, all grappled with the problems of mobility and belonging in late Rome. Gregory enjoyed an ambiguous relationship with his home city of Nazianzus, seeking to make his name on the imperial stage. Julian faced the contradiction of how to encourage patriotic ideology and localist theology 'from above' as the emperor of an aspirant universal monarchy. Basil, unlike the others, did seek (and hold) power in his πατρίς: but also needed to justify his position as an ascetic whose first duty was to reject the earthly homeland in search of the heavenly. Each, therefore, faced distinct facets of the broader problem posed by civic patriotism in the later Roman world, which challenges also confronted others in later Roman society. More generally, all three were significant figures in their own time, both in terms of direct influence and subsequent recognition. More particularly, all were leaders of, or prominent in, their respective intellectual traditions. Julian was the pre-eminent imperial representative of Iamblichean philosophy and reformer of traditional religion, while Basil and Gregory were prominent proponents of Nicene orthodoxy, ecclesiastical reform and social change.[85]

As such, comparing these men offers an insight into how civic patriotic political language was used and theorised at some of the highest levels of Roman society. Julian's imperial position was greatly superior to that of even the most important bishop, and emperors had substantial power to set the tone and agenda of political discussion. Nonetheless, this thesis will suggest that civic patriotic

[83] McGuckin 2001, 229–40.

[84] Gregory was opposed by the Arian party in Constantinople from the start. He succeeded in alienating the Egyptian Nicene bishops through the 'Maximus affair' and the supporters of Meletius of Antioch (who had first sent him to capital) by suggesting that Meletius' rival Paulinus be confirmed as bishop when Meletius died in 381. Paulinus had been a rival, more hardline *Homoousian* claimant for the see and was the favourite of the Egyptians and the Westerners. For the background to the Meletian Schism, see Hanson 1988, 382–4, 509, 651–3, 792–3, 810–12. On Gregory's resignation from Constantinople, see Elm 2000, 416–17; McGuckin 2001, 350–66; McLynn 2010a. Van Dam 2002, 146–50 views Gregory's departure as reflecting his genuine dislike at having to engage in machinations at the capital; Hanson 1988, 806–11; and Bernardi 1995, 227–8 suggest his resignation was prompted by dissatisfaction with the decisions and proceedings of the Council. I am more persuaded by McGuckin's view that he was forced out by ecclesiastical politics (McGuckin 2001, 359) and regretted his departure, given the extensive attention he subsequently gave to curating his legacy as analysed in Elm 2000; Storin 2019b, 25–7.

[85] Basil was not always so militant: along with Gregory's father Gregory the Elder he seems to have attended and assented to the homoiousian council at Constantinople in 360, and was later dogged by accusations that he had not always been purely Nicene.

language offered both opportunities and constraints even to emperors.[86] Secondly, all three knew each other, and Gregory (and perhaps Basil) directly interacted with Julian's work.[87] Basil and Gregory, of course, were close for much of their lives and Gregory gives us the longest contemporary biography of Basil in the form of his encomium of his friend. More loosely, all three were raised in relatively similar environments, with similar educational backgrounds, and adhered to philosophical/religious traditions which had been influencing and competing with each other for centuries. All three wrote in Greek, and wrote in broadly comparable genres. As a result, such comparison is justified by the existence of a common late Roman debate even as it reveals and explains differences between them.[88] Despite my remarks here on the congruence of their personal connections, circumstances, intellectual preoccupations and linguistic ties, however, I hope that the rationale for analysing these three men together will emerge most strongly in the comparisons and contrasts I make throughout the chapters which follow.

Why only these three? Aside from the practical considerations of an 80,000-word thesis, a close focus on three men enables a closer and more thorough investigation of the role played by civic patriotism both as a political language and an ideological system at a particularly significant moment in late Roman history. Focusing closely on three core figures allows civic patriotic terms to be closely analysed in their generic, biographical and other contexts, expounding them as part of a political language in close connection with contemporary events rather than an abstract and abstruse intellectual system. Moreover, it became clear that civic patriotic ideas had bearing on a wide range of subjects, making it expedient to focus on the full breadth of this range in a narrow selection of authors rather than explore a small part of it in a variety of thinkers. For that reason, though I may cite other authors at various points, they will be as background to the central triad under comparison. I exclude Latin authors from this study partly on the same basis of practical necessity, but mostly because the parallel, if intertwined, Latin tradition of civic patriotic rhetoric deserves its own, independent treatment given its distinctive features. Foremost of these is the place of the city of Rome – there was no Greek city which could rival the central force of the Eternal City in Latin authors' imagination. Other categories of evidence (legal, epigraphic) are vital for a picture of cities and civic patriotism in the round, but are less informative of its intellectual content. As a result, this study self-consciously represents a "deep dive" into the intellectual system and rhetorical deployment

[86] Put simply, the limitations of distance and technology made emperors reliant on the compliance of local elites, and therefore encouraged them to use civic ideas in negotiations with individual cities to best achieve their goals. For an analysis of this approach in relation to Constantine, see Lenski 2016, 15–23.
[87] Julian's influence on Gregory is obvious and is the premise of Elm's study: see also Rousseau 1994, 33. Basil is more doubtful. A surviving letter suggests that Julian invited Basil to court in 362, though its authenticity is difficult to assess (*Ep*. 26 (*Ep.* 32 Bidez-Cumont)). For my suggestion that Basil's *Asketikon* may respond to the criticism of Christian monastics found in Julian's *Letter to a Priest*, see ch. 4 p. 91.
[88] For other studies comparing pagans and Christians, see Brown 1992; Daley 1999; Van Dam 2002; Sandwell 2007; Elm 2012; Wenzel 2010; Hodges-Kluck 2017; Niccolai 2020.

of civic patriotism, as a phenomenon of elite political and religious life, in the fourth-century Greek East.

* * * * * *

This thesis is divided into three parts, each of which deals with a separate aspect of civic patriotic political thought and political language. Chapter One sets out the continuing relevance of civic patriotism in the political thought of the fourth-century Roman Empire. It shows, contrary to conventional narratives of the rising power of imperial government and its deleterious effect on the localities, that patriotic ideas remained powerful tools in fourth-century politics. They gave imperial elites, including rulers like the emperor Julian, ways of demonstrating their legitimacy and concern for local interests, while allowing cities and individuals to petition for access to government resources. A key characteristic of this language (as found in Chapter One) was its relatively secular quality, as it was used to appeal to elites across the religious spectrum.[89] Though this scared/secular relation was not a rigid or uncontentious division, it clear from the reactions of contemporaries that certain activities could be classed as more or less sacrally charged than others.[90] Indeed, Basil of Caesarea was one of the early Christian writers to employ the notion of *adiaphora*, or things indifferent for salvation – a requirement for any religious theorist of secular space.[91] This suggests that late-antique public space was divided by grades into more and less 'secular' sections. Finally, Chapter One will suggest that we can see this repurposing of civic language in the form of a change of medium: the civic patriotic language in this era is mainly found in letters and poems, rather than epigraphy, which were easier to distribute to members of a trans-imperial elite. A second chapter in this section (Chapter Two) details the ideology of elite rule that enabled this change. It discusses how elites were idealised, how this fitted with contemporary philosophy and how it was tied to local service. It also discusses the burden of local belonging – local service referred to as slavery, or taxation as unfair – as well as the exclusionary function this language had by debarring outsiders from access to these narrowed circles of power.

Part Two addresses the religious challenges to this consensus. Chapter Three describes how there was a strident attack on local attachment from Christian reformers, in particular based around the idea of obtaining 'citizenship in Heaven' and 'making the desert a city' by embracing monasticism. Though more muted, Julian also articulated some more conventional challenges to local belonging through the Stoic notion of 'citizenship of the world'. Yet it was in Christianity that the results of this were most stark, strengthening the bonds between churches across the empire, elevating

[89] Markus 1990, esp. 13–17, 27–43. For studies following this broad approach, see, for instance, Lim 2009, 505–10; idem 2012; the summary/afterword offered by Markus of the papers in Rebillard and Sotinel 2010; Brown 2012, 32–4, 50–2, 74–7, 100–3, Jacobs 2014, Watts 2015.
[90] See scepticism towards the notion of the secular in Rebillard 2012, 96; reiterated in Rebillard 2020.
[91] Basil, *Ep*. 236.7 (Courtonne 3.54–5).

anti-local heroes and lionising exile and departure from one's native city. Julian, by contrast, lacked this strongly oppositional stance. The second chapter of this section (Chapter Four) delves into parallel ascetic movements in fourth-century religious philosophy that opposed civilisation as useless and vain, but that philosophers nonetheless attributed divine origins to it. It argues, however, that pagans and Christians had different attitudes to those same human origins which made it easier for the former to embrace civic patriotism. Julian could celebrate local identity and diversity because he endorsed the idea that the gods ordained different customs for different peoples, which his Christian counterparts found hard to countenance. Overall, though embracing secular civic patriotism to similar degrees, an analysis of their religious views suggests deep differences of principle between Julian and his Christian colleagues.

The third part of this thesis brings these two strands together to analyse how far Basil, Gregory and Julian were able to create and implement coherent accounts of religious civic patriotism. Chapter Five details how Basil, Julian and Gregory attempted to re-centre civic identity on religious figures and to change patterns of elite spending. The former came in terms of embracing martyrs or pagan heroes as central focuses of local feasts, and of encouraging their fellow-believers to regard religious outsiders also as civic outsiders. Though spending is frequently seen in terms of a transformation from patriotic euergetism to Christian charity, both Julian and his Christian counterparts attacked current patterns of elite spending using similar philosophical rationales, and employed a blend of patriotic slogans and appeals to universal humanity to try and effect change. A final chapter (Chapter Six) addresses perhaps the most paradoxical element of this religious civic patriotism – that of justifying and encouraging secular civic patriotism on religious bases, and of portraying priests as patriots. While hardly surprising for Julian, this was very much in contrast with what the Cappadocians argued elsewhere. Ultimately, this section as a whole will suggest that religious civic patriotism was not a perfect nor a universally successful synthesis, neither replacing a more secular patriotism nor fully answering the criticisms of anti-local, anti-worldly rhetoric. Nonetheless, it provided a serviceable middle ground for those concerned with local service and religious propriety.

Part One – Fourth-Century Civic Patriotism

What use, if any, did fourth-century cities and elites have for civic patriotic ideas? For many scholars of the ancient city, the answer is decidedly negative. They point to the expansion of imperial government and the new 'aristocracy of service', mirrored in the intellectual sphere by a new trans-imperial notion of belonging and an autocratic and sacralised ideology of government.[1] More modern accounts no longer associate these developments with decadence and decline, but the universalising concerns of the late Roman state and its elite remain at the forefront of recent scholarship.[2] At worst, the survival of civic patriotism has seemed the antiquarian preserve of reactionary pagans – hence scholarly dismissals of it in Libanius and Julian.[3] Yet, as the first part of this thesis will argue, Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nazianzus frequently employed this language, despite being two of the most prominent Christians of their age. What civic patriotism was, and what it did in the changed circumstances of fourth century, is an urgent question.

The purpose of the first part of this thesis is to answer these questions, by exploring civic patriotic rhetoric as it was employed in the Greek East in the latter half of the fourth century, through the works of Basil, Julian and Gregory. If the traditional view that civic autonomy, popular government, euergetic spending and the civic *curiae* declined in late Antiquity is valid even to a limited extent, this forces us to ask: what could civic patriotic language actually achieve in the new empire of Diocletian and his successors? To answer this question, we need to look at how the terms and ideas of civic patriotism were adapted for this new era. As John Weisweiler puts it, the fourth century saw the 'transformation of the governing elite of the empire into a global class' which

---

[1] The most recent sustained account is Liebeschuetz 2001, which ultimately has its roots in Jones 1940; see recently Zuiderhoek 2016, 167–85. Compare, from a different angle, but coming to the same conclusion, the view of Peter Brown that religious identity and the rich/poor divide eclipsed the social significance of the citizen/non-citizen distinction – see Brown 2002, 85–89; and for the West, Brown 2012, 21–30, 61–71. On Romanness supplanting Greek and local identity, see for example Kaldellis 2007, 77–9; Ando 2017; contrast Weisweiler 2016, 207 who argues for the recognition and celebration of difference within a new trans-imperial elite.

[2] While differing substantially over how far imperial elites challenged imperial authority, the studies of Jairus Banaji and John Weisweiler both emphasise the integral importance of an expanded imperial bureaucracy for elite power: Banaji 2007, 157–8; 2016; Weisweiler 2015; 2016; 2017. See also Matthews 1989, 253–78; Brown 1992, 3–34; Heather 1994; Kelly 2004, 186–231; Sarris 2011, 19, 25–6; A. Skinner 2013; Schmidt-Hofner 2021, 240–1.

[3] Particularly in the dedicated studies or lengthy discussions in Dvornik 1955; Athanassiadi 1981, 98–112; Bonamente 1983, 39–43, 95–6; see, more generally, Introduction n. 44. Kopecek and Forlin Patrucco are exceptions to this generalisation, though their studies are not particularly focused on genre and tend to view this language as a Classical idiom without relevance for the religious sphere, a separation I will contest in Parts Two and Three of this thesis: Kopecek 1974; Forlin Patrucco 1982; 1985. From the other side, Tougher gives a cautious suggestion of the continuities of Julian's city policy: Tougher 2007, 49–51; see also the emphasis on Julian's view of paideia and its civic aspect in R. B. E. Smith 1995, 42–6.

'unlocked access to forms of virtue which had been unavailable to the ethnically exclusive rulers of Republican and early imperial Rome'.[4] Civic patriotism thus had to become integral to these new forms of virtue – and as a political language, its terms needed to be redefined for this new age.[5]

The evidence adduced in the following two chapters will suggest that civic patriotism was indeed successfully redefined. As well as using longstanding precedents, elites used the core concepts of πόλις and πατρίς in innovative new ways. Civic patriotism was increasingly employed to intercede with the imperial aristocracy of service, both for cities as a whole and for individuals who hailed from them, rather than in intra-city contexts. This context can effectively account for the fall in civic inscriptions in the third century and the continuing enthusiasm for civic patriotic ideas in the fourth.[6] Such inscriptions had served domestic audiences, who were no longer the main targets of patriotic displays. Those inscriptions that do survive from this period embraced a higher and more poetic register typical of *paideia* – another sign that civic patriotism was aimed at a more aristocratic audience.[7] Provincial identity also formed a more significant element of πατρίς belonging, reflecting elites' need for larger networks in an age of expanded horizons.[8]

Imperial elites and emperors themselves continued to see the usefulness of assuming the mantle of the civic benefactor, even if their 'benefactions' were of a quite different sort to those of earlier generations. Although elites continued to sponsor festivals and buildings in their local cities, these same men could become benefactors by their patronage of other local men, and interceding with the imperial government on behalf of their peers.[9] Moreover, the presence of patriotic ideas in letters and orations (and in Gregory's case, epigrams) attests to their significance in empire-spanning literary genres. Though many (though not all) of these orations would have been given to a more mixed

---

[4] Weisweiler 2016, 188; compare Schmidt-Hofner 2021, 241–8.
[5] Weisweiler 2017, 165; cf. Q. Skinner 2002, 149–50ff.
[6] Here see MacMullen 1982; Roueché and Reynolds 1989, xxiv–xxv; Meyer 1990; Van Dam 2018, 507–8; Beltrán Lloris 2014; Meseguer 2018; note however regional variation and innovations in style and material discussed in Bolle, Machado, and Witschel 2017, 19–20 that make it difficult to speak of 'decline' in straightforward terms; Meseguer 2018.
[7] Thus Robert 1948, 109; R. R. R. Smith 1999 (though he overstates the distance and distinctiveness of imperial administrators compared to local elites); Sironen 2017. Note however that such inscriptions would still probably have been comprehensible even to those without an elite education: Agosti 2008; cf. emphasis on commisioners' and audiences' expectations in Agosti 2020. For this reason I am sceptical of the view that the decline of inscriptions indicates the decline of civic patriotism, though as I argue it certainly indicates a significant shift in the intended audiences for displays of patriotic virtue – Liebeschuetz 1996a, 163–4; Zuiderhoek 2016, 93.
[8] On the increasing importance of provincial identity in this period, see Roueché 1989, 220; Roueché and Reynolds 1989, 33; Callu 1996, 20; Mathisen 2015; on provincial networks in imperial administration, |C. Kelly 2004, 173–4. For the suggestion that Rome in the high imperial period fostered provincial identity, see Ando 2017, though he underestimates the continuity of provincial belonging into late Antiquity. Compare also the negative account in Larsen 1934, 212, 216.
[9] For the prestige conferred by the formal legal status of city-patron, see Krause 1987, 181, though it is notable that this institution does seem to have declined (at least for the West); for its function in the earlier Empire, see Nicols 2013, 274–6. For the importance of elite networks more generally, see Watts 2015, 98–116; Weisweiler 2015.

public, their later publication placed them within the sphere of elite culture. This type of self-fashioning is most obviously true of Gregory Nazianzus, who painstakingly edited his letter-collection to present himself as an educated, influential and virtuous aristocrat.[10] This marrying of patriotic fervour and imperial audience was not entirely new. Writers like Plutarch, Dio Chrysostom and Aelius Aristides had paraded their patriotic credentials to elites across the Roman world, while imperially-connected patrons like Augustus' Aphrodisian freedman Zoilus had long been celebrated as local benefactors.[11] Yet the expansion of the imperial government increased the significance and frequency of these connections.[12] In tandem, the distinctively late-antique character of letter-collections does suggest a qualitative shift towards a trans-imperial audience for civic patriotic sentiment.[13]

Yet civic patriotic language remained relevant on the local stage. Curial elites continued to see their roles in terms of service to the πόλις and πατρίς, and others encouraged them to see themselves in such terms.[14] Other specialists like doctors, rhetors and lawyers were likewise urged to local service. Although some elite men did seek to escape the burden of 'slavery' to local responsibility, such openly negative sentiment was relatively infrequent. In the terms of the 'Cambridge School' of political thought, the normative power of civic patriotic language was such that at least some measure of local performance was expected. The expectation of service was the corollary of the view that elites were uniquely positioned to lead their cities, and that they were owed deference and obedience by the δῆμος. Yet civic patriotism was not the only language that could compel obedience. Fourth-century political thought prized unity, order and monarchy. These tendencies could tell against local elites, in favour of removing power to an autocratic emperor and his governors. As Peter Brown has argued (drawing on Michel Foucault), the goal of statecraft in this

---

[10] McLynn 2009b; Storin 2017; Storin 2019b, 25–8, 175–8.

[11] On the twin local and imperial dimensions of Second Sophistic literary activity, see Bowersock 1969, 26–9, 110–17; on Zoilus, see Reynolds 1982, 97–101, 156–64.

[12] Even in the first and second centuries AD, elites sought imperial positions – see Plut., *Mor. de tranq. anim.* 470C (Paton, Pohlenz & Sieveking 1972, 201). This suggests that it was the expansion of the bureaucracy, rather than a deficit of patriotic fervour, which pushed curial elites to seek imperial office in the fourth century.

[13] For the particularly 'late-antique' imperial public which stimulated the explosion of letter-collections, see Sogno, Watts, and Storin 2017, 6–7 who argue that enhanced elite mobility as well as the New Testament precedent encouraged letter-collections as a literary form in late Antiquity. For the types of and motives behind letter collections in late Antiquity, see Neil 2015; Allen and Neil 2020, 11–21.

[14] For evidence that the imperial government viewed local obligations in patriotic terms, and sought to impose them using the same rhetoric, see *CTh* 12.1 (*De Decurionibus*), which mentions *patria* in 44 out of 235 entries (192 excerpted imperial rulings). Interestingly, thirty of these are dated 370–400. That compares to entries from those three decades constituting just under half the entries in the *Code* as a whole, suggesting that the period's lawmakers (Basil and Gregory's contemporaries) were particularly concerned with *patria*. This particular interest amongst the legal draftsmen of Theodosius I fits with that emperor's attempts to increase the membership of the *curiae* overseen by Cynegius in 384–385 (who was himself *quaestor*) and the literary style affected by several of the emperor's *quaestors* in this period – see Honoré 1998, 46–7, 48–52, 55–6. One needs, however, to bear in mind the potential for random variation within a relatively small sample size, and the fact that not all uses of the term were necessarily emotive. For attempts to shore up the councils under Valentinian and Valens, see Lenski 2003, 275–9; for the relationship more generally, Millar 1983; Liebeschuetz 2003, 104–36; Curchin 2014.

vision was that the ruler should advance the interests of his people regardless of particular πατρίς ties.[15] This vision was indifferent towards civic patriotism, or even inimical. As I will explore, Basil, Julian and Gregory all made use of these more monarchical visions of authority concurrently with more civic patriotic ideas. Yet while they were assuredly challenged by alternative ideals of governance, I will argue that civic ideas continued to influence late Roman political thought. Rather than perishing as the exhausted remnant of an earlier era, patriotism was re-invigorated as an eminently late-antique ideology.

[15] See introduction pp. 10–11.

Chapter One – Civic Patriotism in Trans-Imperial Elite Networks

This chapter will suggest that civic patriotic rhetoric was an imperial and fourth-century genre.[1] It was employed and promoted in letters to imperial officials, which were collected and circulated as examples of epistolary style.[2] Moreover, it formed a key resource for the composers of panegyrics in both poetry and prose, as is clear from the sections of rhetorical handbooks devoted to how most powerfully to extoll cities either in themselves or as part of the praise of individual laudands.[3] These (with the less common genre of laudatory epigram) made civic patriotism accessible to a trans-imperial literary public, and gave it clout in the negotiation of favours and demands which characterised late Roman government.[4]

In connection with this movement towards a more imperial audience was anambiguity over what exactly the πατρίς was, and with whom one could claim a common fatherland. In ancient thought, city and territory were believed to form a mutually dependant unit, a vision reflected by an administrative reality in which cities and their territories formed the basic element of local government and tax collection.[5] Πόλις and πατρίς were frequently interchangeable, therefore. Basil of Caesarea often used these terms in a manner implying that Caesarea was the metropolis of the territory of Cappadocia – a stance similar, on a smaller scale, to Julian's view that Rome was the city and the Empire as its territory. Nonetheless, there were times when πατρίς might be invoked without reference to a specific city, and πόλις to an urban area without its territory.[6] When talking about 'civic patriotism', therefore, the potential divergence between 'civic' and 'patriotic' needs to be kept in view. Bearing in mind this caution, this chapter will address the two main ends to which civic

---

[1] Compare the late-antique boom in urban panegyric, which was aimed at impressing visiting imperial officials. Compare also the expansion in the genre of *patria* literature (historical writing, often in poetic form, which drew on contemporary folklore about cities' origins and histories), which is notable for being associated with eastern cities prominent in larger imperial networks, again suggesting the evolution of an imperially-grounded civic localism: Focanti 2018, xxxvii–viii.

[2] Aside from those cited below, the vast collection of Libanius is replete with this kind of language deployed to intercede with imperial officials. The study of ancient and particularly late-antique letter collections has boomed in recent years – see R. Gibson 2012; studies collected in Neil and Allen 2015; Sogno, Watts, and Storin 2017; Müller 2018; Riehl 2020. For specific authors, see Howard 2013; Van Hoof 2014b; Storin 2019b.

[3] Much of the latter half of first treatise attributed to Menander Rhetor deals with these topics (Men. Rhet., 344–367 (Russell & Wilson 1981, 29–75)); see also for instance in the second treatise *Peri Epideiktikōn* 369–1 (80–1), *Peri Klētikou* 427–430 (187–93). For Greek panegyric in late Antiquity, see generally Mary Whitby 1998; papers in Omissi and Ross 2020; on civic aspects (in Themistius) see Vanderspoel 1995. There are numerous studies of the orations of Julian and Gregory (Basil's panegyrics are limited to martyrs) – see particularly (in addition to the above) the studies in the collections of Hägg and Rousseau 2000, Hägg and Børtnes 2006; Tougher and Baker-Brian 2012; the 2017 volume of *Studia Patristica*.

[4] Brown 1992, 47–57; C. Kelly 2004.

[5] See Plut., *Mor. an seni* 791C–D (Hubert 1957, , 41–2), 792E (45), 797A (54–5), 797E–F (56–7), where πόλις and πατρίς are frequently coterminous; Dey 2015, 2.

[6] The term ἀστύ, which was sometimes used for the physical city compared to the more political/institutional connotations of πόλις, is rarely used by any of the three authors outside of Gregory Nazianzus' poetic works, which were written in the archaising vocabulary of sub-Homeric Greek.

patriotic rhetoric was put in this late Roman context.[7] I will suggest that it enabled its users to advance the corporate interests of their cities and accrue political capital from being publicly seen as local patriots. I will also argue that civic patriotic language was a key means of legitimising individual interests by giving demands for social advancement or material interest a more dignified gloss as the assistance of the πόλις through benevolence to its individual citizens. All in all, I will contend that civic patriotic rhetoric remained an important discourse in the fourth century, even as its audience, media and function underwent significant change.

Civic Rhetoric on the Imperial Stage: Intercession with Officials, and Promoting Imperial Status

As petitioners, both Basil and Gregory were confronted, at different times, with the prospect of their cities' reduction in status.[8] Such occasions were rare, but they demanded a great deal of attention. For Basil, this conflict came to a head in 371, when the emperor Valens divided the province of Cappadocia into an eastern and a western part.[9] For Basil the change represented a very real diminution in his prestige. As metropolitan bishop he enjoyed jurisdiction over the entirety of the province, a reach which would be drastically curtailed by sub-division. (Gregory succinctly summarised the rivalry between Basil and the new metropolitan Anthimus of Tyana: 'souls were the pretext, but the real cause was desire for power'.)[10] Additionally, Caesarea would suffer through no longer being the capital city of such a large province.[11] Both Basil and the city thus stood to lose out if the province was split, and he thus wrote three letters to high officials at court, entreating them to intervene with the emperor and prevent the division.[12]

[7] For the earlier period, see Le Roux 2002; Beck 2020.
[8] On a similar subject, *Codex Vossianus* 77 preserves a lengthy letter attributed to Julian (*Ep.* 28/ *Ep.* 198 Bidez-Cumont) in which the writer petitions the governor of Achaia to release Argos from its obligation of having to fund the Isthmian Games at Corinth. Though the letter probably dates from the first century A.D., its themes are eminently in keeping with fourth-century rhetoric, including the lengthy invocation of ancient precedent, patriotic rivalry between the cities and Argos' long-standing prestige, the economic needs of the community and the significance of philosophy, making it understandable why some commentators (Wright 3.xxii–xxiii) have thought it genuine. See Spawforth 1994, 211–16.
[9] Probably for administrative reasons rather than primarily to punish Basil for his stridently Neo-Nicene doctrinal position, as Cappadocia Prima contained many imperial estates and Cappadocia Secunda was more urbanised – Jones 1971, 184–6.
[10] Gregory, *Vit. sua* l. 460 (White 44).
[11] For this episode, and the rivalries between Cappadocian cities over prestige, though not so much from the ideological side, see Van Dam 2002, 24–38; more generally, Lendon 1997, 79–89. For the advantages accrued by provincial capitals, see Jones 1964, 2.756; Liebeschuetz 1972, 132–6; Lewin 2001; Dey 2018, 166–9. Note the scepticism of Lavan, who sees them as more typical of their local urban systems than as imperial capitals-in-waiting – L. Lavan 2007a, 184.
[12] For this episode, see also Kopecek 1974a, 320–6; Pouchet 1992, 220–36; Rousseau 1994, 234–6; McGuckin 2001, 187–203. On these and Cappadocian officeholders more generally, see Van Dam 2002, 55–61. See below for PLRE references.

All three letters were replete with civic patriotic political language.[13] Basil praised the official Aburgius for his 'zeal for your homeland, seeing that you render a just recompense to her from whom you were sprung [ἡ περὶ τὴν πατρίδα σπουδή, δικαίας αὐτῇ ἀποδιδόντος σου τὰς ἀμοιβάς, ἐξ ἧς ὁρμηθεὶς τοσοῦτος ἐγένου]'.[14] From the outset, Basil established a strong sense of debt owed by Aburgius to Cappadocia, through which he supposedly attained such high status (it is unclear whether this was a generic reference to his upbringing or whether Aburgius had enjoyed more concrete support from other Cappadocians throughout his career). Going on, Basil next described him as a man 'who would sympathise even with a foreign city labouring under such misfortune, to say nothing of the city that brought you into life [ὃς καὶ ἀλλοτρίᾳ συμπαθοῖς πόλει τοιαῦτα καμνούσῃ, μὴ ὅτι γε τῇ σε παραγαγούσῃ εἰς τὸν βίον]'.[15] The latter statement in particular indicates just how normative and unreflective civic patriotism, and its associated language, was felt to be. Sympathising with a 'foreign' city was supposedly something noble and unexpected, despite the Roman Empire's claims to universality.

To the elderly Cappadocian official Martianus, Basil stressed the obligation upon him to write in defence of Caesarea's interests, which excused his importunity in writing to a man he had never met.[16] The appeal, on the one hand, was moral - 'my afflicted country urges me to hurry to aid her [με κάμνουσα ἡ πατρὶς ἐπείγει πρὸς ἑαυτήν]'.[17] On the other, it was also the result of local pressure: 'accordingly our fellow-citizens have written urging us to hasten to them [ἐπέστειλαν οὖν ἐπείγοντες ἡμᾶς οἱ πολῖται], and it is necessary to meet the summons… in order to avoid the censure that would be occasioned by our failing to help them'.[18] Martianus' sense of personal duty was also invoked, as Basil called on him not to 'ignore our country when she has fallen to her knees [καὶ εἰς γόνυ κλιθεῖσαν τὴν πατρίδα ἡμῶν μὴ περιδεῖν]'.[19] Basil took a similar line with Sophronius, a native of Cappadocia and Valens' *magister officiorum*.[20] 'The magnitude of the misfortunes which have seized our fatherland [τὸ μὲν μέγεθος τῶν καταλαβουσῶν συμφορῶν τὴν πατρίδα ἡμῶν] was constraining me (by going to court) to describe the miseries which now afflict our city not only to your noble self but likewise to all others who like you have great power in worldly affairs',[21] and 'to urge you, if you

[13] Forlin Patrucco 1982.
[14] Basil, *Ep*. 75.1 (Courtonne 1.176–7). It is uncertain what position Aburgius held at this point in his career. PLRE 1.5 (Aburgius).
[15] Basil, *Ep.* 75.1 (Courtonne 1.177).
[16] PLRE 1.564 (Martianus 5).
[17] Basil, *Ep*. 74.1 (Courtonne 1.173).
[18] Basil, *Ep*. 74.1 (Courtonne 1.173).
[19] Basil, *Ep*. 74.2 (Courtonne 1.173–4). Though Basil frequently employs the first personal plural to refer to himself, other elements in the letter suggest that Martianus as a Cappadocian is included.
[20] PLRE 1.847–8 (Sophronius 3).
[21] Basil, *Ep*. 76.1 (Courtonne 1.178).

are influential, to offer your hand to our city which has fallen to her knees [παρακαλέσαι, εἴ τις δύναμις, χεῖρα ὀρέξαι τῇ πόλει ἡμῶν εἰς γόνυ κλιθείσῃ].'[22]

Several themes stand out in Basil's rhetoric, which were true of civic patriotic language more generally. The first is the emotive charge attached to identity as a member of the city. Basil and his addressees were supposed to feel the pain that Caesarea itself experienced.[23] This emotional involvement arose from their origins as Cappadocians, and was portrayed as an instinctive, natural attachment which compelled affection, rather than exacting it through reasoned argument. Indeed, it seems likely that the perceived instinctiveness of civic patriotism was the reason it never received intellectual codification and systematisation. To try to justify the impulse that provoked it would have been to concede patriotism's greatest strength, namely that it was supposedly natural and unthinking. Connected to this visceral attachment was the stress on Caesarea's identity as a substantive agent, which was most powerfully expressed by its personification as a lady in distress, as in Basil's letter to Martianus. 'For you are not unaware, oh excellency, of what she has suffered — that like Pentheus she has been torn asunder by veritable Maenads, demons in fact.'[24] Basil expanded the metaphor, claiming that the imperial decree resembled the pronouncement of an incompetent physician, who unwittingly dissected his patient in an attempt to heal her. This emphasis on the feminine representation of the city formed part of a broader late-antique discourse, with cities portrayed as female on coins and in allegorical works, and which evoked maternal alongside nativist affection.[25] The personification of the city likewise echoed a political language which cast threats to civic wellbeing in terms of diseases affecting the body.[26] Medical and maternal language thus combined to create, on the one hand, the notion of the city as an independent, abstract entity with its own set of interests; on the other, they enhanced and justified obligation to it.

It is notable, too, that Basil appealed (in the case of both Sophronius and Aburgius) to their sense of religious duty, telling both that they had received their authority from God.[27] Indeed, in the latter's case he suggested to him that he possessed this power 'for the benefit of his fellow-citizens [εἰς τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν πολιτῶν βοήθειαν]', ending his letter on a somewhat admonitory note which made clear the link between religious duty and πατρίς belonging.[28] Unlike in other letters and sermons that I will examine later, Christianity was invoked here in a rather secondary capacity, amounting to an

[22] Basil, *Ep*. 76.1 (Courtonne 1.178–9). The rhetoric of falling to the ground is common in both ordinary petitions (Gascou 1997, 194) and the rhetorical handbooks; Men. Rhet. *Peri Presbeutikou* (Russell & Wilson 1981, 423).
[23] Van Nijf 2014.
[24] Basil, *Ep*. 74.1 (Courtonne 1.173). See also *Ep*. 96 (Courtonne 1.208).
[25] Grig 2012; Poulsen 2014.
[26] For the Classical period, see Brock 2000; Brock 2006; Meister 2012.
[27] Basil, *Ep*. 75.1 (Courtonne 1.177), 76.1 (Courtonne 1.179). It is perhaps indicative by comparison that Martianus' letter is replete with Classical precedents and images (the Maenads, Solon etc) and has no reference to God, which leads Pouchet to suppose that Martianus was a pagan; Pouchet 1992, 222.
[28] Basil, *Ep*. 75.1 (Courtonne 1.177); cf. Ep. 15 (Courtonne 1.45).

added gloss on secular patriotism rather than a serious attempt to rethink it in Christian terms.[29] Compared to his *Asketikon* or his preaching, in these letters Basil made little use of theology or scriptural quotation. Nonetheless, the invocation of the recipients' duty to God added another argument in support of Basil's intercession for Caesarea.

This episode also shows the flexibility even of core civic patriotic terms like πόλις and πατρίς – emphasising the usefulness of treating them as part of a loosely-defined 'political language' rather than a tightly-theorised philosophy. In order for his intervention to work, Basil had to stretch the political language of civic patriotism to allow it to accommodate the equation of province and πατρίς, and πατρίς with Caesarea.[30] This employment of πατρίς to refer to a province- or region-based loyalty makes sense when viewed in its imperial context. Though they retained their loyalties to particular provincial cities, individuals at court would have been unwise to rely solely on connections with inhabitants of a single centre, and emphasising commonality on the level of the province would thus have been a more effective strategy for strengthening personal networks.[31] Additionally, the expansion of the apparatus of imperial provincial administration, the growth of a parallel Christian infrastructure of provincial governance through the metropolitan bishop, and the division of provinces into smaller, more homogenous units further encouraged such loyalties.[32] Provincial belonging could be associated with a particular principal city, as in Basil's intercessions, and (on a larger scale) Julian's sense of the Empire itself as the πατρίς of which Rome was the πόλις.[33] Yet it did not always need to be so – Gregory's epigrams referred to Cappadocia generally without singling out Caesarea, and his panegyrical poem on the Armenian governor Hellenius forewent the mention of any particular city when praising him as the ornament of his native land.[34] Πόλις and πατρίς, therefore, remained distinct concepts even though they were often interchangeable and overlapped significantly.

Returning to the main theme of civic status, Gregory was faced with a similar situation to Basil after his return from Constantinople. Nazianzus, also known as Diocaesarea, was threatened with the removal of its civic status, perhaps due to a local disturbance.[35] This was a potentially

---

[29] See ch. 6, esp. pp. 140–6.
[30] As noted by Gascou 1997, 189 n. 3. Cf. Callu 1996, 20.
[31] Such connections were an essential way for emperors and their subordinates to recruit ministers and clients, such as the string of Illyrian emperors and their supporters, Theodosius I's favouring of Spaniards, the 'Lycian coterie' influential at the eastern court in the years up to 392, Zoticus and other officials from Lydian Philadelphia who aided the career of John Lydus and others. See C. Kelly 2004, 44–5, 48–9, 173; with Matthews 1975, 35–9, 107–15, 272–4; Williams 1985, 24–38; Lenski 2003, 56–67.
[32] See Part I.
[33] Julian, *In Const. I* 5C–D; on this passage and its sources, see Tantillo 1997, 147–52; see further ch. 4 pp. 95–6. On the development of a more inclusive Roman notion of belonging, see M. Lavan 2013, 208–10. See also Julian's looser sense that Athens was the first city of Greece at Julian, *In Euseb.* 3 118C–20A, *Ad Ath.* esp. 270B.
[34] Gregory, *Carm.* 2.2.1 ll. 278–80 (PG 36.1471A), 359–60 (1477A). PLRE 1.413 (Hellenius 1).
[35] On this episode, see McLynn 2006, esp. 283–8. Whether or not Nazianzus and Diocaesarea are the same place is debated – but Gregory refers to himself as a native of Diocaesarea (*Carm.* 2.1.19 ll. 25–6 (White 156)), suggesting that they were, and the emotive language he adopts in this letter makes more sense if his addressee

serious threat: it would cause the city to be relegated to the status of a village, subject to another city's councillors and fiscally subordinate. Gregory was thus entreated by the city's inhabitants to intervene with the governor, Olympius, who had prescribed the penalty.[36] Gregory wrote two surviving letters. The shorter was fifteen lines long, primarily invoking Olympius' respect for Gregory's own person as an old man, a man of God and a man of *parrhesia* in order to excuse the effrontery of the Diocaesareans' protest against his punishment.[37] In general, it was typical of Gregory's ordinary correspondence, which invoked generic virtues and personal connections more than civic ideology.

By contrast, Gregory's second letter was replete with civic patriotic language. In a substantial letter Gregory gave free reign to his Classical rhetorical training. As in Basil's case, the reduced condition of one's city was portrayed as painful and distressing, which Gregory conveyed through a number of artful paradoxes and contrasts. Gregory opened his case by describing the conflicting urges that the demotion of the city produced in him - 'the illness makes me impetuous, but does not let me approach [ποεῖ γὰρ με θρασὺν ἡ νόσος, οὐδὲ προϊέναι συγχωροῦσα]'.[38] The theme of illness was continued by Gregory's personification of the city, and invocation of the grief felt by its inhabitants. 'They feel the pain of their dying mother, they cannot bear to be called citizens and be without a city [μητρὸς ὑπερήλγησαν νεκρουμένης, οὐκ ἤνεγκαν πολῖται καλεῖσθαι καὶ εἶναι ἀπόλιδες]'.[39] The city's physical illness produced a mental affliction which affected the people of the city (and indeed, Gregory claimed himself as well). 'They lost their minds, they acted unlawfully, they abandoned hope of salvation, the paradox of their suffering has driven them out of their minds.'[40] That 'paradox' (τὸ παράδοξον) was not simply akin to the emotional shock of losing a relative, however, because to be 'citizens without a city' (πολῖται ἀπόλιδες) was a deeply unnatural state. In Greek thought, life in cities had long been seen as a normative, civilized state, and cities one of the key components for education, morality and flourishing human society.[41] To be deprived of a city, where humans satisfied their need for civilised sociability, threatened the very mental development and psychological stability of the individual, as the extensive use of the register of mania throughout the letter aptly demonstrates.

Gregory rounded out his personification by making use of the same metaphor of assistance as evoked by Basil, this time in the person of Diocaesarea herself. 'Give your hand to me as I am fallen, give aid to she who is weak [δός μοι χεῖρα χαμαὶ κειμένῃ, βοήθησον ἀσθενούσῃ] … it is more fitting

knew he was from the city. In support of the identity of the two, see Szymusiak 1972, 548; Mossay 2001, 440–1; Van Dam 2003b, 200 n. 5; McLynn 2006, 283–4; Elm 2012b, 19 n. 6. Against, see Mitchell 1993, 66; Talbert 2000, 66; Ousterhout 2011, 148.

[36] For Olympius and Gregory, see also Bernardi 1995, 250. PLRE 1.646 (Olympius 10).

[37] Gregory, *Ep*. 142.3 (Gallay 2.33).

[38] Gregory, *Ep*. 141.1 (Gallay 2.30).

[39] Gregory, *Ep*. 141.6 (Gallay 2.31).

[40] Gregory, *Ep*. 141.6 (Gallay 2.31).

[41] On *urbanitas* as the aura of sophistication accruing to city-dwellers, see Ramage 1973, 6.

for you to raise up cities than to destroy those which have met with disaster [πόλεις ἐγείρειν σοι πρεπωδέστερον ἢ καταλύειν τὰς κεκμηκυίας]', evoking a new paradox in the form of a governor who de-civilised rather than improved his territory.[42] And Gregory likewise characterised the city as a living entity with its own identity. 'The death of a man is terrible (how could it not be?)... how much more terrible is it for a city to die, which kings founded, time consolidated and many following years conserved [πολλῷ δὲ δεινότερον πόλιν ἀποθανεῖν, ἣν βασιλεῖς ἱδρύσαντο καὶ χρόνοι συνεστήσαντο καὶ ἀκολουθία μακρὰ διεφύλαξεν].'[43] Once again, the rhetoric of death and illness on display reflected a long-running set of images in Greek thought, which connected civic troubles to illnesses.[44] Gregory's emphasis on the city's history and its storied past was also meant to evoke sympathy. Overall, the letter's elaborate and emotive language, as well as its length, suggest that it was intended for an audience within Nazianzus as well as the governor himself.

Unlike Basil, Gregory's appeal was successful, though probably because Olympius was more amenable to revising his judgement rather than because his use of political language was more adept. A sceptical reading (as one might characterise Neil McLynn's) suggests that Gregory can hardly be called a civic patriot because his intervention in this case was not wholly disinterested, and because in an oration potentially connected to this event he employed a far more anti-patriotic register, aligning himself with the governor and the authorities. Gregory on this reading desired to ingratiate himself with the governor and escape any remaining local obligations – not to patriotically to aid his hometown.[45] Yet the very fact that Gregory felt the need make this elaborate display of patriotic affection, even if it served cynical ends, demonstrates the power that civic patriotism exerted as a political language.[46] The public nature of late-antique epistolary culture meant that Gregory's act of writing would hardly have gone unnoticed in his home town.[47] Even if it had been, Gregory made sure to publicise in his letter-collection as part of his retrospective programme of self-fashioning.[48] In Gregory's case, he was successful in achieving his stated end, and additionally firmed up his potentially precarious position among the local elite by earning respect as someone who had successfully interceded for his locality. In Basil's case, he failed to prevent provincial division, but he did publicly perform his duties as an elite representative of his community, which could have earned him political capital for his ongoing struggles with his opponents within Caesarea. Both dossiers display the public character of civic patriotic political rhetoric, and its relevance in defending the

[42] Gregory, *Ep*. 141.3–4 (Gallay 2.30)
[43] Gregory, *Ep*. 141.2 (Gallay 2.30).
[44] Brock 2000.
[45] McLynn 2006, 284–5. Gregory had been evicted from the see of Constantinople by the Council of 381, which had ruled that he was in violation of canon 15 of Nicaea which forbade episcopal translation, a ruling he protested by claiming that he had been consecrated to neither of the sees (Sasima and Nazianzus) that he was accused of holding. See also Introduction n. 84.
[46] For broader methodological reflections, see Q. Skinner 2002, 157.
[47] Neil 2015, 11–14. See below.
[48] Storin 2017, 83–4.

position and power of the city in question. And both show that the role of patron was a response to local demand.[49] Basil professed to Martianus that 'the citizens have written to us',[50] while Gregory referenced the *curiales* who 'are looking to us as because of our having freedom of speech with you.'[51] Making these kinds of intercessions, then, was what was expected of a powerful local man, as showing oneself a pious servant of the πατρίς.

So far we have seen examples where members of the elite outside the imperial system re-purposed age-old civic tropes in order to intercede with members of the administration. They did so partly in response to local pressures from their peers, and partly because they knew this language was a necessary part of engaging with this broader political world. Let us now turn to emperors and their administrators. What did they have to gain from accepting petitions of this nature – from allowing themselves to be portrayed as benevolent civic patriot?

Partly, emperors' sentiments were 'civic' (or perhaps 'pro-urban') rather than 'patriotic'. That is, they were interested in the wellbeing of the urban system rather than motivated by affection for any particular city.[52] In his first panegyric on Constantius, Julian thus praised the emperor for his generous enrichment of the cities through grants. '[The cities] have all prospered through you… and each through its general prosperity improves the welfare of its private households [ἐπιδίδωσι δὲ τῶν ἰδίων ἕκαστος οἴκων διὰ τὰς κοινὰς τῶν πόλεων εὐετηρίας].'[53] This concern may at first sight look like a secular version of Brown's 'specific, localized manifestation of the inexhaustible love of God Himself'.[54] Such a characterisation, however, misses the ideal of reciprocity hard-coded into imperial-civic relations. This made the emperor's relationships with particular urban centres unique and individual – and these personalised relations in turn fostered the development of more patriotic relationships. An example from the same oration can be found when Julian praised Constantius for his generosity to Antioch. In return, Julian claimed that, 'I often hear that the city calls herself by your name' as Constantius had provided it with a safe harbour, porticoes, fountains and prospered it through his governors.[55] Constantius' long periods of residence at Antioch and his genuine popularity

[49] See Forlin Patrucco 1983; 1985, 198.
[50] Basil, *Ep*. 74.1 (Courtonne 1.173); cf. Ep. 15.
[51] Gregory, *Ep*. 142.3 (Gallay 2.33). This stress on the common purpose of the whole city was also rhetorical. As Richard Lim argues, it was necessary to show consensus and unanimity when petitioning for imperial support in religious or secular spheres – thus Lim 1995a, 24–30.
[52] This extended to economic concerns – though Roman elites often disparaged commercial activity, they recognised its practical importance for urban activity. See, for instance, Basil, *Ep*. 76.1 (Courtonne 1.178), 96.1 (Courtonne 1.208), *In Ps. XXIX* 5 (PG 29.516B).
[53] Julian, *In Const. I* 43A. On this passage and the Constantinian origins of Julian's policy, see Bonamente 1983, 51–5; cf. Henck 2007.
[54] Brown 2012, 504.
[55] Julian, *In Const. I* 40D–41A. See Tantillo 1997, 379–80. The manuscripts record minor variations in the text here which does not substantially affect the meaning.

there are confirmed from other sources.[56] The emperor's propagandists, as Julian then was, were thus able to claim a distinct bond with the city – and clearly believed that trumpeting this link was to Constantius' advantage. This was not the only example of such an imperial connection. Athens too was gifted many thousands of bushels of wheat, and honoured Constantius with a statue and the title of *strategos* in exchange.[57] Julian himself sought more concrete support from the Athenians during his revolt against Constantius, promising them lavish rewards if the city acknowledged his authority.[58] This exchange of civic honours for largesse was a scaled-up version of previous ruler-city interactions, where the ruler appeared a kind of civic euergete writ large.[59] In relation to Athens, too, it drew on a long-running precedent of imperial generosity – most lavishly represented by the emperor Hadrian.[60]

Yet rulers could also be civic patriots in a more straightforward sense. In the same oration, Julian praised Constantius for augmenting 'the city of your ancestors [τῇ πατρῴᾳ πόλει]' (probably Constantinople) by completing its walls and restoring various buildings.[61] In Julian's own case, he employed the rhetoric of civic language extensively when justifying his transfer of an obelisk from Alexandria to Constantinople in a letter of 362.[62] Referring to Constantinople as 'my homeland the city of Constantine [τὴν ἡμῖν πατρίδα Κονσταντίνου πόλιν]',[63] he went on detail his affection for the city in florid terms:

> The city claims the monument [ἀνάθεμα] from me because it is the place of my birth and more closely connected with me than the late emperor [πατρὶς οὖσά μου καὶ προσήκουσα πλέον ἤπερ ἐκείνῳ]. For though he loved the place as a sister I love it as my mother [ὁ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὴν ὡς ἀδελφήν, ἐγὼ δὲ ὡς μητέρα φιλῶ]. And I was in fact born there and brought up in the place, and I cannot ignore its claims.[64]

In actual fact, Julian's motives were more complicated than a simple desire to prosper his supposed home. His statement associated himself more closely with the city than Constantius had been, an association which he then used to justify his nascent attempt to remodel Constantinople in a more

---

[56] Henck 2007. For the frequency of Constantius' residence in Antioch, see Barnes 1993, 218–24 (Appendix 9). Julian quoted a rhyme in his *Mispogon* about how 'the Chi and the Kappa [Christ and Constantius] never dealt unjustly with this city'. Julian, *Misop.* 357A.
[57] Julian, *In Const. I* 8C–D.
[58] Julian, *Ad Ath.* 287D, see on Athens ch. 2 n. 43, 46. On this 'personal touch', see Rosen 2006, 217.
[59] For imperial munificence, see, for example, Zuiderhoek 2009, 110–12; Brown 2012, 111.
[60] Boatwright 2002, 144–57.
[61] Julian, *In Const. I* 41A. On this relationship, see Dagron 1974, 87; Tantillo 1997, 152–60.
[62] Weis 1964 concurs with Wright 3.153 n. 1 in identifying this obelisk with the obelisk which Theodosius I brought to the Hippodrome, and with Bidez-Cumont 1922, 63–4 in dating the letter to before Julian heard the news of the lynching of Bishop George of Alexandria (likely to have reached him by mid-January 362); for this incident, see ch. 5 pp. 104–5. I am sceptical of the precision of this dating, but the point is not material.
[63] Julian, *Ep.* 48 443B (*Ep.* 59 Bidez-Cumont).
[64] Julian, *Ep.* 48 443B.

pagan mould.[65] Likewise, it enabled him to justify punishing Alexandria, which offended Julian by its continuously disorderly behaviour. The emperor removed an ancient monument from the city, and instructed it to set up a bronze statue of 'a man who you say you love' in place of the lost obelisk, 'since I love you no less than my native land [ἐπειδὴ καὶ ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ἔλαττον τῆς πατρίδος φιλῶ]'.[66] In this context, the man in question was probably Julian himself, given that he described the statue as of 'colossal' size (κολοσσικός). One would not accord such prominence to a private citizen or a rival like Constantius, while the label 'man' would have been inappropriate for a divine subject or a deified former ruler.[67] Under the guise of civic patriotic affection, Julian suggested a measure that would vastly increase his visual prominence in Alexandria. While one might be tempted to dismiss his use of this rhetoric while emperor as outmoded, his self-portrayal as a civic patriot chimes with his characterisation of Constantius in his first oration, and corresponds with the deployment of this language (at a lower social level) in Basil and Gregory. Civic patriotic intervention in favour of one's city, therefore, was not simply a discourse employed by suppliants, but also by rulers – and, though it could be used in conjunction with references to God or to gods, it was accessible to both pagans and Christians.

Representing Elites as Civic Patriots: Gregory's Letters and Epigrams

Thus far we have seen benefactors and petitioners portray themselves as civic patriots in a fairly familiar context – the tussles over civic status that had been part and parcel of Roman life since the Empire's expansion.[68] The elevation of provincials offered more opportunities for the use of this type of language, and the emphasis on provincial belonging demonstrates the flexibility of the bounds of πατρίς, but neither of these shifts mark a great gulf with earlier patriotic practices.[69]

What is distinctive in late Antiquity, however, is the widespread compilation and display of Greek letter-collections incorporating substantial civic patriotic content. Here, it is necessary to say a few words on late-antique epistolography. The web of the trans-imperial elite was held together by letters and produced them in prodigious quantities.[70] The survival and production of such letter-collections in turn correlates with the nature and size of the imperial elite – with Pliny and Cicero the pre-eminent writers in the earlier, Latin tradition.[71] By contrast, earlier late-antique Greek collections

[65] I will discuss this in more depth in Part III, but see Greenwood 2017, 14.
[66] Julian, *Ep.* 48 443C (*Ep.* 59 Bidez-Cumont).
[67] I thus depart from Wright's view that Constantius was potentially the honorand (Wright 3.153 n. 3) preferring Bidez-Cumont 1922, 63–4.
[68] Lendon 1997, 74–7.
[69] On provincial identity in the high imperial period, see Ando 2017.
[70] See, for example, Van Dam 2002, 73–94; Watts 2015, 65–70. On letters and friendship, see Van Dam 2003b, 131–8.
[71] Salzman 2017b, 17–23.

are mostly philosophical in nature.[72] This makes sense given the nature of contemporary politics: until the fourth century the imperial ruling elite was predominantly Latin-speaking and smaller than that of the late Roman world. Its expansion and the increasing role of Greek elites thus explain the late Roman explosion of letter-collections and the particular proliferation of those in Greek.[73]

Looking at the genre's appeal in more depth, the letter-collection gave its authors a chance to display their connections and learning, and shape the public version of their biography.[74] For readers, these collections offered models of style which were helpful in accessing this elite world. Moreover, the letter was a public document even before it was collected and published: they were often read aloud and might be copied, stolen or intercepted.[75] Letters thus had substantial rhetorical and intellectual function.[76]

Not all letters that have reached us resulted from careful processes of selection. At least two collections of Julian's letters seem to have circulated after his death, put together by supporters and critics respectively.[77] Basil's letters seem to have been assembled more haphazardly from his archives and those of his correspondents, and thus possess the least coherence as a collection.[78] By contrast, Gregory of Nazianzus did curate his letters into an extensive epistolary 'autobiography', publishing them during his own lifetime.[79] As a result, it is Gregory's collection I will focus on here as most keenly displaying the possibilities open to elites who wanted a public demonstration of their patriotic credentials.

The public nature of these late-antique letters amplified the significance of their civic patriotic language. For a supplicant, invoking a common provincial origin strengthened this connection between correspondents.[80] From the recipient's perspective, it offered a chance publicly to demonstrate one's patriotic piety. These dynamics can be observed at work in Gregory's extant letters to the Cappadocian magistrate Sophronius. When Gregory wrote to Sophronius asking for a

---

[72] On the intriguing profusion of pseudonymous Greek collections before late Antiquity, see C. Jones 2017, 38–43.
[73] Here see Neil 2015; Sogno, Watts, and Storin 2017, 6–7; Watts and Sogno 2018, 393–4; Allen and Neil 2020, 11–21. The prominence of letters in the New Testament also meant that the they could easily be viewed as Christian, acting as a secondary reason for their late-antique popularity.
[74] See here more generally, R. Gibson 2012, 74; on the Cappadocian Fathers, Howard 2013; on Gregory specifically, McLynn 2006; McLynn 2014; Storin 2019b, 24–8.
[75] Neil 2015, 11–14.
[76] Reed 1997.
[77] Trapp 2012; Elm 2017. In Julian's case certain of his longer epistles are treated as separate from the rest of his letters, and there remain substantial debates about authorship – see recently on *Ep*. 84 Van Nuffelen 2002; Bouffartigue 2005.
[78] Forlin Patrucco 1983a; Pouchet 1992, 25–72; Silvas 2015; Radde-Gallwitz 2017.
[79] The most recent work on Gregory's letters is that of Bradley Storin – see Storin 2017; Storin 2019b; Storin 2019a. See also Bernardi 1995, 242–63; McLynn 2009b; compare on Libanius, Van Hoof 2014b; Van Hoof 2017.
[80] Noted in Vogler 1992, 449. On provincial networks in imperial administration, see C. Kelly 2004, 44–5, 48–9, 173.

favour for a local rhetorician, he specifically cited civic patriotism as a reason for preferring this particular candidate. 'To honour your mother is one of the highest things. The mother of one is alien to another, but the πατρίς is the mother of all [κοινὴ δὲ πάντων, πατρίς]… and you will honour her even now by having regard for us, concerning that of which we are praying.'[81] The request in question was the patronage of a certain Eudoxius, another Cappadocian, who merited reward for his excellence 'in both life and intellect' (καὶ βίῳ καὶ λόγῳ).[82] 'For it would be shameful, you being the public representative of our country [κοινὸν ὄντα σε τῆς πατρίδος προστάτην] … if you do not honour above all the best in wisdom' or respect justice.[83] Sophronius' role as a 'representative' or 'patron' (προστάτης) of the πατρίς was the source of a special moral obligation to serve its interests.[84] By inviting Sophronius to act as patron in this public fashion, Gregory both offered an opportunity and laid down a challenge to him to live up the expectations of his πατρίς.

Naturally, Gregory stressed the pre-eminent role of virtue in making appointments to office. This was particularly marked in letters to non-Cappadocians: compare his letters on behalf of the same Eudoxius to Themistius,[85] or that on behalf of Amphilochius, future bishop of Caesarea and Gregory's cousin, to an official named Caesarius.[86] But when writing to Sophronius for Amphilochius, Gregory again invoked a more civic patriotic register.[87] It would show his greatness of soul, Gregory proclaimed, instructing Sophronius 'honour the fatherland, assist virtue, and show your regard for us [ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν πατρίδα τίμησον, καὶ τὴν ἀρετῇ βοήθησον, καὶ ἡμᾶς αἰδέσθητι τοὺς παρὰ σοῦ]'.[88] In the hypothesised structure of Gregory's original letter-collection, these letters would all have been grouped together by addresee.[89] This would have the effect of advertising both Gregory's patriotic sentiments and Sophronius' willing responsiveness to them. Moreover, Sophronius was still living when Gregory published his collection in the early 380s.[90] Gregory thus had an incentive to cultivate his friendship, and a dossier of letters reminding Sophronius of his past generosity to fellow Cappadocians both praised him and established an expectation of future patriotic favours.

---

[81] Gregory, *Ep*. 37.1 (Gallay 1.46). Compare on the theme of notables honouring and serving the πατρίς in imperial positions, Lib., *Ep*. 61 (Foerster 1963, 57–9), 666 (607–9), 1443 (483).
[82] Gregory, *Ep*. 37.1 (Gallay 1.46). PLRE 1.290 (Eudoxius 2).
[83] Gregory, *Ep*. 37.4 (Gallay 1.47).
[84] Sophronius is unlikely to have been the legal patron of a particular Cappadocian city, despite Gregory's language, as his loyalty to Cappadocia is being invoked here and the formal institution of civic patronage (well known in the case of Pliny and Tibernum Tiferinum) was in decline in this period. Krause 1987, 68–72.
[85] Gregory, *Ep*. 38 (Gallay 1.47–8).
[86] Gregory, *Ep*. 23 (Gallay 1.31–2). PLRE 1.58 (Amphilochius 4); this Caesarius may be identical with PLRE 1.168–9 (Caesarius 1). On Amphilochius, see Pouchet 1992, 405–38; Rousseau 1994, 259–63.
[87] On Gregory's relationship with Amphilochius, see Van Dam 2003b, 148–50.
[88] Gregory, *Ep*. 22.5 (Gallay 1.31).
[89] Storin 2019b. Compare the importance of patriotic language in Basil's letters to Sophronius (*Ep*. 76 (Courtonne 1.178–9), 96 (Courtonne 1.208), 272 (Courtonne 3.145–6)).
[90] PLRE 1.848.

Gregory's collection, I suggest, also established his image as a man with connections amongst his local contemporaries, who might resent his Constantinopolitan sojourn. One of Gregory's letters addressed the Cappadocian magistrate Candidianus,[91] praising him for 'preserving your goodwill toward the fatherland and gathering a deathless glory (in mortal affairs) [τηρῶν δὲ τῇ πατρίδι τὴν εὔνοιαν καὶ ἀθάνατον ἐν θνητῷ πράγματι τὴν δόξαν καρποῦμενος]'. Though affirming in the next sentences that divine affairs merited more consideration, Gregory's language was thoroughly Homeric – 'deathless glory' (δόξα ἀθάνατος) 'in mortal affairs' (ἐν θνητῷ) evoked a poetic world where service to the πατρίς and immortal glory were closely tied.[92] Candidianus was a provincial governor in the diocese of Pontus under Julian (361–2).[93] This Homeric language and appeal to patriotism may thus have been an attempt to appeal to the Classicism of a potential supporter of Julian's, albeit delivered with a polite but firm assertion of Gregory's Christianity.[94] As Storin has observed, Gregory's publication of his letter-collection formed a way of advertising his position as a man of contacts and influence.[95] One might add that also it showed commitment to his provincial peers. Far from abandoning them to take up a more prestigious position of power close to the imperial centre, he had patriotically interceded with imperial elites on the πατρίς's behalf throughout his life.

However, I suggest that civic patriotism in these letters also had a generic imperial public in mind, which appreciated civic patriotism when shown by others even if they did not share in the same πατρίς. In support of this contention, we may recall Julian, who lauded Constantius as a patriot and emphasised his own credentials. Why should an emperor present himself, or allow himself to be presented, as particularly favouring a certain city, province or group, unless such favouritism was normative and expected? Likewise, career officials like Sophronius, Martianus or Aburgius accepted petitions framing them as civic benefactors presumably because of their imperial prominence and not despite it. It seems likely that civic patriotism and a good reputation in one's homeland was expected of elites even by people with no connection to that particular locality, as simply indicative of a commitment to a common imperial norm.[96] One may compare the remarks of Symmachus when recommending a bishop to his brother: 'His cause, not his religion, persuades me to do this: Clemens, performing the duty of a good man, . . . has safeguarded Caesarea, his fatherland [*officium Caesaream, quae illi patria est… tutatus est*].'[97] Symmachus and his brother had connections to Caesarea

[91] PLRE 1.178–9 (Candidianus 2). It is usually thought on the basis of this letter and the absence of scriptural references in extant letters to him that Candidianus was not a Christian – see Pouchet 1992, 107.
[92] Gregory, *Ep*. 10.13 (Gallay 1.16).
[93] See Basil, *Ep.* 3 (Courtonne 1.13), Storin 2019, 84.
[94] It is worth noting that this is the only letter to Candidianus in Gregory's corpus.
[95] Storin 2019b, 87–94; with Storin 2017.
[96] See for example Lib., *Ep.* 76 (Foerster 1.77), 1392 (2.433–4), 1460 (2.495), 1514 (2.539). See now Ryan 2020, 115–16.
[97] Symm. *Ep*. 1.64 (trans. Salzman and Roberts 2011, 133). Cited in Gassman 2020, 141; with commentary in Weisweiler 2011, esp. 343–9.

Mauretania,[98] but in the published version of the letter there was no indication of this link – merely the general commendation of patriotic sentiment.[99]

Gregory's collection of funerary epigrams, subsequently published in book form, was another text where civic patriotic ideas were used to appeal to a wider imperial audience as well as to local readers. These texts extensively employing traditional epigraphic motifs and literary conventions.[100] Unlike inscribed epigrams, however, these were accessible to (and targeted towards) a trans-imperial reading public.[101] Gregory's decision to produce a book of funerary tomb epigrams, that might in another context have been prime candidates for inscription, is a suggestive reflection of the contemporary decline of the epigraphic habit alluded to above.[102] Trans-imperial influence is confirmed by the fact that Gregory's words have been found inscribed as far away as Egypt – which also suggests the possibility that some were inscribed locally.[103] There is rather less scholarship on the purpose of Gregory's epigrams than on his letters. This is partially because collections of epigrams are less common generally, and partially because scholars have tended to read Gregory's epitaphs in emotional terms.[104] Nonetheless, I would argue that similar rationales informed the publication both of Gregory's epigrams and of his letters. Both collections allowed for the demonstration of civic patriotic credentials, on the part of Gregory and the figures he wrote to and wrote about. As such, like the 'gifts bearing Greekness' of the letters,[105] the poems were 'gifts of friendship' which affirmed and celebrated Gregory's connections before a wider audience.[106]

Many of the men celebrated by Gregory were figures of both local and imperial significance, such as the high official and Cappadocian Martianus, to whom Basil had written (unsuccessfully) over the status of Caesarea.[107] 'The Tomb of renowned Martianus. If you have heard of this representative of the noble Cappadocians at Rome, adorned with every kind of virtue, [εἴ τιν' ἀκούεις, Καππαδοκῶν Ῥώμης πρόθρονον εὐγενέων, παντοίας ἀρετῆσι κεκασμένον], reverence even his dust and tend his

[98] For the Symmachi's connection to North Africa, see Salzman and Roberts 2011, 132–3.
[99] For the broader significance of this episode and local links in forming Symmachus' trans-regional elite networks, see Weisweiler 2011.
[100] For the interaction of Gregory's poetry with contemporary Anatolian epigraphy, see Floridi 2013; Simelidis 2019; on their literary artifice, see Consolino 1987. Scholars analysing the epigrams have tended to concentrate on debating the influence of Christianity or their originality rather than their social or political significance: thus Salvatore 1960; though see now Goldhill and Greensmith 2020.
[101] The classic study is MacMullen 1982. See further bibliography at Part I n. 6–7.
[102] On epigrammatic collections in the earlier period, see Krevans 2007.
[103] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.108 (Beckby 502), inscription given in I.Métr. 61/GVI 593. For comment, see Simelidis 2019.
[104] Van Dam 2003b, 79, 98. More generally in connection with his poetry Bernardi 1995, 314 refers to him as 'une âme tormentée', Van Dam 2003a, 173 suggests some of the sentiments in his poetry can 'seem pathetically self-indulgent'; White 1996, xixx is more sympathetic. For a summary of this style of approach (with bibliography), see McLynn 1998, 465; Elm 2000, 414 n. 8; Storin 2019b, 21–4. See further ch. 6 n. 58.
[105] Howard 2013.
[106] Demoen 1997. See also McDonald 2020.
[107] See above n. 16.

monument and tomb.'[108] The subsequent epitaph requests that 'if there is any gratitude for my glory, may this tomb remain forever'.[109] Gregory here did not refer to Martianus as a προστάτης but rather with the *hapax* πρόθρονος, which conveyed the sense of an intercessor for the community including (presumably) ambitious provincials who sought promotion.[110] That Martianus was acting as the πρόθρονος 'of the Cappadocians at Rome' underscores the degree to which civic patriotic ideology's scope was expanded and (effectively) internationalised. He was praised here for assisting other Cappadocians who found their way to Rome, perhaps as orators, litterateurs, aspirant bureaucrats, or merchants. Emphasising Martianus career at Rome, Gregory went on to stress the service he had performed there, which had earned him gratitude from the cities of Italy. 'When Martianus went beneath Earth, mother of all, every city of the Italians groaned [πᾶσα μὲν Αὐσονίων ἐστονάχησε πόλις].'[111] Yet he would also be fêted by Cappadocians: 'we, safeguarding your great tomb now in place of yourself, will hand it over to those coming after as something revered for eternity [ἡμεῖς δ' ἀντί νυ σεῖο τάφον μέγαν ἀμφιέποντες αἰὲν ἐπερχομένοις δώσομεν ὥς τι σέβας]'.[112] Other epigrams also combined his imperial and local service, emphasising further the integration of civic patriotic ideals into wider imperial elite networks and ideology.[113]

Another recipient of such acclaim was Gregory's younger brother Caesarius.[114] Caesarius had trained as a physician at Constantinople and intermittently pursued his calling there, close to the corridors of power, leaving the city for Cappadocia and returning again at least twice in his life (once under Constantius and another time under Julian).[115] Eventually attaining the post of *quaestor* of Bithynia under Valens, Caesarius narrowly escaped death in 368 in an earthquake that shook the city of Nicomedia, before succumbing to a plague which ravaged the city thereafter. Gregory's funerary poetry celebrated his medical accomplishment and its glorification of Cappadocia, though emphasising in particular Caesarius' imperial career. 'Beautiful Caesarius, widely acclaimed from our fatherland, who attained the height of all wisdom [κάλλιμον ἐκ πατρίης σὲ μεγακλέα τηλόθ' ἐόντα, ἄκρα φέροντα πάσης, Καισάριε, σοφίης], we sent you, the first of our physicians, to the emperor, but alas, received afresh only your ashes from the Bithynians' land [πέμψαντες βασιλῆι τὸν

[108] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.116 (Beckby 506). Gregory's epigrams circulated together in book form before being added to the *Anth. Pal.* – see Alan Cameron 1993, 16, 145–6; Lauxtermann 2003, vol. I, 111–12; Goldhill and Greensmith 2020, 41–2. Paton thinks the reference to 'Rome' here indicates Constantinople (Paton 1917, 451 n. 1), but I follow PLRE 1.564 in thinking the references indicate the actual city of Rome given that Martianus' career was mainly western.
[109] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.117 (Beckby 506).
[110] Archaising and obscure language is a more general feature of late-antique verse epigraphy – see Sironen 2017, 450–2.
[111] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.106 (Beckby 500).
[112] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.106 (Beckby 500).
[113] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.107 (Beckby 500), 113 (Beckby 504).
[114] On the importance of traditional education and wisdom in Gregory's epigrammatic praise of Caesarius, see Goldhill and Greensmith 2020, 43–4. Biographical summary in PLRE 1.170 (Caesarius 2).
[115] On Caesarius' career and his relationship with Gregory, see McGuckin 2001, 30–4, 115–16, 157–62; Van Dam 2003b, 60–5; Elm 2012b, 66, 225, 471–2.

ἔξωχον ἰητήρων, φεῦ, κόνιν ἐκ Βιθυνῶν δεξάμεθ' αὖ σε πέδου].'[116] Another epigram compared the dual desolation of court and country as a result of this loss. 'When Caesarius died the imperial courts lamented, and Cappadocia suddenly tottered [Καισαρίου φθιμένοιο κατήφησαν βασιλῆος αὐλαί, Καππαδόκαι δ' ἤμυσαν ἐξαπίνης]'.[117] In another epigram Gregory compared the death of Caesarius with that of Philagrius, probably to be identified with the Cappadocian Prefect of Egypt of the same name.[118] 'Listen, Alexandria, Philagrius has lost his beauty, which was not inferior to his rational soul, and envy has snatched the young Caesarius. Nevermore shall you send such flowers [τοῖα... ἄνθεα] to Cappadocia, blessed in horses'.[119] Both men were cast as credits to Cappadocia, connecting Cappadocia and Alexandria by their careers, leading both to lament their deaths.[120] Gregory focused more on Caesarius' prestigious career at court, mentioning it in *Epigrams* 86, 93, 95, 96 and 97, compared to the three epigrams which specifically invoked Cappadocia.[121] And interestingly all the invocations of Cappadocia as Caesarius' desolated πατρίς came together with mentions of the court or with Alexandria. Along with invocations of his wisdom and skill as a doctor, then, Caesarius' imperial career drew more attention than his did his role as a local patriot and source of prestige.

* * * * *

Overall, then, we have seen how civic patriotic rhetoric was used to further individual and communal advantage by Basil, Julian and Gregory. The differences in their circumstances and religious views makes this common language the more impressive. It was not only used by petitioners, but could enable the powerful (including emperors) to gain legitimacy. While civic patriotism only formed one element in a wider group of arguments, this was also true of the early Empire. Rationales based on virtue, family or need had always co-existed with, complemented and contested locality. What is strikingly different, however, is the migration of genre and what this says about civic patriotism's function. Poems and letters reached a different public to inscriptions, creating horizontal links with other imperial elites rather than vertical ones with other citizens.[122] The decline in epigraphic celebrations of patrons was at least partially made up for by acclamations chanted in the theatre and elaborate public orations, both of which gave city and fatherland a high prominence.[123] Nonetheless,

---

[116] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.93 (Beckby 494).
[117] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.96 (Beckby 494).
[118] PLRE 1.694 (Fl. Philagrius 5) – *Anth. Pal.* 8.96 is not cited in the PLRE entry, but it seems overwhelmingly likely that poem refers to the same Philagrius given the poem's linkage of Alexandria and Cappadocia which accords with the other known details of Philagrius' life. Caesarius meanwhile had studied in Alexandria.
[119] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.100 (Beckby 496).
[120] Caesarius had studied at Alexandria along with Gregory himself. Philagrius according to Athanasius was an Arian sympathiser – *Historia Arianorum* 10 (Opitz 1935, 188), 12 (189), 18.2 (192); *Epistula Encyclica* 3 (Opitz 1935, 171–2) – underscoring the confessionally-neutral character of Gregory's civic patriotism here. My thanks to Kay Boers for references/discussion on this point.
[121] See also invocations of his learning generically, often referring to his skill as a physician specifically: *Anth. Pal.* 85B, 86, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98 (Beckby 490, 492–6).
[122] Compare the public nature of local inscriptions highlighted in Chaniotis 2012; Ellis-Evans 2012.
[123] Brown 2012, 66–7, 77.

the increasing significance of letter-collections (and also the collection and publication of panegyrics) testifies to the significance of an elite imperial reading public. Indeed, public collections of inscribed letters such as those at Oinanda and Aphrodisias quite possibly influenced the collection of early Christian letters – which may indicate in turn that trans-imperial letter collections themselves had roots in local civic practices.[124] Moreover, in the patriotic language of these letters and epigrams there is a clear sense of the priority of the elite as the addressees and the subjects of pleas made in the name of the city, compared to an arguably more egalitarian earlier rhetoric. It is in this sense that we might speak, with Quentin Skinner, of fourth-century users of this language as 'innovating ideologists', taking a familiar discourse and applying its terminology to new ends while preserving the appearance of ideological continuity.[125] Nonetheless, despite common narratives of late-antique history which prioritise the growth of the late Roman state and the relative decline of local officeholding as an elite career, the adaptability and flexibility of civic patriotic ideas and rhetoric is indicative of the wider responsiveness of elite culture in late Antiquity – as well of the continuing significance of local identity in an increasingly interconnected imperial world.

[124] Nasrallah 2018.
[125] Q. Skinner 2002, 149–50.

Chapter Two – Local Elites and Civic Patriotism

The previous chapter established the significance of civic patriotic language as a means of elite communication and the advocacy of communal and individual interests. This chapter will concentrate on the ideology of elite rule, and how civic patriotic ideology enabled elites to justify their social pre-eminence. It is a commonplace that elites came to dominate cities during the high Imperial period, though what this domination meant is more contentious.[1] Both the declinist interpretation of Wolf Liebeschuetz and the more positive account of Peter Brown, however, share the view that elites became less attached to their localities.[2] A primary concern of this chapter will thus be to show that aristocratic activity and governance within the πόλις was still conceived in the familiar terms of service to the πατρίς – that elitism, in other words, did not necessitate the decline of local feeling. The conduct and prestige of elites was also felt to 'ornament' and glorify the πατρίς, as the deeds of famous orators and generals had done in earlier ages.

However, this elitism could challenge civic elites. In particular, the emphasis on the need for order and hierarchy tended to favour monarchy as a mode of rule, and encourage subordination to imperially-appointed officials. This subordination, in turn, was not usually couched in patriotic terms, but rather grounded in generic appeals for order. As such, it will suggest a qualified support for Brown's view (following Foucault) that monarchical ideas of governance could challenge civic patriotism.[3] Nonetheless, it will conclude by arguing that this challenge did not destroy patriotic sentiment altogether. Rather, Basil, Julian and Gregory made use of both elitist monarchic and civic patriotic languages in different circumstances. This duality foreshadows the same ambivalence we will see on a wider scale with the Cappadocians' religious ambivalence towards the whole idea of attachment to an earthly πατρίς – though it was not nearly as great a concern.

Civic Patriotic Language and Local Elite Rule

Leadership of the locality in office was both a normative duty and a legal responsibility in the later Roman Empire. Yet it could also be an onerous burden. By the late fourth century, many local officials were imperial appointees, while smaller and more numerous provinces meant easier

[1] On the role of notables, see Larsen 1934, 212; Jones 1940, 208–9; Bowman 1971, 155–8; Whittow 1990; Laniado 2002, 201–23; Michael Whitby 2006, 450–1; Curchin 2014.
[2] Liebeschuetz 2001, 104–24; Liebeschuetz 2002; Brown 2002, 74–87; Brown 2012, 53–71.
[3] For roots of Brown's view, see Introduction pp. 10–11 and further remarks in Brown 2002, 6–7.

gubernatorial supervision of councils' decisions.[4] Local councillors (*curiales* or βουλευταί) nonetheless remained responsible for collecting imperial taxes, liable to fill local magistracies (which involved financial outlay) and perform civic liturgies. City councils no longer minted their own coinage and enjoyed generally reduced revenues, with much urban spending in the hands of governors instead.[5] Careers in imperial administration had, in contrast, become more lucrative, more prestigious and (crucially) more available.[6] It is sometimes suggested that this elite abandonment was the result of declining civic patriotic sentiment,[7] though it seems more probable that Greek elites desired imperial recognition from a much earlier period.[8] In any case, trans-imperial elite networks became increasingly common in the later Roman Empire as a result of central government's expansion.[9] For this reason, many scholars see this period as characterised by 'curial flight' from local councils to central government posts, and the general decline of these institutions.[10]

Yet the position of local elites remained privileged in many respects. They still maintained privileges of exemption from corporal punishment and conscription, without paying the extraordinary levies to which senators were liable. Their responsibility for the collection of taxes offered plenty of opportunity for peculation, leading the fifth-century Gallic presbyter Salvian famously to bewail the fact: *quot curiales fuerint, tot tyranni sunt.*[11] Informally, members of the local elite (though not always members of the curial class) exercised substantial influence over imperial officials.[12] Claims of mass curial desertion were the rhetoric of interested parties: principally imperial governments which sought to enlist as many local notables into the tax system as possible, and members of the elite like Libanius who echoed these claims in the hopes of preferment. It particularly suited Julian, for

[4] A burgeoning literature has arisen in the last thirty years on local office and the government of cities in late Antiquity – see Whittow 1990; Liebeschuetz 2001, 104–36; Liebeschuetz 2002; Laniado 2002; Cecconi 2006; Rapp 2005, 279–89; Haarer 2015 and now the collected studies in *L'Antiquité tardive* 2018. On new officeholders and positions, see Burton 1979; Curchin 2014; Schmidt-Hofner 2014; Feissel 2017; Frakes 2018.
[5] The precise mechanisms for this change are unclear. The traditional view of A H M Jones, endorsed by most historians, was that cities lost their lands under Constantine, and received back one-third under Valens. Jones 1964, 1.131–2, 2.732–4, Delmaire 1989, 645 n. 5 with earlier bibliography: following Jones are Bonamente 1983, 46–7, Lenski 2016, 173–5. Bransbourg favours the view that land remained attached to cities but that they lost control of it and all but one-third of its revenues – see Bransbourg 2008; 2009. Schmidt-Hofner dissents further and suggests that no confiscation took place under Constantine; rather it was solely temple lands that were acquired – Schmidt-Hofner 2006; reasserted in Schmidt-Hofner 2020. Some readjustment of the balance between imperial and local revenues to the benefit of the former certainly took place, however. For civic spending, see Roueché and Reynolds 1989, xxv; Bodnaruk 2017, 153–4; Ryan 2020.
[6] See here Part I n. 2 above.
[7] See Introduction pp. 9–11.
[8] Thus Plutarch's statement that '[some] are not content with whatever portion of either repute or power among their own fellow-countrymen has fallen to their lot, but weep because they do not wear the patrician shoe'. Plut. *Mor. de tranq. anim.* 470C (Paton, Pohlenz & Sieveking 1972, 201).
[9] Weisweiler 2015; Weisweiler 2016.
[10] For the classic account, see Jones, 1940, 205–10; Jones 1964, 2.748–52; Liebeschuetz 1972, 166–86; Liebeschuetz 1996b, 7. The picture remains a fairly common one: see, for instance, Delmaire 1996; Lenski 2003, 275–7; Banaji 2007, 131–3; Dey 2015, 25–33; reprised in Dey 2018, 164–7.
[11] Salvian, *De gubernatore Dei* 5.4.18 (Lagarrigue 1971, 324).
[12] Whittow 1990; Brown 1992, 22–6; Liebeschuetz 2002; Michael Whitby 2006.

instance, to portray himself as the benevolent patron of the cities by issuing pro-conciliar legislation which highlighted the incompetence of his predecessors and stressed his unique concern for his subjects.[13] Civic patriotism was invoked as a way of encouraging these elites to stay as administrators and rulers of their πατρίδες, but these appeals also served their interests by entrenching them at the expense of other groups in the πόλις.

That said, there clearly were reasons for trying to escape local service as well as for engaging in it. One such route is illustrated by Basil's correspondence with the young Cappadocian Christian Firminus, who had enrolled in the imperial army and was maintaining some kind of ascetic practice.[14] Basil accused him of writing infrequently, alleging that 'you yourself have been silent through shame of your plan' to abandon the πατρίς.[15] Accusing him of 'deserting the ranks of your blessed forefathers [καταλιπόντα σε τὴν τῶν μακαρίων προγόνων τάξιν]', Basil exhorted him instead to take up a career in local office.

> [We urge you] to return to your native country, since as regards security of life and all glory it is enough to be the ruler, like your forefathers, of your own city through your leadership [καταλαβεῖν τὴν πατρίδα, ἀρκοῦν πρὸς ἀσφάλειαν βίου καὶ πρὸς πάσαν περιφάνειαν τὸ ἐξίσου τοῖς προγόνοις κρατῆσαι τῆς πόλεως ἡγησάμενον]: and in this we are confident that you can succeed without difficulty, as we observe, not only the suitability we observe in your nature [τὴν ἐκ φύσεως ἐπιτηδειότητα ἀφορμῶντες], but also the absence of opponents.[16]

A number of ideas thread through this exhortation. Basil's invocation of Firminus' fitness by 'nature' (φύσις, a term carrying the sense of inherent or essential being) is significant given his reiteration of the precedent set by Firminus' 'forefathers' (πρόγονοι). Firminus' ancestors, Basil seems to say, were not just a source of moral obligation: they provided him with an almost genetic disposition to serve the πατρίς. Finally, Basil described Firminus' provincial career of (presumably) curial service and local magistracies in terms of 'ruling' (κρατῆσαι) the city. While perhaps hyperbole in favour of impressing on Firminus the power he would be able to wield in his locality, civic patriotic ideas more generally had adapted to present elite 'rule' in these more starkly authoritarian terms. Writing to a retired *censitor*,[17] Basil pleaded with him to resume a career in local politics rather than enjoy the exemption to which

---

[13] Tougher 2007, 49–51; Schmidt-Hofner 2020, 144. Compare the criticism of his policy offered in Amm. Marc. 25.4.21 (Seyfarth, Jacob-Karau, Ulmann 1978, 364).
[14] PLRE 1.339 (Firminus 3), though Basil, *Ep.* 116 is missing from the PLRE entry. See further on Firminus, Kopecek 1974a, 327–34.
[15] Basil, *Ep*. 116 (Courtonne 2.20–1).
[16] Basil, *Ep*. 116 (Courtonne 2.21). Compare the linkage of ancestral rule and civic leadership in Basil, *Ep*. 24 (Courtonne 1.60).
[17] *Censitores* were imperially-appointed officials with the responsibility of reassigning the tax burden of a province – see Jones 1964, 1.62, 1.454–5; Vogler 1992, 457.

his career in imperial service had entitled him. Basil argued that he owed it to his city to come out of his rural idyll and fulfil the function of civic leadership, 'to rule over a city as though it were a single household [κρατεῖν πόλεως ὡς μιᾶς οἰκίας]', again using κρατέω.[18] Mixing domestic and civic governance was not necessarily an unusual move, but it reinforced a distinct sense of subordination.[19] Yet intriguingly, a letter which seems to be Firminus' response (though not labelled as such in the manuscripts) makes only the vaguest reference to the arguments of 'men who are joined to us by many other just claims', and concentrates rather on the ascetic reasons for abandoning military service.[20] Clearly civic patriotic imprecations were not always accepted by their addressee – even if the request itself was.

When Basil wrote to his contacts at court to try and get them to lobby against the division of Cappadocia in 381, he stressed further how essential the elite was to civic health.[21] Basil emphasised that Caesarea would suffer with the relocation of a portion of its elite to the small city of Podandus, which Valens was proposing to elevate to civic status.[22] 'The danger is not slight, with the rulers removed, that everything will collapse, together with its pillars [τῶν κρατούντων ὑφαιρεθέντων, ὥσπερ ἐρείσμασι πεσοῦσι συγκατενεχθῆναι τὰ πάντα]'.[23] Like Gregory describing the chief citizens as 'pillars' (ἐρείσματα), Basil's rhetoric underscored the importance of the elite for the wellbeing of the city. Indeed, at times the elite even appeared coterminous with the citizen body. Basil warned of the city's collapse 'since many of her *curiales* were taken away beforehand [πολλῶν μὲν καὶ πρότερον αὐτῆς ἀφαιρεθέντων τῶν πολιτευομένων], and now almost all of them have emigrated to Podandus'.[24] In another letter, Basil emphasised that this meant the death of civic government. 'For gone is our government [πολίτευμα], and the whole body politic [τὸ πολιτικὸν σύνταγμα], having abandoned its dwelling in the city through despair over its rulers [τῇ περὶ τοῦς κρατούντας ἀθυμίᾳ], is wandering aimlessly through the countryside'.[25] The health of the city could not have been more clearly linked that of its elite, or their leadership role more emphatically stated. This was fully in line with the view of imperial administrators and other contemporaries. Julian attacked the elite of Antioch in his

[18] Basil, *Ep*. 299 (Courtonne 3.173).
[19] Kings as fathers are a classic Homeric *topos* – see *Odyssey* 2.47, 2.262, 5.12.
[20] Basil, *Ep*. 117 (Courtonne 2.22). Cf. Lib., *Ep.* 1048 (Foerster 1963, 2.170–2), 1066 (2.190), from which it seems that Firminus did eventually became one of Caesarea's municipal sophists after a long military career, returning to his πατρίς but avoiding the responsibilities Basil wished him to take up.
[21] Compare ch. 1. pp. 27–32.
[22] Podandus was a small town on the strategic *Via Tauri* route on the border between Cappadocia and Cilicia, and upgrading it to civic status offered Valens a staging post on the way to Antioch. See Harper 1970; Van Dam 2002, 29–30.
[23] Basil, *Ep*. 74.3 (Courtonne 1.175).
[24] Basil, *Ep*. 75 (Courtonne 1.177).
[25] It is notable that *Vaticanus graecus* 434 (Ec in Fedwick's classification) reads 'body of citizens' (τὸ πολιτῶν σύνταγμα) here – Basil, *Ep*. 76 (Courtonne 1.178); see PG 32.431 n. 34. If this is the original reading Basil's statement recalls even more Gregory's protestation that Nazianzus' citizens would become disoriented and de-civilised by the loss of their πόλις – see ch. 1 pp. 32–3.

Misopogon for failing to recruit fitting men for the council, while the legal draftsmen of Honorius referred to curial flight as causing 'the ruin of the councils [*exitium curiarum*]'.[26] Basil thus threatened the state with the prospect of curial flight, ironically using government rhetoric about the need for *curiales* to serve their *patria* and the dangers of councillors' desertion against imperial policy. To put it in the terms of the Cambridge School of political thought, it was an adept and skilful redeployment of a shared political language to which both Basil and the Roman state were committed. It was also partially successful: although the provincial division went ahead, Caesarea's *curiales* escaped relocation to Podandus.[27]

Civic service, by this same token, could nonetheless be a burden to be shunned. When Basil wrote to the governor Modestus to excuse his friend Helladius from service as a *censitor* outside Cappadocia, he claimed that this exemption was necessary 'that he, being relieved of the responsibilities of tax-assessor, might be permitted to toil in the affairs of our country [ἐν τοῖς πράγμασι τῆς πατρίδος ἡμῶν συγχωρηθῆναι μοχθεῖν]'.[28] For Helladius, so Basil claimed, 'held first place' in the province; forcing him to take up this post would deprive the πατρίς of resources it could use elsewhere. A sense of laboriousness, and the burden rather than the glory of local office, was emphasised by Basil's use of the term μοχθέω, and by the very logic of an argument that stressed the impossibility of simultaneously serving both imperial and local government. This emphasis on the difficulty of government displays how local service could be recast as the opportunity demanded.

Other instances of this argument were rather more forceful. Neil McLynn has pointed to Gregory's attempts to exempt his nephew-in-law Nicobulus from curial service, accusing his opponents of trying to impose 'slavery' on him in his petition to Olympius.[29] 'Must Nicobulus be a slave [δεῖ δουλεύειν Νικόβουλον], or his children, as it seems to those who threaten him?'[30] Gregory invoked his service to the imperial government: 'nowadays when one helps the public interest [τὰ δημόσια], when one grows the city councils, does one compromise one's private interest?'[31] Highlighting Nicobolus' concern for 'public interest' in a wider sense, Gregory aimed to play on the tension between imperial and local needs for resources, suggesting that Nicobulus had already done his part through his time in imperial service and that he thus deserved exemption from local dues.[32] Basil, too, interceded for a petitioner who wished to enjoy his imperially obtained exemption from curial service, but found himself

[26] Julian, *Misop.* 367D–68B; *CTh* 12.1.149. On Julian's measures against curial flight, see Bonamente 1983, 79–85 who argues that his most significant single measure financially was his revocation of exemptions for Christian clerics.
[27] Van Dam 2002, 34.
[28] Basil, *Ep.* 281 (Courtonne 3.153). PLRE 1.412 (Helladius 2), PLRE 1.605–8 (Domitius Modestus 2). Kopecek 1973, 458 identifies this Helladius with Basil's successor as bishop of Caesarea; cf. Kopecek 1974a, 37–40.
[29] McLynn 2006, 289; see also Kopecek 1974a, 334–7. PLRE 1.629 (Nicobulus 1).
[30] Gregory, *Ep.* 146.6 (Gallay 2.38).
[31] Gregory, *Ep.* 146.6 (Gallay 2.38).
[32] Compare also Gregory, *Ep.* 147.6 (Gallay 2.40).

liable for the liturgies of his underage grandchildren.[33] Urging in addition the supplicant's age and misfortunes as well as his exemption, Basil stressed the hardship of public service, compared to the restful leisure to which his unnamed petitioner was entitled.[34] Curial service, therefore, was hardly an unalloyed opportunity, even if its burdens may have been overstated. Even among those who intended to remain in their localities there was a recognition of its burdens.[35]

Administration, however, was not the only arena in which local elites might serve. More traditional privileges for doctors, rhetors and teachers were maintained in late Antiquity by the imperial state, which expected them to benefit both their city and mankind generally.[36] Moreover, these professions were often the road to personal advancement, with physicians like Julian's confidant Oribasius or Gregory's brother Caesarius rising high in imperial service.[37] Yet these professions retained patriotic associations. Allowing a doctor named Zeno to return to Alexandria, Julian expected the credit because of Zeno's popularity in his hometown - 'though absent, you are winning to your cause the whole city of Alexandria [τὴν τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων πόλιν ἀπὼν ἐπιστρέφεις εἰς σεαυτὸν]'.[38] 'And may the favour from it be reserved by both parties in common to me, as it returns Zeno to Alexandria and Alexandria to you [καὶ ἡμῖν κοινὴ παρ' ἀμφοτέροις χάρις ἀποκείσθω, Ἀλεχανδρεῦσι μὲν Ζήνονα, σοὶ δὲ ἀποδοῦσα Ἀλεχάνδρειαν]'.[39] The expectation was that Alexandria ought to be grateful to the emperor for benefiting them specifically, and was not just an invocation of Julian's benevolence to cities in general. It was also a recognition that doctors practising their ordinary profession were of benefit to the city in a specifically localist fashion, rather than merely on the grounds of universal φιλανθρωπία, which formed the rhetorical basis of Julian's other constitutions on doctors' exemptions.[40]

If doctors provided physical health, rhetors and lawyers contributed to the city's social wellbeing by representing it in civil suits, exhorting the benefits of co-operation and harmony, and

---

[33] Basil, *Ep.* 84.2 (Courtonne 1.188–9).
[34] See also *Ep.* 88 (Courtonne 1.192), in which Basil pleaded for leniency to allow the magistrates of Caesarea more time to collect the *aurum comparaticium*, a levy paid in lieu of conscripted recruits (see Jones 1964, 1.149, 1.420, 1.432).
[35] The same is true of imperial service: in addition to Basil's above-cited letter regarding Helladius, note Gregory's successful attempt to enable Nicobulus to retire from his post as *praefectus mansionis* on grounds of ill-health, which triggered the attempt to recruit him for curial service by local magistrates (see *Ep.* 126–7 (Gallay 2.35–7)).
[36] Grants of immunity from various liturgies to municipally registered teachers had been imperial policy since the first century AD, though late Antiquity did see the (haphazard) increase in the number of salaries directly provided by central government: Kaster 1988, 216–30; cf. Browning 2001, 870–1.
[37] On the increasing incorporation of doctors into an imperial system of exemptions like that of municipal teachers and the corresponding spread of the title ἀρχιάτρος, see Nutton 1977, 203–6.
[38] Julian, *Ep.* 17 426B (*Ep.* 58 Bidez-Cumont).
[39] Julian, *Ep.* 17 426C.
[40] Cf. Julian's notion of medicine as a divine gift to enable human philanthropy, justifying the confirmation of previous exemptions of physicians from various types of curial service at *Ep.* 31 (*Ep.* 25b Bidez-Cumont), *CTh* 13.3.4; see further Nutton 1977, 197–8. On medicine in Julian's writing, see Sardiello 1998.

representing it before the imperial authorities.[41] Indeed, the laudatory orations were themselves gifts to the πατρίς, because one had a duty to render thanks for benefits received, and the origins of panegyric specifically lay in speeches given on the occasion of a religious festival or πανήγυρις.[42] In his speech of thanks to the Empress Eusebia made just after he became Caesar in November 355, Julian described his praise of Greece and Athens in such terms: 'just as Corybants when excited by the flute dance and leap without method, so I am spurred by the memory of my studies to sing an encomium of that country and her people [ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ τῆς μνήμης τῶν παιδικῶν ἀνακινηθέντας ᾇσαι τῆς χώρας καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐγκώμιον]'.[43] Julian's trip to Athens had taken place under a cloud: just prior he had been held at court for several months under suspicion of treason.[44] Suggesting in the oration that this stint was in fact a beneficent concession to his classicism, therefore, was a clever way of reinterpreting the incident in light of his restored relationship with Constantius.[45] Though Julian did emphasise his ties to the city elsewhere, these were probably more calculated pieces of rhetoric than scholars have allowed.[46] Yet though his motives may have been complicated, the notion that praise was a natural product of one's attachment to one's homeland and city was clearly normative. Civic patriotic political language offered Julian a flexible way of both advertising his own virtue and of negotiating a new place in his cousin's regime.

Like Julian, Gregory in his epigrams celebrated literary and oratorical ability as aiding and augmenting the city. This is particularly visible in his epigrams on his uncle and cousin, Amphilochius (the elder) and his son Euphemius.[47] The latter was lauded as 'a rhetor among rhetors, and a rhyme-smith among poets, the glory of his fatherland, the glory of his parents [κύδος ἐῆς πάτρης, κῦδος ἑῶν τοκέων]'.[48] Gregory praised Euphemius' father with a cycle of eight poems (131–8), which reinforced this message. 'Amphilochus has died: if anything good was left amongst men it is gone, the spirit of rhetoric is diminished and the Graces mingled with the Muses have departed. But above all your dear native city Diocaesarea mourns you [ἔξοχα δ' αὖ σε ἡ Διοκαισαρέων μύρατο πάτρα φίλη].'[49] These praises were redolent with civic language and tropes, culminating in the florid

[41] Browning 2001, 860–2.
[42] Edwards 2015, 214.
[43] Julian, *In Euseb.* 119D. Cf. his description of Greece and Athens as his 'true πατρίς' at 118D, and the praise at 119A–D. There might be a coded reference to mystic initiation in the reference to Corybantic rites: Julian *Contr. Herac.* 222C; Gregory, *Or*. 4.54–6 (Bernardi 1983, 158–62).
[44] Cf. Introduction p. 17.
[45] On the oration and Eusebia's role, see Tougher 1998; James 2012.
[46] Julian, *Ep. ad Them.* 260B, *In Sol.* 152D–53A, *Ep. ad Ath.* 274D–75B (though Julian did not refer to Athens explicitly as his πατρίς in this letter). For Julian as an Athenian patriot, see Athanassiadi 1981, 50–1, 85–6; Pagliara 2014; for a contrasting emphasis on the emperor's ties to Constantinople, see Lenski 2003, 101 n. 200; cf. Weis 1964, 110–11.
[47] The father and brother of the bishop Amphilochius of Iconium – PLRE 1.57–8 (Amphilochius 2); PLRE 1.298 (Euphemius 1).
[48] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.122 (Beckby 508). Compare the description of Alypius (PLRE 1.47 (Alypius 6)) in Gregory, Ep. 207.2 (Gallay 2.100).
[49] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.134 (Beckby 514).

celebration of his abilities spoken in the person of the city herself. 'I, Diocaesarea, am a small town, but I gave a great man to the law-courts, Amphilochus [τυτθὸν μὲν πτολίεθρον, ἀτὰρ πόλυν ἀνέρα δῶκα βήμασιν ἰθυδίκοις ἡ Διοκαισαρέων, Ἀμφίλοχον [sic]]. With his death perished the fire of oratory and the nobly-born boast of his native city [καὶ πάτρης εὖχος ἀριστοτόκου].'[50] These praises underscore how men like Gregory emphasised family prestige through civic patriotism, claiming that elite activities geared towards private interests benefiting the πατρίς – amply demonstrating how civic patriotism was repurposed to aristocratic and dynastic ends.

Such expectations of elite governance and service were furthered by the links between families and cities, with the continuity of the former seen as integral to the welfare of the latter, and the deaths of prominent individuals viewed as much as a loss for the city as a whole as a misfortune for their immediate relatives. Some significant modern scholarship has emphasised elements of Christianity ambivalent or actively hostile towards the ancient city-family nexus, which demanded that individuals reproduce in order to maintain the city's continuity.[51] Yet such invocations of the value of individuals and families to the πατρίς were frequent elements of Cappadocian rhetoric. Writing in consolation to the wife of the official Nectarius to console her for the death of her son, Basil remarked on how 'his death has been a blow to two fatherlands, ours and Cilicia [ἐκείνου ὁ θάνατος πληγὴ ἐγένετο πατρίδων δύο, τῆς ἡμέτερας καὶ τῆς Κιλίκων]'.[52] Gregory's funerary epigrams particularly underscored the connections between family and πατρίς. The Euphemius mentioned above (Gregory's cousin) received a total of sixteen epigrams, several of which connected him to the πατρίς. Thus Gregory lamented that, 'his qualities were formerly the glory but now are the lament of Cappadocia [τὰ πρὶν Καππαδόκαις ἦν κλέα, νῦν δὲ γόος]',[53] praising the boy as 'he who was the talk of all Cappadocia'.[54] All the poems of the cycle stressed his youth, nearly all his accomplishment (more or less generically), and his being on the verge of marriage – connecting service to the πατρίς via virtue, the value of perpetuating the aristocratic *genos*, and the tragedy of being cut down in one's prime.[55] Likewise in two epigrams on the youth Bassus, Gregory lamented his death abroad. 'You have fallen far from your home by a robber's hand, nor does your ancestral tomb hold you. But nevertheless great is the name you have left in all Cappadocia [οὐδὲ σὲ τύμβος ἔχει πατρώιος· ἀλλὰ

[50] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.135 (Beckby 514); see also *Anth. Pal.* 8.138 (516). Compare Basil, *Ep.* 76 and its description of 'men of learning' as the glory of the city (Courtonne 1.178).
[51] Brown 1988, 7–8, 436–41; contrast Cooper 1996, 163–8, who agrees that virginity was a disruptive model of womanhood, but frames it as competing within civic space rather than outside or against it.
[52] Basil, *Ep.* 6.1 (Courtonne 1.19); compare his description of the boy as ἔρεισμα γένους, πατρίδος ἐλπίς to Nectarius himself (*Ep.* 5.1 (Courtonne 1.16)). He may be the same Nectarius as the future bishop of Constantinople who replaced Gregory (native of Cilicia, high status, around the right age, Christian) – Deferrari 1.33 n. 1. See PLRE 1.621 (Nectarius 2).
[53] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.125 (Beckby 510)
[54] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.126 (Beckby 510); compare *Anth. Pal.* 8.121 (512), ornamentation generally *Ep.* 37.1 (Gallay 1.46).
[55] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.122, 126–7 (Beckby 508–10).

καὶ ἔμπης πᾶσιν Καππαδόκεσσι μέγ' οὔνομα σεῖο λέλειπται].'[56] Gregory's rhetoric here made the πατρίς and the aristocratic household more or less coterminous – a development enhanced by his numerous epigrams against tomb desecrators, many of which presented elite tombs as beloved ornaments of the locality.[57]

Nor was Julian any different. In his panegyric in praise of Constantius' wife, the Empress Eusebia, whose family hailed from Thessalonica, he extolled her father for being the first of his family to attain consular rank. Julian's laudation expressed civic patriotic political language at its finest:

> For indeed it is a nobler thing to be the founder of a mighty city than a mere citizen… [and] it seems that sons receive from their fathers, and citizens from their cities, certain aptitudes for glory [Λαμβάνειν δὲ ἐοίκασι παρὰ τῶν πατέρων οἱ παῖδες καὶ οἱ πολῖται παρὰ τῶν πόλεων οἷον ἀφορμάς τινας πρὸς εὐδοξίαν].[58]

Julian's rhetoric here was imbued with patriotic notions of the parallel between, and mutual entanglement of, family and πατρίς belonging, relating rhetorically the two clauses (παρὰ τῶν πατέρων οἱ παῖδες and οἱ πολῖται παρὰ τῶν πόλεων) to each other in a chiastic (and highly assonant) fashion to strengthen further the sense of association between sons and fathers and cities and citizens. It was, moreover, only natural that 'sons and citizens' (οἱ παῖδες καὶ οἱ πολῖται) should concern themselves with the 'certain aptitudes for glory' (ἀφορμάς τινας πρὸς εὐδοξίαν) for which both city and family prepared them. Warming to his theme, however, Julian emphasised the virtue displayed by Eusebia's father, who had exceeded the upbringing and reputation conferred by his πατρίς. 'He who by his own effort pays back to his ancestors and his native land a more honourable foundation [προγόνοις τε καὶ πατρίδι μείζονα τιμῆς ὑπόθεσιν]… yields the prize to no man on the score of native nobility.'[59] Julian's treatment underscored how Eusebia's father glorified both his living descendants and his city, establishing that family's native virtue which was consummated in Eusebia herself and her marriage to the emperor – a greater achievement, in this telling, than to have merely received such

---

[56] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.147 (Beckby 520). Compare the polemical contrast Gregory made between the burials of Constantius and Julian – the former in 'his ancestral city' (τὴν πατρῴαν αὐτῷ πόλιν) (*Or.* 5.16 (Bernardi 1983, 324)) amidst much pomp and circumstance, the body of the latter was less fortunate. 'The city of Tarsus received him; I do not know why and for what reason they were to condemned to this indignity' (*Or.* 5.18 (328)).

[57] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.177–8 (Beckby 536), 182, 184 (538–40), 203–6, 212 (548–52), 224 (558), 239, 243 (564–6). For attacks on tomb desecration generally, see Rebillard 2009, 63–77.

[58] Julian, *In Euseb.* 108D.

[59] Julian, *In Euseb.* 108D. Compare praise of repaying ancestors at *In Const. II* 83A; Gregory's sentiment on Basil at *Or.* 43.8 (Bernardi 1993, 132).

glory from one's ancestors.[60]

If elites and their families formed a stronger element in civic patriotic thought, what role did this open up for elite women? The conventional view of Hellenistic city politics is that their oligarchic character gave women new prominence, and that their options were somewhat (though not massively) expanded by the coming of Christianity.[61] While this is doubtless true to some extent, their political role was limited in the thinkers under assessment. Women could certainly be praised as informal peacemakers, with Julian extolling Constantius II's wife Eusebia by comparing her to the Homeric queen Arete of Phaeacia, who had been able to 'resolve with justice suits arising amongst the citizens',[62] personally thanking her for interceding on his behalf with Constantius in 355 and thus exercising a role in public policy.[63] Normally, however, writers were keen to emphasise that female virtue ought to be exercised in a domestic environment as peacemakers.[64] Indeed, in a poem addressed to the Constantinopolitan noblewoman and deaconess Olympias on the occasion of her marriage, Gregory forthrightly opposed an active female engagement in civic politics.[65] He advised Olympias instead to devote herself to the domestic sphere and remove herself from public life. 'Your house is your city and your sacred grove [οἶκός σοι, πόλις ἐστὶ, καὶ ἄλσεα]. Do not look for others'.[66] This stark admonition both suggests Olympias' influence in church and city (ἄλσεα and πόλις) and the attempts of men like Gregory to limit that influence in line with conventional ideas of the separation of domestic and political spheres.[67] The influence that women did gain in this period, then, does not seem to have been reflected by a significant shift in the civic patriotic language used by the authors studied. Indeed, as we shall see with Gregory's discussion of his sister Gorgonia in Chapter Three, emphasising her non-civic attributes was a key element in Gregory's promotion of her as a virtuous female philosopher.

---

[60] Julian, *In Euseb.* 108C–D. Some measure of ambivalence on this question was to be expected in the later Roman Empire, where a number of provincial families achieved imperial prominence for the first time – see Banaji 2007, 131–3. Note however the caution against too high an estimate of social mobility in A. Skinner 2013. Julian also mentioned that Thessalonica was the chief city of Macedonia when detailing Eusebia's good qualities at 110B; cf. 107D.

[61] Bremen 1996, 4–5, 163–8, 302–3 discusses female prominence in the Hellenistic πὸλις but sees it as a fundamentally restrictive on elite women's freedom to dispose of their property; contrast the more optimistic view of Hemelrijk 2004. Christianity as the source of limited new opportunities for women argued (cautiously) in G. Clark 1993, 140–1; Cloke 1995, 4–6; by contrast, Burrus 1996, 160–4 emphasises more radical, if ultimately unsuccessful, challenges to orthodox gender roles.

[62] Julian, *In Euseb.* 105D.

[63] Julian, *In Euseb.* 120B–C, 121A, 123A–B. See Tougher 1998.

[64] Julian, *In Euseb.* 127B–28B, compare Gregory, *Or*. 8.9 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 262–4). For the ambiguous character of Julian's praise in this panegyric, see James 2012.

[65] PLRE 1.642–3 (Olympias 2); on the poem, see Mary Whitby 2008; on Olympias generally, see E. Clark 1979, 107–26; McCarty 2014. Gregory's admonitions had little effect, as Olympias became one of John Chrysostom's most active supporters.

[66] Gregory, *Carm.* 2.2.6 ll. 54–5 (PG 37.1546A).

[67] Humphreys 1993, 1–21; Burrus 1996, 6–12.

Despite the praise of elite leadership, there were clear limits to this civic vision. Not only was the later Roman Empire a monarchy, but neither Basil, Julian nor Gregory sought to challenge the *status quo*. Rather, all three embraced it. This monarchic strand of political thought and life stood in tension with the idea of a virtuous, self-governing aristocracy – particularly when the ruler was represented in the provinces by governors, replicating the monarchic system at the provincial level.[68] As such, it offered a separate political language, and not simply the redefinition of existing civic terminology. However, I will suggest that this alternative way of viewing political participation did not completely erase civic patriotic ways of conceiving power. Rulers like Julian and Constantius, as I have argued, had good reason to stress their links to particular cities. Elites, meanwhile, had opportunities for political participation through roles in the army and administration.

Both forms of government, monarchic and oligarchic, emphasised that good leaders needed to inspire their subordinates. Constantius, Julian claimed 'inspired the cities with zeal for undertaking public services [προθύμους δὲ εἶχες τὰς πόλεις πρὸς τὰς λειτουργίας]',[69] a pattern for the radiation of virtue also true for those lower down the social hierarchy.[70] Constantius' selection of officials was a further opportunity for praise. 'You take thought that your subjects should be well-born, as though you were the founder and law-giver of each city [καθάπερ ἁπάσης πόλεως οἰκιστὴς καὶ νομοθέτης]',[71] and contrasted his policy with some kings who by repressing virtue caused 'disasters for their cities'.[72] Conversely, Julian invoked to his own credit the competence of his uncle's administration of Antioch, given that Julian had appointed him. 'Did he not with utmost foresight administer the city's affairs [οὐ προμηθέστατα δὲ πάσαις ἐπεξῆλθε ταῖς οἰκονομίαις τῆς πόλεως]?'[73] This was of most concern to Julian, given his position as emperor. But those lower down the social scale shared the assumption. When discussing the appointment of bishops, Basil remarked that 'of whatever sort the rulers are, the characters of those governed are accustomed to become such for the most part'.[74]

This belief that elites could inspire obedience, however, could clash with the realities of dissent. Julian found this to his chagrin in his engagement with the city of Antioch. Despite (by his account) attempting to win over the city to his religious policy and augment its council, Julian was rebuffed by

[68] For criticism of monarchic rule by members of the (imperial) aristocracy, see Schmidt-Hofner 2020.
[69] Julian, *In Const. I* 48B; compare *Misopogon* 354B–C.
[70] See Basil, *Ep.* 269.2 (Courtonne 3.140).
[71] Julian, *In Const. I* 44B.
[72] Julian, *In Const. I* 43D. See the requirement that a monarch should appoint good magistrates at *In Const. II* 91D; compare the emphasis on administrators' virtue analysed in Weisweiler 2017; Schmidt-Hofner 2021.
[73] Julian, *Misop.* 365C; PLRE 1.470–1 (Julianus 12).
[74] Basil, *Ep*. 190 (Courtonne 2.141–2).

elite and populace alike.[75] In response, Julian promulgated his *Misopogon*. In the satire, Julian had his licentious Antiochene interlocutor expose his philosophical incoherence.[76] 'You say that you are not our master [δεσπότης εἶναι οὐ φὴς οὐδὲ ἀνέχῃ τοῦτο ἀκούων] and you won't hear [that title].' Yet despite this seeming leniency, Julian also forbidding the term ἀρχή (government, rule or empire, which like δεσπότης carried associations of overlordship), the Antiochene complained that 'you compel us to be enslaved to the magistrates and the laws [δουλεύειν δ' ἡμᾶς ἀναγκάζεις ἄρχουσι καὶ νόμοις]. But how much better it would be for you to accept the name of master, but actually allow us to be free [ὀνομάζεσθαι μέν σε δεσπότην, ἔργῳ δὲ ἐᾶν ἡμᾶς εἶναι ἐλευθέρους].'[77] Julian suggested that the supposedly authoritarian conduct of his predecessor Constantius, for which the Antiochenes yearned, was a self-contradictory model, allowing both autocracy and chaotic licence to co-exist. Playing with concepts of slavery (δουλεία) and freedom (ἐλευθέρια) throughout the *Misopogon*, Julian suggested that the Antiochene lack of virtue made them incapable of being truly free and capable of conducting civilised political life. Moreover, they had responded inadequately to his attempts to regenerate their city council, nominating unworthy men. They were thus guilty of ignoring the interests of their πόλις as well.[78] Yet ironically, the paradox Julian sought to expose in the ideology of his predecessor was the inverse of his own situation: as the Antiochenes had complained, in Julian's model 'freedom' was limited to doing what the emperor wanted.

Julian's time in Antioch illustrates a problem which faced many late Roman rulers. Although a virtuous prince ought in theory to be able to persuade his subjects to obedience, imperial power could and did impose itself on local elites, vitiating their autonomy. Yet the consensual expectations of civic rhetoric – and the practical difficulties of imposing the imperial will – meant that emperors had to pick their battles carefully. The very fact that Julian composed a pamphlet critiquing the Antiochenes as unconcerned for their city's wellbeing illustrates his need to justify his dispute with the city.[79] It also suggests his need to avoid accusations of tyranny, hence his repeated disavowal of despotism while on the throne.[80] Julian's position was, after all, far from secure – he had taken the throne in a successful

[75] In addition to the bibliography cited below, see Downey 1939; Browning 1975, 149–58; Athanassiadi 1981, 201–25; Elm 2012b, 327–35.
[76] The *Misopogon* has been assessed from various angles in recent years, from arguments over how successful or appropriate it was (Bowersock 1978, 103–4; Gleason 1986) to assessments of its genre (Marcone 1984; Long 1993; Janka 2008; Quiroga 2009) to (latterly) considerations of its political ideas and influences (Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011; Baker-Brian 2012; Hartman 2017).
[77] Julian, *Misop.* 343C.
[78] Julian, *Misop.* 367D–68B.
[79] Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011, 169–72. For a more judgemental formulation of the same tension Julian faced, see Bonamente 1983, 92.
[80] See for instance Julian, *Ep. ad Them.* 258A–B, 260D–62A, *Caes.* 308D, 332C–D. For the exchange between Julian and Themistius, see Barnes and Vanderspoel 1980; Vanderspoel 1995, 118–34; Elm 2012b, 96–106; Mike Humphries 2012; Watt 2012; Schramm 2014; Swain 2014.

coup barely a year before and might reasonably have feared challengers.[81] Taking the unusual step of satirising the Antiochene critics of his policies as insufficiently patriotic was thus partly necessitated by his insecurity. Paradoxically, Julian thus needed to portray himself as a consensus-minded, freedom-loving civic patriot in order effect his imperial will. This extends, in turn, to his self-portrayal as opposed to autocracy and tyranny more generally: it was a response to his political circumstances, and not simply the result of passionate political naivety.[82] It is a testament to Julian's eloquence and relative philosophical sophistication that scholars have so often neglected the *realpolitik* behind his self-image, giving him credit (as well as criticism) for idealism.

Compared to Julian, Basil and Gregory faced the opposite rhetorical imperative in their relationships to authority. Rather than avoid accusations of tyranny, they needed to prove their loyalty to the monarch and his governors.[83] Although they might address such men in informal and familiar terms in the semi-private world of Roman epistolary culture, formal public addresses to officials often required a more emphatic demonstration of the benefits of hierarchy, governance and order under a single ruler. If the governor in question was also one's friend, it positioned one as *primus inter pares* in the local community, as having sole intercession with such a high personage.[84] Just as Julian emphasised equality and civic community from above, so Gregory (and to a lesser extent Basil) constructed hierarchical, autocratic relationships from below.

As bishops Basil and Gregory also other personal incentives to endorse monarchy. Emphasising the abstract benefits of monarchy had theological advantages for themselves as monotheists. It also made a case for a more monarchic, episcopal model of church governance – in which both had strong personal stakes.

A sermon Gregory preached before his congregation and his friend the tax equaliser (*peraequator*) Julianus is an excellent example of this trend towards a more deferential attitude when imperial officials were publicly present.[85] Julianus' visit to Cappadocia seems to have been in response

[81] For an analysis of the panegyrics produced during Julian's reign from this angle, see Omissi 2018, 208–22. Julian's fiscal liberality also makes sense in this context – for details of his policies, see Lenski 2003, 288–90.
[82] Dvornik 1955; idem 1966, 659–66; Bowersock 1978; Athanassiadi 1981; for the view (with which I agree) that Julian's self-image was not mere anachronism, see Marcone 1998; Elm 2012; compare Constantius II's civilitas analysed in Henck 2007. For the ideology of the *civilis princeps*, see Wallace-Hadrill 1982. One may compare Ammianus' view that Julian excessively hankered after popularity – see Amm. Marc. 25.4.18 (Seyfarth, Jacob-Karau, Ulmann 1978, 363).
[83] See, for instance, Gregory's speech before Theodosius I, where he bade the emperors to 'be as gods to those under you' – Gregory, *Or*. 36.11 (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 264). Cf. Van Dam 2002, 92.
[84] For an incisive analysis of these dynamics, see McLynn 2014.
[85] Julianus (PLRE 1.472 (Julianus 17)) was *peraequator* in Cappadocia from 374–375, a role which entailed reassessing and reassigning provincials' tax liabilities outside the ordinary census cycle – see Jones 1964, 1.455, 2.537. He probably knew Gregory from Athens (Bernardi 1968, 137–8). Gregory also dedicated a short praise

to a poor harvest the previous year (in 373). He had been lenient in his assessment of Nazianzus' obligations, for which Gregory tells us he demanded public praise.[86] Gregory's oration placed a high value on obedience to authorities, which made obvious sense in this context. Gregory urged his congregants to be satisfied with their social positions: 'let each remain in the station [τάξις] in which he was called, brothers, and of which he is most worthy'.[87] This conception of order implicitly posited that individuals in power really were deserving of their status, identifying the order of the polity with that of nature. Julianus, by his liberality, could naturally be assumed to fit this description.

Going on, Gregory made plain the perils of subverting this order. '[One] should not desire to govern at his peril. Neither should the law of subjection [ὁ τῆς ὑποταγῆς νόμος] be dissolved, subjection which holds together both earthly and heavenly things. Let us not create the anarchy of the rule of many [μηδὲ ποιῶμεν ἀναρχίαν τὴν πολυαρχίαν].'[88] As well as reiterating the importance of the 'law of subjection' (ὁ τῆς ὑποταγῆς νόμος) for both earthly and heavenly life, Gregory suggested the need for subjection to a unitary political authority, rather than 'the rule of many' (πολυαρχία, 'polyarchy'). Interestingly, although it is possible that Julianus was himself a Cappadocian, Gregory makes no reference to this in his oration.[89] This could count against the identification – or it could equally suggest that Gregory deemed such a reference inappropriate as it implied a measure of local bias, and moreover established a relation of equality and affinity with the rest of the congregation which Gregory was seeking consciously to avoid.[90] The ambiguous role played by social order in civic patriotic rhetoric is another point of interest here. Civic patriotic authors used the need for social order and hierarchy as a justification for elites to govern their communities, but it could also be used to stress the subjection of those same elites to their superiors in imperial administration. Order and hierarchy were thus double-edged swords – particularly in this speech, where Gregory saw no need to invoke the πατρίς at all, preferring the Pauline injunction to render unto Caesar. Insofar as this hierarchical idiom was uninterested in πατρίς and cognate terms, it represents a distinct political language which offered a potential challenge to civic patriotism.

An emphasis on order, particularly monarchic order, was more widely typical of Basil and Gregory's thought. Thus Gregory's sentiment at the beginning of his *Apology for his Flight*: 'I know

---

poem to him – see *Carm.* 2.2.2 (PG 37.1477A–80A) – and wrote *Ep*. 67–9 (Gallay 1.87–9) to him in connection with this affair. For comment, see Holman 2001a.

[86] For background, see Bernardi 1968, 131–9; McGuckin 2001, 221–3; Van Dam 2002, 89–92. Gregory, *Or*. 19.1 (PG 35.1044D–45A) claims Julianus demanded praise but this could be a protest by Gregory to evade accusations of sycophancy.

[87] Gregory, *Or*. 19.10 (PG 35.1053C). See also Gregory, Or. 17.6 (PG 35.973B–D), on which McLynn 2014.

[88] Gregory, *Or*. 19.10 (PG 35.1053C).

[89] On the basis of Gregory, *Carm.* 2.2.2 ll. 17–18 (PG 37.1479A).

[90] Though note the equality Gregory sets up between himself and Julianus, casting himself as fulfilling a debt of praise called forth by Julianus' generosity. Holman 2001a, 106–7.

therefore that anarchy and disorder are less advantageous than order and governance [ἀναρχίαν καὶ ἀταξίαν λυσιτελεστέραν οἶδα τάξεως καὶ ἀρχῆς] even for beasts, let alone for men.'[91] Τάξις (order) and ἀρχή (rule, governance) were constitutive elements of the cosmos itself, as well as of human society, and in this respect were as valuable to ecclesiastical as to political government. It is no accident that Gregory here was proclaiming the virtuous of monarchic, episcopal rule.[92] Monarchic rule was also a reflection of nature of God's own nature. In one of his famous theological orations, Gregory forcefully made this identification. 'There are three fundamental views concerning divinity: the rule of none, the rule of many, and the rule of one [τρεῖς αἱ ἀνωτάτω δόξαι περὶ θεοῦ, ἀναρχία, καὶ πολυαρχία, καὶ μοναρχία].'[93] Yet as Gregory elaborated in a series of short, focused clauses, there were serious deficiencies with the first two. 'Anarchy is without order. Polyarchy is riddled with strife, and thus is anarchy, and thus without order. And thus both lead to disorder, which leads to chaos [εἰς ταὐτὸν γὰρ ἀμφότερα φέρει, τὴν ἀταξίαν, ἡ δὲ εἰς λύσιν], for disorder is a symptom of chaos.'[94] As a result, 'we judge monarchy honourable [ἡμῖν δὲ μοναρχία, τὸ τιμώμενον]', albeit in triune, neo-Nicene form as far as theology was concerned.[95] Gregory's criticism was not entirely fair, for most contemporary pagan philosophers posited some kind of highest divinity which ordered the spectrum of lower powers. Nonetheless, the terminology of multiple 'gods' still represented a weakpoint, which Gregory ably exploited.

Basil was also concerned by the dangers inherent in the division of power, particularly when concerned with the order of the church. Citing the disorder of Israel referred to in Judges 21:24 ('there was no king in Israel, and every man did what was right in his own sight'), Basil argued that unity was an essential element in worldly organisations, and that it should thus be expected of ecclesiastical ones as well. '[I noticed that] all division and discord and even rivalry of leaders proceeded from a lack of leadership [πᾶσαν δὲ διαφωνίαν καὶ διάστασιν, ἔτι τε πολυαρχίαν, ἐξ ἀναρχίας ὁδοποιουμένην].'[96] Going on, he adduced the additional example of harmony provided by bees, which he described as 'living under military discipline, following their king in a well-ordered fashion [νόμῳ φύσεως

[91] Gregory, *Or*. 2.4 (Bernardi 1985, 90). Compare Gregory, *Or*. 6.16 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 160–2), 11.7 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 344–6), 17.6 (PG 35.974D–75A), 22.15 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1980, 262–4).
[92] Compare his reflections on the Council of Constantinople in *Vit. sua* ll. 1556 (White 124), 1743–4 (138).
[93] Gregory, *Or*. 29.2 (Gallay and Jourjon 1978, 179); compare *Carm.* 1.1.3 ll. 71–83 (PG 37.413A–14A) analysed in Dvornik 1966, 689.
[94] Gregory, *Or*. 29.2 (Gallay and Jourjon 1978, 179). Compare the attacks on polytheist theology at Gregory, *Or*. 2.37 (Bernardi 1985, 136), *Or*. 4.120 (Bernardi 1983, 286) and the concern to deny Tritheism at *Or*. 31.13 (Gallay and Jourjon 1978, 300–2).
[95] Gregory, *Or*. 29.2 (Gallay and Jourjon 1978, 179), compare *Or*. 32.4 (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 88–92). For the theological importance of Gregory's insistence that the divine essence was monarchic in order to refute Eunomian accusations of Tritheism, see Cross 2006, 114–16.
[96] Basil, *Praef. de iudicio Dei* 2 (PG 31.658B). Compare the injunctions towards having a single monastic superior at Basil, *Reg. Fus.* 24 (PG 31.981D–84B), 43 (PG 31.1028A–29B).

στρατηγούμενον, καὶ κατακολουθοῦν εὐτάκτως τῷ ἰδίῳ βασιλεῖ]'.[97] Order and subjection were thus posited as prerequisites for harmony in church and state alike.

So too was a notion of personal merit. Elsewhere on bees in the *Hexaemeron*, Basil praised how they conducted themselves in subjection to a king, who was pre-eminent by merit and not elected, 'for often, the people's lack of judgement lifts the worst to power [πολλάκις γὰρ ἀκρισία δήμου τὸν χείριστον εἰς ἀρχὴν προεστήτατο]'.[98] Indeed, it was partly this sentiment that drove Basil to condemn those who prided themselves on holding local magistracies in his homily *On Humility*.[99] 'If the people gives out the honour [εἰ δῆμος ἀξίωμα δῷ], if someone is thought worthy of the privilege of the front seats, if the honour of pre-eminence is voted to him… [he believes] it is as if he is lifted above human nature.'[100] Basil's main criticism of this practice was that its glory was fundamentally empty – and partly, that was the result of the foolishness and impermanence of the δῆμος. That popularity probably played a role in Basil's own election and subsequent authority was passed over without comment.[101] The denigration of the δῆμος was hardly very innovative, but it underscores how the 'civic' element in civic patriotism had been narrowed to elite participation – and how it could in theory be squeezed out entirely in favour of an unambiguously hierarchical autocratic political language.

Julian's own, occasionally inconsistent views on kingship make more sense in view of this broader ambivalence about the relationship of order and hierarchy to civic patriotism, and the social position of the individual giving the speech. For him to have allowed the Antiochenes the kind of license they desired would have posed ideological problems for his self-image as a dutiful philosopher-ruler – though it would probably have constituted astute statecraft (as Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen argue).[102] Julian's discussion of the king's role borrowed liberally from Plato's *Laws* and Dio Chrysostom's *De Monarchia*, as well as making extensive comparisons with the heroes of the *Iliad*.[103] *Laws* had the city as the object of governance and had set the pattern of using 'the city' as a synonym for the entire political community, which was extended to the Roman Empire.[104] To some extent, therefore,

---

[97] Basil, *Praef. de iudicio Dei* 2 (PG 31.658B). On bees in Classical thought more generally, see Xenophontos 2013; Carlson 2015; on political animals, see Cooper 1990.
[98] Basil *Hex. VIII* 4 (de Mendieta and Rudberg 1997, 133); cf. ch. 3 n. 20. See also *Hom. in Gord.* 1 (PG 31.489B).
[99] The circumstances of this homily are difficult to reconstruct – Bernardi 1968, 66–7, 91; for analysis, see Ford 2019.
[100] Basil, *De humil.* 1 (PG 31.525D).
[101] McGuckin 2001, 170–1; Holman 2001b; Van Dam 2003a. It is worth noting that Gregory ascribes Basil's election to the influence of his father and extra-Cappadocian bishops, against the wishes of the Cappadocian episcopacy – see Gregory, *Or*. 43.37 (Bernardi 1992, 206); see further, 43.57–8 (Bernardi 1992, 244–52); see Lenski 2003, 253.
[102] Thus Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011.
[103] Interestingly, *Laws* had in fact rejected monarchy in favour of a mixture of propertied, educated magistrates appointed by lot (*Leg.* 693D–E (England 1921, 1.107), 756E–57E (1.166–168)), although Plato suggested that a tyrant would be needed to set up the ideal system in the first place (*Leg.* 709E–12A (1.123–5)).
[104] For the city-state origins of this political thought in comparative perspective, see Scheidel 2019, 320–8.

Julian's treatise was thoroughly civic. Nonetheless, it envisaged a prominent role for the monarch unlike its Platonic exemplar. According to this conception, 'by putting down civil discord [στάσις], vicious morals, luxury and profligacy' and 'insolence, lawlessness, injustice and greed for boundless wealth', the king will prevent 'feuds and dissensions' (στάσεις καὶ ἔριδας) from damaging the city.[105] These sentiments, notably, were expressed in Julian's second oration, composed during Constantius' reign while Julian was still his subordinate Caesar. Although the oration came close to open defiance of the *Augustus*,[106] it was still given from a public position of inferiority. Julian's remarks did have a more civic patriotic slant via his extensive use of Plato, his comparisons with Homer, and the oration's other substantial debt to Dio Chrysostom's *De Monarchia*.[107] Although it was not unusual to discuss the administration of the Empire in terms of administering a city, Julian was consistent in doing so, which probably reflects an ideological commitment. Nonetheless, even Julian emphasised egalitarian and hierarchic aspects of rule to different degrees depending on circumstances.

While monarchs could be civic patriots, and the rhetoric of order applied in the interests of local elites, monarchy, order and hierarchy could thus be used to challenge local elite power, and invoked without reference to patriotic concerns. However, this emphasis on order and hierarchy was only a partial challenge to civic patriotic language. Exponents of civic patriotism since the Hellenistic era had taken an elitist attitude towards the role of the masses, while both local and imperial elites continued enthusiastically to present themselves as benefactors of their πατρίδες. While a generic rhetoric of order did pose a potential challenge to civic patriotism, therefore, it never replaced it entirely. Nor, significantly, did exponents of these monarchical or hierarchical ideas attack loyalty to the πατρίς directly. At most, like Basil, they criticised elements of it (like the δῆμος). Unlike in the Christian sources I will discuss in Part Two, the potential tensions between the languages of elite πατρίς loyalty and universal hierarchical *imperium* remained largely implicit.

* * * * *

Civic patriotism thus remained an important political language in the later Roman Empire. In the first chapter, I analysed how patriotic language was used by rulers to garner prestige, and exploited by petitioners to pursue status and favours. I argued that this process can be seen as a shift towards a more trans-imperial elite audience for civic ideas, manifested most obviously by a shift in media towards portable, elite-oriented works like letter-collections or Gregory's books of epigrams. Civic patriotism was thus a political language undergoing change in the fourth century, as what it meant to serve the

[105] Julian, *In Const. II* 88B–C.
[106] Curta 1995; Omissi 2018, 202–3.
[107] As noted in François 1915; cf. Bonamente 1983, 39 n. 12.

πατρίς itself shifted. Nonetheless, there was significant continuity from the earlier period in the terminology and fundamental ideas of πόλις and πατρίς.

In the second chapter, I suggested that civic language continued to be a useful way of justifying elite leadership, demonstrating a clear continuity with the Hellenistic era. Hierarchy and order were presented as natural prerequisites for civic flourishing, which necessarily implied a significant role for local elite families. This emphasis on hierarchy did have the potential to undermine civic language, as it need not refer to the πατρίς and could stress instead the need for elites to submit to the imperial hierarchy. Yet I suggested that, ultimately, political actors at local and imperial level still valued πατρίς ties. As a result, the more hierarchic political theory should not be seen as replacing or eclipsing civic patriotic language (*pace* Brown), but rather as both competing with and complementing it. For such a direct opposition we must turn to the Christian engagement with patriotic ideas – to the challenge posed by the City of God to the cities of man.

Part Two – Religious Challenges to Civic Patriotism

As illustrated in Chapter One, civic patriotic language played a key role in the writing and oratory of Basil, Julian and Gregory of Nazianzus. Although its terms were refashioned for the times, in classic Skinnerian fashion, the rhetoric of πόλις and πατρίς remained a significant intellectual and political force. Yet it was not unchallenged. As suggested in Chapter Two, monarchism and generic ideas of order might be indifferent and sometimes antagonistic to civic patriotism. Yet a far more substantial and direct challenge came from a profoundly otherworldly strain in late Roman intellectual culture. Philosophy in this period displayed markedly monotheistic, ascetic and universalising tendencies.[1] In Christian circles, these trends traced themselves back to its earliest origins in Second Temple Judaism and other Hellenistic religious movements, while in pagan philosophy these trends became more marked with the increased popularity of Plotinus and his successors (often termed "Neoplatonism" – a label I will embrace for its convenience and recognition).[2] These tendencies could, and did, pose challenges to several core elements of civic patriotic ideology.[3] In its 'civic' element, the denial of the world might necessitate the rejection of civilisation entirely, as potentially envisaged by more extreme forms of asceticism. Moreover, even if civilisation was not itself superfluous, cities might be identified as places awash with vice, inimical to the conduct of higher life.

The localist aspect of civic patriotic ideology was perhaps even more endangered by this rejection of the world. After all, it relied on an emotive attachment between individual and place, which was attacked by ascetics as fundamentally a distraction from the individual's concentration on the divine. Although a philosopher might defend involvement in politics as bringing the fruits of asceticism to bear in order to improve the city, such benefits need not be applied to one's own locality in particular. Indeed, universalist notions of the fundamental commonality between human beings and the marginalisation or rejection of local gods in favour of worshipping the supreme divinity

---

[1] Fowden 1982; Bradbury 1995; Fowden 1997, 543–48; Gerson 2000. For the importance of the move away from 'locative' ways of understanding the world in order to evolve the category of 'religion', see Williams 1989, 6. It is worth noting that these tendencies were not limited to philosophy, but can be observed in popular religion as well: on this see, for example, Beard, North, and Price 1998, 278–301; Chaniotis 2018, 344–85; see particularly, papers in Athanassiadi and Frede 2002; Mitchell and Van Nuffelen 2010a; Mitchell and Van Nuffelen 2010b. For developments in Asia Minor, see Mitchell 1993, 43–51.

[2] On the distinction between high Imperial and Neoplatonic philosophical attitudes towards religion, see Van Nuffelen 2011, 233–41.

[3] See discussion in Greer 1986; Dunning 2009, 4–24. Dunning suggests that this opposition between the Christian πάροικος or παρεπίδημος was constructed as much (or more) than it reflected social realities of distinct group practices or persecution. He therefore shies away from Greer's view that Christian sojourning, anti-worldly identity was a 'paradox' or problem, arguing that it was used to recommend or reject a diverse set of practices and attitudes depending on the author using it (Dunning 2009, 103–4). I prefer Greer's view that this oppositional language did nonetheless pose real problems in both intellectual and practical affairs, albeit with Dunning's insight that different authors felt (or used it to pose) different problems depending on their specific contexts, rather than it representing one single paradox.

suggested that a merely local identity was inadequate or inferior.[4] Governance, therefore, was to some extent untethered from locality. These expanded ideas of belonging might also have chimed with a stress on imperial organisations. As we saw in Part I, imperial identity did not necessarily exclude local belonging, but it could pose a threat to the position of local elites, and forced civic patriotic language to adapt to a world of trans-imperial elite networks. Wealth and elite personnel were not unlimited, and arguments for the increased significance of religious or imperial belonging could lead to the re-allocation of status, power and funds from local municipal councils to religious institutions.[5]

The pair of chapters in this section thus examines how the civic patriotic rhetoric analysed in the first section was debated and contested in contemporary philosophical circles. It analyses the thought of its Christian and non-Christian subjects sympathetically and as elements in a wider cultural dialogue. This follows the examples of a number of excellent modern studies, which emphasise the commonalities between Christians and non-Christians in late Antiquity, explore their ideas in parallel, and elucidate their mutual communication.[6] In particular, dedicated religious reformers on both sides might have more in common with each other than with their less enthusiastic co-religionists.[7] Yet this study does not flinch from the significant differences which emerge from such comparison, which such accounts can sometimes elide. Although Julian, Basil and Gregory took part in a wider fourth-century conversation about the local, the civic and their limits, it was often an oppositional one. In particular, Julian's theology emerges as stridently local in comparison with that of the Cappadocians. On the question of civilisation, although there was agreement over its divine origin and general desirability, Basil was a somewhat less enthusiastic exponent than either of his contemporaries.

Moving theme by theme, I will examine how Basil and Gregory, and to a lesser extent Julian, thought about questions of local and universal identity. The Christian rhetoric of citizenship of Heaven, I will argue, was a key locus and creator of division, in that it encouraged participants to think of their identities as bifurcated and hierarchically related much more than the Stoic notion of citizenship of the inhabited world (the οἰκουμένη) to which Julian occasionally had recourse.[8] This rejection of the local had real consequences in elevating the experience of exile, the ties between regional churches and the cults of martyrs. These extended and popularised concepts whose

[4] Ideas particularly marked in imperial religious ideology from the late third century – see Fowden 2005.
[5] For attempts to quantify the scale of the shift, see Heather 1994; Van Dam 2011; Wood 2018, 57–78. On the growth of Christian charity in late antiquity see (in particular) Finn 2006, Brown 2021, Caner 2021.
[6] In particular on Julian and Gregory, see Elm 2012b; more generally (for the West), Alan Cameron 2011. For studies which address commonalities between Christians and non-Christians, see, for instance, McLynn 2009a; Athanassiadi and Frede 2002; Mitchell and Van Nuffelen 2010a; Van Nuffelen and Engels 2014; Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2014.
[7] See, in general, the arguments of Sandwell 2007; Sizgorich 2008; Rebillard 2012. See Introduction p. 20.
[8] That is not to deny the mutual influence of Stoic and Judaeo-Christian discourses of citizenship, but rather to acknowledge the more oppositional nature of the latter – see Runia 2000, 366; Chin 2016.

application in pagan circles was more limited. A second chapter will examine the 'civic' side of the civic patriotic identity, detailing how renouncing 'the world' and viewing worldly comforts as distractions from philosophy interacted with ideas of philosophical leadership and the divine origins of civilisation and of the Roman Empire in particular. Taken together, these chapters will suggest that the localist aspects of civic patriotic rhetoric came under far more scrutiny than the urban ones.

Chapter Three – The City of God and the Challenge to Localism

From its inception, the Christian Church was deeply influenced by civic patriotic political language. Such language was well adapted to the Hellenistic and Roman milieu in which Christianity developed, but also reflected the significance of the holy city of Jerusalem in Jewish political and ritual life.[1] Figurative exegesis of Jerusalem pre-dated specifically Christian readings. Philo of Alexandria had allegorised the 'city of God' referred to in the Psalms as the well-ordered soul,[2] and while reticent about spiritualising Jerusalem nonetheless did so when interpreting Psalm 46:5 ('the rushing of the river makes glad the city of God').[3] The city (particularly Jerusalem) was a more widespread metaphor for community in the early Church,[4] and was continued by later writers. While sharing with Philo the starting assumption that Jerusalem was the metropolis and central place of Israel, the prominent theologian Origen diverged in generally preferring to view that city in metaphorical terms. 'If, then, Israel is a race of souls, and there is a city, Jerusalem in Heaven, it follows that the cities of Israel, and, consequently, all Judea, have for their metropolis the heavenly Jerusalem', citing Galatians 4:26 and Hebrews 12:22 to demonstrate the Pauline precedent for this interpretation.[5] Origen's interpretation here was particularly significant – not least because the passage in question (from *On First Principles* 4.3.8) appears in the *Philocalia*, a collection of extracts quite possibly compiled and edited by Basil and Gregory themselves.[6] If the *Philocalia* was their compilation it would further suggest the influence which city-focused ways of thinking about Christian belonging suffused their thought. (It would probably have been the first substantial work that either produced.) Even if not, Origen's interest in the heavenly city was clearly evident to fourth-century readers.

There were many influential authorities, therefore, which redefined the terms πόλις and πολίτευμα familiar from civic patriotic language to suggest the common identity of the whole body of believers, the distinctive beliefs and behaviours it entailed, and its exclusion of worldly identity. As such, Basil and Gregory were the inheritors of a potent tradition, pioneered by a string of innovating

---

[1] On views of the city in the Hebrew Bible, see Wilson 1986; Gray 2018; on the civic context for the spread of Christianity, Meeks 1986; Adams 2009; Chaniotis 2018, 384–5.
[2] Runia 2000, 370.
[3] The reference to a rushing river suggested to exegetes a city of God that was not the physical Zion, given that Jerusalem is not situated near a river. Runia 2000, 377.
[4] Galatians 4:26, cf. Matthew 5:14. There is a substantial literature on the language of citizenship in the New Testament; for comment, see Brewer 1954; Greer 1986; Krentz 1993; Dunning 2009; Rapp 2014; Oakes 2019.
[5] Origen, *Philocalia* 1.24 (Robinson 1893, 30) (= *De principiis* 4.3.8 (Crouzel and Simonetti 1980, 370–2)).
[6] Scholars generally view the *Philocalia* as composed by Basil and Gregory on the basis of Gregory, *Ep.* 115.3 (Gallay 2.10): 'I have sent you a little book, a selection of the *philocalia* of Origen, as a remembrance of me and of the holy Basil' – Robinson 1893, xiv; Gribomont 1963; Rousseau 1994, 11–14, 82–4; McGuckin 2001, 103–4. However, see the sceptical opinion of Harl 1983, 1–20, McLynn 2009d. Whether or not the *Philocalia* as we have it is their work is uncertain. Although *Ep*. 115 suggests that they clearly knew a 'Philocalia' of Origen, it may not necessarily be the same one as has come down to us.

ideologists who had adapted civic patriotic terminology to describe a quite different set of ideas and institutions. Yet the continuity of this tradition should give us pause. Contrary to their minority status in the pre-Constantinian period, fourth-century Christians might be thought to have had little use for such an oppositional notion of the relation between their faith and 'the world', because many aspects of society were being 'Christianised'. Many aspects of Christianity inimical to that change were being quietly abandoned: thus opposition to military service, holding governmental office, calling the emperor κύριος and so on.

Moreover, by late Antiquity there was a pagan idiom of heavenly citizenship which lacked a socially confrontational aspect and which Christians could have co-opted to blunt the antagonistic bent of their own notion of heavenly identity. In the late third century, the writer known as Menander Rhetor had advised a prospective eulogist to comfort relatives with such knowledge: '[say] "there is no need to mourn, for he has citizenship with the gods [πολιτεύεται γὰρ μετὰ τῶν θεῶν]," or "he dwells in the Elysian Fields"'.[7] Philosophers had also contested civic patriotic attachment without advocating radical renunciation of cultural traditions more broadly.[8] In his moral writings of the late first and early second centuries, Plutarch drew on Plato's *Timaeus* to argue that, because the soul's origin was divine, 'there is no such thing as the homeland according to our nature [φύσει γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι πατρίς]'.[9] And while the Stoic Epictetus did argue in the early second century that the individual ought to respect divine law first and πατρίς second, that law was limited essentially to conserving what one had and enduring tribulation according to the divine will, without attacking the earthly homeland in principle.[10] The continuing oppositional stance of Christian heavenly citizenship, therefore, cannot simply be taken for granted.

The Rhetoric of Heavenly Citizenship

Basil and Gregory nonetheless drew readily on this discourse in precisely this oppositional spirit. They did so to try and persuade Christians to see themselves as members of a separate community of

[7] Men. Rhet., *Peri Paramythēkou* 414 (Russell & Wilson 1981, 160); translation slightly altered from the Loeb. Compare Musonius Rufus: the virtuous man is not troubled by exile because 'he considers himself a citizen of the city of God which is made up of men and gods [νομίζει εἶναι πολίτης τῆς τοῦ Διὸς πόλεως, ἣ συνέστηκεν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων καὶ θεῶν]', *Exilium non malum est* 2 (trans. Lutz 1947, 68).
[8] Even Libanius acknowledged this anti-patriotic aspect of philosophical self-presentation: see *Ep.* 385 (Foerster 1.375).
[9] Plut., *Mor. de exil.* 600E (Paton, Pohlenz & Sieveking 1972, 515), invoking Pl., *Ti.* 90A–B; cf. *Mor. de exil.* 607C–F (Paton, Pohlenz & Sieveking 1972, 531–2). Plutarch's stance is somewhat tougher than earlier Stoics who had been mainly content to suggest that the virtuous man might be comfortable in any land – compare Epictetus, *Sermones* 2.16.32–8 (, 66–7), Musonius Rufus (writing slightly earlier), *Exilium non malum est* 2 (trans. Lutz 1947, 68); for comment, see Hoof 2010, 129–30. On the Stoic idea of the cosmic city, see Schofield 1991, 57–103; on Second Sophistic attitudes to exile more generally, see Whitmarsh 2001; Nesselrath 2007; Richter 2017, 93–4.
[10] Epictetus, *Sermones* 2.16.28–47 (Souilhé 1949, 65–8).

higher moral standing, rejecting the bonds of earthly civic patriotism. Unlike the letters and epigrams analysed in Part I, many of these would have had broader audiences, and were aimed at persuading the city-public as a whole. In a sermon given once he had returned to Constantinople after the attempted seizure of the see by a Nicene Alexandrian known as Maximus the Cynic, Gregory naturally sought to denigrate any notion that his conduct had been unworthy.[11] This involved refuting the notion that one ought to give heed to earthly belonging. 'Will they drive you away from your city?', Gregory asked rhetorically, 'they will certainly not drive you away from the one which lies above as well.'[12] Notably, this departed from traditional philosophical sentiments by rejecting the earthly πατρίς entirely, and not merely by subordinating it. 'I do not praise your dwelling, whatever you may have, lest you lose your true fatherland, for which you must reserve your citizenship [μὴ τῆς ἀληθινῆς πατρίδος ἐκπέσῃς, εἰς ἣν ἀποτίθεσθαι χρὴ τὸ πολίτευμα].'[13] Gregory's employment of this language was a powerful challenge to his congregation, and was highly relevant to his personal circumstances. In denigrating the earthly city as a mere 'dwelling' (κατοικία), denying it the title of πατρίς, and portraying citizenship as something that needed to be 'stored away' or 'entrusted' (ἀποτίθεσθαι, recalling similar ideas of storing treasure – θησαυρίζω – in Heaven through charity), Gregory reinforced the message that heavenly identity excluded the earthly.

Yet it was in Basil's works where the specific terms were most explicitly theorised and debated. In one of his sermons on baptism, Basil encouraged his hearers to purify their lives and undergo purification by a series of short, sharp exhortations. 'Be enrolled as a member of the Church. The soldier is numbered in the lists; the athlete is enrolled to strive in the contest; and one of the people who has been enlisted as a citizen is numbered among the tribes [ὁ δημότης πολιτογραφηθεὶς τοῖς φυλέταις ἐναριθμεῖται]... as having citizenship in Heaven.'[14] Basil's homily subsumed three types of activity – political, military and athletic – under the same banner of heavenly πολίτευμα.[15] This reflects an archaising awareness on his part of the traditional links between all three as civic

[11] The chronology of this affair is mainly reconstructed from Gregory's own testimony. When Gregory arrived in Constantinople in 379 at the behest of his Antiochene Nicene allies, he assumed the leadership of a relatively small Nicene flock. He therefore initially welcomed the support of Maximus, a Nicene Alexandrian with influence with the city's many Egyptians, who arrived in the city the following year. Gregory gave an oration praising him as a true philosopher – *Or*. 25, which surprisingly remains unredacted, seemingly in its original form (see ch. 6 n. 90). Gregory then retired from the city, during which time Maximus attempted to use his Egyptian support to have himself proclaimed as bishop against the then-incumbent, the Arian Demophilus. Despite attaining the support of Alexandria, he failed to win over enough supporters in the city, fleeing and unsuccessfully petitioning the new emperor Theodosius I for the see of Constantinople. He travelled to Egypt to try and gather more support, but was banished from the province by the prefect. Gregory regarded this attempt to take the leadership of the Nicene community and seize the bishopric as personal betrayal. Gregory himself was subsequently offered the see of Constantinople by Theodosius after Demophilus refused to assent to Nicene doctrine. On the episode, see Snee 1981, 108–78; Bernardi 1995, 191–4; McGuckin 2001, 311–25; Van Dam 2002, 139–42; Elm 2013.

[12] Gregory, *Or*. 26.16 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1981, 264).

[13] Gregory, *Or*. 26.14 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1981, 260).

[14] Basil, *Hom. ex. ad bapt.* 7 (PG 31.440A). See also §3 (PG 31.429A); cf. Basil, *De Baptisma* 1.2.22 1564B (Ducatillon 1989, 172–4).

[15] On athletics and martyrs, Stewart 1984; Cobb 2008, 33–6, 55–8.

activities and a desire to spiritualise them as Paul had done, even if military activity was now strictly imperial, athletics were in decline and formal public participation by the δῆμος reduced.[16] Yet all were in theory communal public activities, reflecting the spectacle and collective significance of the individual's spiritual reform. It also featured in his defence of Trinitarian theology, as Basil argued that the Holy Spirit was vital in enrolling Christians as citizens of Heaven.[17]

This concept of heavenly citizenship had a more Aristotelian and ecclesiological significance.[18] Indeed, Basil drew here on definitions of the city which had been current for a long time in Greco-Roman thought, applying them to the Christian language of heavenly citizenship. Basil was thus transforming civic patriotic terminology in the finest tradition of Christian innovating ideologists. Expounding Psalm 46:5 (Septuagint Ps. 45) – with which this chapter opened – 'the rushing of the river makes glad the city of God', Basil gave a lengthy account of what precisely the 'city of God' meant.[19] 'Certain men define a city to be an established body of people governed according to law [ὁρίζονται γάρ τινες πόλιν εἶναι σύστημα ἱδρυμένον, κατὰ νόμον διοικούμενον].'[20] Moving from this basic definition, Basil enumerated how each of the aspects of the definition fitted the city of God.

> The approach to the city [ie. the Church] which has been assigned coincides with that to the heavenly Jerusalem, the city laid up in Heaven. And the group there is of the firstborn, of those enrolled as citizens in the heavens [σύστημα… τῶν ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς]. And it is ordered through the constancy of the way of life of the holy ones, and governed according to the heavenly law [ἱδρυμένον τοῦτο διὰ τὸ ἀμετακίνητον τῆς διαγωγῆς τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ κατὰ νόμον τὸν οὐράνιον διοικούμενον].[21]

This view of the Church as a city was repeated in his *Homily on Psalm 59* (Masoretic Ps. 60), though not at such length.[22] Such explicit definitions of the Church as a city attest to the city-mindedness of

---

[16] On late-antique athletics, see Remijsen 2015.
[17] Basil, *De spiritu sancto* 9/23 109C (Pruche 1968, 328). Compare Gregory, *Or.* 38.17 (Moreschini and Gallay 1990, 142–4), according to which humans are enrolled as citizens of Heaven by the Incarnation. For the Holy Spirit in Basil and the other Cappadocians, see Hildebrand 2007 on the Spirit and baptism esp. 174–7; Radde-Gallwitz 2009 (but without exploring the connection with metaphors of citizenship).
[18] See Nikolaou 1981; cf. Stoic ideas of the cosmic city analysed in Schofield 1991, 57–92.
[19] See, in addition to the following, Basil, *In Ps. XLV* 5 (PG 29.424A).
[20] There may be an echo of Origen, *Contr. Cels.* 8.75 here; compare also Basil's casual definition of with reference to bees πολτεία at *Hex. VIII* 4 (Mendieta and Rudberg 1997, 133) (see above ch. 2 p. 57–8); cf. his remarks on cranes at *Hex. VIII* 3 (Amand de Mendieta and Rudberg 1997, 132).
[21] Basil, *In Ps. XLV* 4 (PG 29.421C–24A).
[22] ΄Perhaps he [the prophet] means the Church [by the term πόλις]. For a city is an organisation managed by law [πόλιν μὲν, διὰ τὸ σύστημα εἶναι νομίμως οἰκούμενον]', Basil, *In Ps. LIX* 4 (PG 29.468B); compare also his *Enarratio In Isaiam Prophetam* 1.19 (PG 30.150B): 'a city is an organisation of men of differing pursuits welded together into a community of life [πόλις ἐστὶ σύστημα ἀνθρώπων, ἐκ διαφόρων ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἐπὶ κοινωνίᾳ βίου συγκεκροτημένον].' Lipatov-Chicherin 1993 argues for the authenticity of this text, noting the almost uniform ascription to Basil in the manuscript tradition and commonalities with other elements of Basil's

his congregation. Most likely preaching to a wider and less well educated audience compared to the readers of his letters and tracts,[23] Basil explained that a πόλις was characterised by the common activity of its inhabitants, their orderly and regulated conduct, and pointed to the importance of enrolment in their composition.[24] Such an exegesis drew heavily on elements prevalent in earlier New Testament symbolic exegesis, and matched a somewhat commonplace simplification of Aristotle's thought on the nature of πόλις communities.[25] The definition of a city as an organisation 'ordered according to law' also drew on common Stoic conceptions.[26] Nonetheless, despite using πόλις imagery, Basil's aim was to changing his congregation's behaviour, urging them to deny their worldly inclinations in pursuit of the heavenly Jerusalem. 'Therefore having raised the eyes of your soul worthily of those things above seek out that concerning the city of God.'[27] One may compare the language and purpose of the ninth homily of the *Hexaemeron*, which argued from the upward orientation of the human form and head that humans were intended for contemplation and ascent to the divine.[28] 'Just as you were formed, thus dispose your own life as well. Have your government in Heaven. Your true fatherland is the Jerusalem above, you are first-born citizens and fellow-tribesmen, "who have been enrolled as citizens in the heavens."'[29] Basil's attention to the Church as an 'established body of people ordered according to law' [σύστημα ἱδρυμένον, κατὰ νόμον διοικούμενον], while clearly drawing on Classical definitions of community, nonetheless elevated Christian belonging over and against worldly affiliation.

Yet perhaps most interesting are the failures to employ πόλις, πολιτεία and πολίτευμα where others had done so. Most notable in this regard is the lack of application to the monastic life, compared to the interest in such metaphors developed and encouraged by the Greek *Life of Antony*, which had famously described its protagonist's asceticism in urban terms. 'The desert was made a city [ἐπολίσθη] of monks, coming forth from their own affairs and being enrolled in the polity in the heavens [ἀπογραψαμένων τὴν ἐν τοῖς οὐράνοις πολιτείαν]'.[30] As Timothy Barnes observes, it is

---

corpus. The main obstacle raised by critics is its length (the text occupies PG 30.118–667) which makes it difficult to place a period of composition, the lack of anything specifically Basilian, and the lack of contemporary witnesses or cross-references.

[23] For preachers and audiences, see below n. 112.

[24] Interestingly, Gregory of Nyssa shared this Aristotelian view of πόλις and πολιτεία with his brother (*De inscriptionibus Psalmorum* 2.16.84), suggesting further that this was a consistent element of Basil's thought.

[25] In Aristotle's discussion of πόλις, he holds as axiomatic that all communities seek a good of some kind and that this good in the case of a πόλις is also just (*Pol.* 1.2.16 1253a (Aubonnet 1960, 15–16), *Eth. Nic.* 8.9 1160a (Bywater 1894, 168–9)), while *Eth. Nic.* 5.6 1134a (102) also emphasises that political justice is dependent upon the rule of law.

[26] See Cic., *Leg.* 1.23 (Plinval 1959, 13), Clem., *Strom.* 4.26 (PG 8.1381A–B), Dio Chrys., *Or*. 36.20 (De Arnim 1962, 2.6); for analysis see Schofield 1991, 61–3, 67–73.

[27] Basil, *In Ps. XLV* 4 (PG 29.424A).

[28] On the *Hexaemeron,* see Amand de Mendieta 1978; Swift 1981; Amand de Mendieta 1985; Lim 1990; Rousseau 1994, 318–49; Van Dam 2003a, 105–31.

[29] Basil, *Hex. IX* 2 (Amand de Mendieta and Rudberg 1997, 149). Compare Philo, *De opificio mundi* 49–50 (, Cohn 1896, 16), as well as the view that giving in to pleasure renders reason an exile instead of a citizen (59 (130)). On Basil's use of Philo in the *Hexaemeron*, see Runia 1993, 235–41.

[30] Ath., *Vita Antonii* 14.7 (Bartelink 1994, 174). Chitty 1966; Rapp 2014.

notable that the portrayal of Anthony's monasticism as civic is a feature of the Greek version of the life, lacking in the Syriac.[31] Yet Basil notably does not describe the communities of ascetics he founded as 'cities', preferring more prosaic terms like κοινωνία.[32] To be sure, Basil did use the Pauline metaphor of citizenship of Heaven and the notion of the heavenly πολιτεία extensively to refer to the monastic life. Discussing the benefits of reading Scripture in a letter to Gregory, Basil lauded it as full of examples of people who 'appear as animate images of the godly way of life [τῆς κατὰ Θεὸν πολιτείας]',[33] and defending his ascetics elsewhere as men 'whose government [πολίτευμα] is in Heaven'.[34] Nonetheless, these exhortations do not seem to differ much in character or tone to those to lay Christians on whom Basil urged moral reform.[35]

The closest approach to the language of Antony came with reference to Basil's ecclesiastical complex, the Basileiados. The Basileiados was a complex made up of (at least) a chapel, a hostel for guests, monastic living-quarters, and a charitable 'hospital' with a particular focus on the care of lepers, built outside Caesarea some time in the 370s.[36] Pleading with the governor of Cappadocia, Elias, not to listen to members of the local elite who accused Basil of self-aggrandisement, Basil pointed to how the Basileiados aided one of the governor's fundamental tasks: 'to restore the works that are fallen into ruin, to people the uninhabited areas, and in general to transform the solitudes into cities [καὶ ὅλως εἰς πόλεις τὰς ἐρημίας μετασκευάσαι]'.[37] That this was more than an isolated occurrence is reflected in Gregory's encomium of Basil, which described the Basileiados as 'the new city [τὴν καινὴν πόλιν]'.[38] In both of these cases, the context mirrored that hypothesised by Barnes for the Greek *Life of Anthony* – justifications of new ascetic practices and organisations for a potentially sceptical audience, not all of whom were necessarily Christians. Yet while the Basileiados did contain ascetics, it noticeably differed from the type of foundation described in Basil's *Great Asketikon* (at least as the Basileiados was described by Basil to Elias). The archetypal *Great Asketikon* foundation was rurally located and focused on spiritual contemplation and self-sufficient

---

[31] Barnes 1986, 362. Links with Iamblichus *Vita Pythagori* have been recently argued to suggest that the *Vita Antonii* was responding to (and influenced by) Neopythagorean ideas and practices – see Rubenson 2013; also Rousseau 2000; Urbano 2008.
[32] Rapp 2019.
[33] Basil, *Ep*. 2.3 (Courtonne 1.8); compare the 'Gospel way of life [Εὐαγγέλιον πολιτείαν]' in *Ep*. 207.2 (Courtonne 2.185); *Reg. Fus.* 8.3 (PG 31.940C). This usage is very common: I count 37 uses of πολιτεία related to the Christian way of life or transformation of one's way of life thereto from a TLG search of Basil's undisputed works.
[34] Basil, *Ep*. 207.2 (Courtonne 2.185). See also *Ep*. 46.2 (Courtonne 1.118), 223.2 (Courtonne 3.11). On a similar count Basil uses πολιτεῦμα 17 times, six of which are straight quotations from Philippians 3:20.
[35] Indeed, Basil's reliance on Scripture for his rules suggests that these instructions theoretically as valid for ordinary Christians as for ascetics – Amand de Mendieta 1957, 44–5.
[36] On the specific circumstances of the Basileiados, see Rousseau 1994; Miller 1997, 85–8; Finn 2006, 228–32, 256–7. See now the significant analysis in Caner 2021, 55–9, who emphasises its particular focus on the treatment of leprosy. For Cappadocian euergetism/charity and the development of the hospital, see ch. 5 n. 74.
[37] Basil, *Ep*. 94 (Courtonne 1.206). The letter has usually been dated to 372, but Rousseau 1994 140–1 is sceptical.
[38] Gregory, *Or*. 43.63 (Bernardi 1992, 262).

economic activity (in a communal setting) rather than charity or the hosting of important lay guests.[39] And it is intriguing that Basil did not adopt the notion of the monastery as city any further, given his enthusiasm for the imagery of ascetics as exemplifying the citizenship and way of life of the heavenly kingdom. Basil had travelled to Egypt to observe asceticism and wrote frequently to Athanasius, to whom the *Life of Antony* was ascribed in the Greek tradition.[40] (Gregory was the first to attribute the *Life* to Athanasius, which suggests it could have been thought of as such in Basil's circles as well.)[41] And perhaps most importantly, Basil's brother Gregory of Nyssa would describe Basil's monasticism in precisely these terms in his encomium of his brother – 'just like [John] the Baptist, because of him the desert became a city [πόλιν τὴν ἔρημον γενέσθαι], crowded by those who flowed in'.[42]

The absence of these civic metaphors for monastic community in Basil's work demands explanation. A starting point is the origin of Basil's ascetic practices, which were clearly connected to those of his immediate family – his sister Macrina had converted their family home into a domestic retreat while Basil was studying in Athens, and he spent much of his earliest experiences in retreat with his brother Peter on family estates at Annesi.[43] As a number of scholars has suggested, therefore, ideas of brotherhood and family were a natural resource when thinking about ascetic community.[44] This was perhaps linked with Basil's reticence to tie the Christian life to philosophy. Ascetics only appear directly as philosophers in his letter to Eustathius, his earliest surviving, and most explicit references to Christians as philosophers and Christianity as philosophy date likewise to this phase of Basil's writing.[45] Though philosophical ideas (the importance of θεώρια, ascent via reason etc) remained fundamental until the end of his life, Basil seems to have avoided the *Life of Antony*'s

---

[39] Silvas 2005, 34–5. Compare the emphasis on total renunciation in Špidlík 1979. Contrast however Lowther Clarke 1913, 61–2, 123–4; Amand de Mendieta 1957, 44, who assume that the other foundations were like the Basileiados in possessing a more social aspect. It is certainly possible that some of the other monasteries were like the Basileiados in civic or charitable function, but it seems at least as probable (if not more likely) that many resembled the retreat at Annesi. In support of this view, see Rousseau 1994, 357.

[40] On Basil's Egyptian ascetic travels, see Gribomont 1959.

[41] Gregory, *Or*. 21.5 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1980, 118). Rousseau 2000, 101 n. 33 disputes this identification, though it is unclear to which other Athanasian work Gregory could be referring.

[42] Gregory of Nyssa, *In Basilium fratrem* 13 (Cavernos Heil and Lendle 1990, 120).

[43] The evolution and character of Basil's asceticism continue to be debated. Gribomont 1957b, 409 argues in favour of understanding Basil's asceticism as evolving into a more recognisably monastic form over time; though Silvas 2005, 29 suggests that a more formal, codified vision is already present in the *Small Asketikon*. (For the *Asketikon*, see ch. 4 n. 47.) Elm emphasises the importance of the Homoiousian Asceticism of Eustathius of Sebaste as leading to Basil's creation of a new model distinct from an older tradition of household-asceticism (Elm 1994, 134–6), while Rousseau views Basil as attached to a later version of Eustathianism and other members of the family to an earlier one – see Rousseau 1994, 73–6. Silvas 2005, 56–71, argues that Eustathius' influence was substantially mediated through Macrina.

[44] Elm 1994; Rapp 2019.

[45] Φιλόσοφος and φιλοσοφία as explicitly Christian in *Ep.* 1 (Courtonne 1.3), 4 (Courtonne 1.15), perhaps 112.2 (Courtonne 2.14). Gregory, *Ep*. 4.3 accused Basil of calling his place of retreat a 'house of thought' (φροντιστήριον) though as Gallay suggests (Gallay 2.4 n. 1) this is probably a mocking reference to Aristophanes, *Clouds* 5.94 rather than an actual title used by Basil. Basil in his *Ad adulescentes* was more generally favourable toward reading philosophical works, though like these letters (probably early) composition, and in McLynn's view actually designed to undercut a too casual reading of philosophy by Christians – McLynn 2010b.

explicit transformation of philosophy into monasticism.[46] Finally, with the exception of the Basileiados, Cappadocian monasteries in this period may simply not have been big enough to warrant comparison with cities – certainly when compared with Egyptian foundations comprising thousands of monks.[47]

The reticence to adopt the innovating language of making the desert a city compares in turn with the conservative nature of Basil's Church/city metaphors. It suggests the importance of citizenship metaphors in Basil's view of the ecclesiastical community. While Basil did view the monastic life in civic terms, it is nonetheless important that 'the city' remained the recognisably civic congregation rather than becoming the monastic πόλις of the *Vita Antonii*. Within the context of the Christian tradition Basil's application of the metaphor was thus not revolutionary but it was a distinct choice. In any case it contrasts strikingly with the endorsement of civic patriotism we saw in Chapters One and Two. Basil here appropriated concepts from civic language and applied them to promote the community of the saints. As we shall see, this theorisation of the heavenly city deftly set the stage for the rejection of the earthly πατρίς.

Philosophy and the Πατρίς

Alongside the explicit association in Basil between πόλις, πολίτευμα and πολιτεία is a common (and more frequent) link between πόλις and πατρίς. The link between πατρίς and πόλις was most explicit in the New Testament in Hebrews 11, which discussed it in relation to the patriarchs and other holy men. Abraham had dwelt in the Canaan as a foreigner faithful in the promise of the heavenly City 'whose craftsman and builder is God' (Hebrews 11:8–10), whilst the holy men more generally 'confessed that they were foreigners and sojourners [ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοι] upon the Earth. For they say that such things plainly declare that they seek a country [πατρίδα]… but now they desire a better one, which is heavenly… [God] has prepared for them a city' (Hebrews 11:13–16).[48]

Christian thinkers had sometimes tried to reconcile the interpretation of heavenly πατρίς with the more conservative civic patriotic understanding of the terms.[49] Basil and Gregory, however, frequently employed the heavenly definition of πατρίς to try and replace this civic patriotic significance. A strikingly self-aware example of this came in Gregory's encomium *In Praise of his Sister Gorgonia* (*Oration* 8), probably delivered just after her death in 369 or 370.[50] While he noted

[46] For the influence of philosophy on Basil (Plato and the Neoplatonists in particular), see Rist 1979; Bradshaw 2014.
[47] See further Amand de Mendieta 1957.
[48] Cf. Origen, *Contr. Cels.* 8.75 (Borret 1969, 350).
[49] See Origen above and, in addition, *Epistla ad Diognetum* 5.5 (Ehrman 2003, 141).
[50] Bernardi 1968, 108–9 suggests a date between 368 and 372. On Gregory's relationship with Gorgonia, see Van Dam 2003b, 93–8.

that 'another might praise the fatherland and family of the departed, respecting the laws of encomium',[51] Gregory deliberately and publicly rejected the claims of the earthly πατρίς to receive praise. Later in the oration, he justified his decision:

> 'If one must discuss the highest and most philosophical thing about her, Gorgonia's fatherland was the Jerusalem above which may not be seen but is of the mind, in which we have our citizenship [Γοργονίᾳ πατρὶς μὲν ἡ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλὴμ μὴ βλεπομένη, νοουμένη δὲ πόλις, ἐν ᾗ πολιτευόμεθα]... Christ is a citizen [ᾗς πολίτης Χριστός] and his fellow-citizens are the festal assembly "and congregation of the firstborn enrolled in the heavens [πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς]," [Hebrews 12:23] and they celebrate a festival around their great founder with the sight of his glory [τῇ θεωρίᾳ τῆς δόξης], and they dance a perpetual dance.'[52]

This was the more striking, because Gregory did praise his (and his sister's) parents as bastions of patriotic piety, and respected the patriotic link between birth and fatherland in other funerary pieces (notably his epigrams and praise of Basil).[53] The reason for his rejection, however, is consonant with his efforts to stress his family's philosophical credentials.[54] Gregory worked hard through much of his life to underline his family's sanctity (and with considerable success); an emphasis on heavenly citizenship fitted naturally.[55] The stress on Gorgonia's heavenly πατρίς and the mention of θεωρία chimes with the characterisation of Gorgonia's heavenly citizenship as 'most philosophical' (φιλοσοφώτερον), and the statement that the heavenly Jerusalem was 'understood' (νοουμένη). Like Basil, Gregory emphasised the importance of sight and the contemplation of the divine, and even cast an Old Testament figure like the patriarch Abraham as precisely such a 'great contemplator of God', due to his abandonment of his πατρίς and journey in faith to the promised land.[56] In Platonic philosophy in particular, true, visionary philosophical insight was associated with access to and contemplation of the higher world, of which festivals might be a type or reflection.[57] This was the

---

[51] Gregory, *Or*. 8.3 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 250), cf. Julian, *In Const. I* 5C–D (on which see Tantillo 1997, 146), *In Euseb.* 108D. For the mention of πατρίς in a consolatory or funerary speech in the rhetorical handbooks, see Men. Rhet., *Peri Paramythikou* 413 (Russell & Wilson 1981, 161), 419 (173).

[52] Gregory, *Or*. 8.6 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 257), cf. *Or*. 8.23 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 296), 39.11 (Moreschini and Gallay 1990, 170).

[53] See ch. 1 pp. 39–41, ch. 2 pp. 49–51, ch. 6 pp. 131–2.

[54] And with Gregory's own self-fashioning as philosopher-ascetic – see McLynn 1998.

[55] Compare his vocal refusal to praise his father's πατρίς in his encomium (*Or*. 18.5 (PG 35.889D)) and his omission of the topic from his encomium of Caesarius (*Or*. 8), albeit without loud advertisement of the fact. For this theme more widely, see the contributions of Hägg, Burrus and Elm in Hägg and Børtnes 2006; and now Goldhill and Greensmith 2020. This is more convincing than Perkins' view that Gorgonia was fitted into traditional models of matronly behaviour – Perkins 2017.

[56] Gregory, *Carm.* 1.2.10 ll. 489-95 (PG 37.745A–46A). Interestingly Julian criticised the patriarch precisely for being a 'sojourner in a foreign land' (*Contr. Gal.* 209E), adducing this as evidence of the Hebrews' impotence and thus their lack of diving favour.

[57] Elm 2014. See however the discussion of this passage in Thomas 2019, 27, who points out that the concept of *theosis* Gregory employs here involves the preservation of the already present divine image rather than actively becoming (more) divine.

more effective because Gregory stressed elsewhere that Gorgonia had not involved herself in public affairs, though she had been an active and valued participant in her church.[58] Gorgonia was thus a philosopher, participating in the civic life and festivities of the heavenly Jerusalem even while on earth, and now enjoying the fellowship of Christ and the saints in Heaven.[59]

Noteworthy also is the unusual view of Christ as a 'citizen' [πολίτης] rather than a lord or ruler, which may be linked to Gregory's Christology.[60] Gregory stressed Christ's human nature on the basis of the famous maxim 'that which he has not assumed, he has not redeemed.'[61] Gregory also transposed the traditional language of founder cult and the celebration of the founder by a civic πανήγυρις to Christ as 'founder' (πολιστής) of the heavenly city. Moreover, in emphasising how Christ was contemplated and celebrated as the object of philosophical *theoria*, Gregory may have had Neoplatonic theories of ideal rule in mind.[62] Plato's Republic had spoken of the ideal city as being 'laid up in the heavens', which served as a theoretical blueprint for the Neoplatonic ideal state.[63] It is significant, moreover, that Gregory criticised pagan philosophers - who Julian celebrated - as men who 'build cities with words that cannot exist in reality.'[64] The imagery of Christ as founder and fellow-citizen made use of a broader consensus on the role of the philosopher-ruler, but which Gregory inverted to emphasise hope for perfection in Heaven rather than a pattern of government for the mortal world.

Gregory's rejection of an earthly πατρίς for his sister thus fitted into his wider attempt to position her as a Christian philosopher, a characterisation continued in the encomium.[65] By contrast, when Julian gave an oration in praise of the Empress Eusebia presenting her as a wise, generous and merciful adviser of Constantius who 'honoured the name of philosophy',[66] he nonetheless chose to praise her πατρίς and ancestors in traditional fashion rather than reach for some notion of exclusively philosophical identity.[67] Gregory's rejection of these tropes was thus a distinctly Christian move. And though it was necessitated by contemporary philosophical ideas, he profitably employed them to endow the conventional Christian language of heavenly citizenship with a rich suite of new associations.

---

[58] Gregory, *Or*. 8.9 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 262–4), 8.11–12 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 272).
[59] See also Gregory, *Anth. Pal*. 8.101–3 (Beckby 498).
[60] There may also be a hint here of the Stoic doctrine that philosophers and gods were fellow-citizens of the cosmic city: see Schofield 1991, 74–82.
[61] Gregory, *Ep*. 101.32 (Gallay and Jourjon 1974, 50). See McGuckin 2001, 393; Wessel 2015; for a reinterpretation of this oration's purpose, see Elm 2015, 15–18.
[62] See O'Meara 2003, 15–16, 91–8.
[63] Pl., *Rep*. 9 592B (Slings 2003, 368)
[64] Gregory, *Or*. 4.44 (Bernardi 1983, 144).
[65] Cf. Gregory, *Or*. 8.14–15 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 274–80).
[66] Julian, *In Euseb.* 120B. Julian however refrained from saying that she herself was a philosopher.
[67] Cf. Elm 2006.

These philosophical influences on Gregory's rhetoric of heavenly citizenship were not limited to Gregory's praise of his sister. In one of his longer poems, *On Virtue*, Gregory launched a blistering attack on Greco-Roman ideas of virtue. In the course of this he addressed the instability of local identity:

> The native land of the body is not free [πατρὶς δὲ σωμάτων μὲν οὐκ ἐλεύθερα], it is dependant on provisions, and evilly divided by gulfs of the sea and enclosed by woods, altering its many weak inhabitants, itself the mother and tomb of those born there, mourning those it strikes down.[68]

The themes here neatly complemented those of the encomium to Gorgonia. Gregory stressed how the πατρίς 'of the body' (σωμάτων) was limited, body and mind being commonly contrasted in both pagan and Christian thought. Not being 'free' (ἐλεύθερος) meant both being dependent on other things (the worldly products necessary for the function of the city and its territory) as well as being physically limited by borders and wild places. Earthly πατρίς thus mirrored the mortal body in its limitations. Gregory's poem concluded with praise of the true freedom which the Christian life entailed, making his emphasis on the servile status of the earthly fatherland all the more striking.[69] Moreover, the emphasis on birth and death cast the πατρίς as paradoxical and even malevolent entity, consuming the labour and lives of its citizens to sustain itself. The focus, again, on the funerary context is telling, and undermined the praises of Gregory's book of epigrams, which had exhorted various individuals as the glory of their native lands.[70] Though not at odds intellectually with such sentiments, Gregory's portrayal here emphasised just how fleeting such glory really was – and encouraged Christians to greater holiness by highlighting how pagans could do great deeds on behalf of something ultimately so meaningless.[71]

Gregory immediately went on to highlight how real virtue and belonging could be found in the true, Christian fatherland, employing these philosophically grounded observations to add force to the Christian redefinition of patriotic language:

> But that which is sought by the wise in place of this one… belongs to its inhabitants forever, is the mother of the living, and alien to travail; and there is a ceaseless chorus which sings the praises of the great Christ, a festival of the firstborn who have been enrolled in the heavenly books for eternity [Πανήγυρίς τε πρωτοτόκων γεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς βίβλοις τε ταῖς αἰωνίοις].[72]

---

[68] Gregory, *Carm.* 1.2.10 ll. 421–7 (PG 37.710A–11A); cf. ll. 489–95 (746A).
[69] Gregory, *Carm.* 1.2.10 l. 995–9 (PG 37.752A).
[70] See further, ch. 1 pp. 39–41, ch. 2 pp. 49–51, ch. 6 pp. 131–2.
[71] Cf. Gregory, *Carm.* 1.2.10 ll. 676–9 (PG 37.729A). One might compare the purpose of Augustine, *De civ. D.* 5.17 (Introduction pp. 6–7).
[72] Gregory, *Carm.* 1.2.10 ll. 428–36 (PG 37.711A).

Several elements are recognisable from his encomium of Gorgonia – the preference of 'the wise' [οἱ σόφοι] for the heavenly over the earthly, the emphasis on eternity and permanence, the description of heavenly activity as a 'festival' [πανήγυρις] celebrated by the 'enrolled firstborn' [πρωτοτόκων γεγραμμένων] centred on Christ. Although Gregory replaced a reference to vision with one to enrolment in the heavenly books, the main themes are highly reminiscent of his description of Gorgonia's heavenly citizenship, adding to the sense that the emphasis on the philosophical in Gregory's ideal of the divine πατρίς was a consistent theme (and, indeed, not a consciously gendered one). Gregory's heavenly πατρίς thus embodied all the characteristics which the earthly one lacked: stability, life, independence, eternity. Another implicit element present in this vision hinted at in earlier passages is the freedom from 'travails' [μόγων], compared to the sometimes onerous burdens of administration placed upon *curiales*. Gregory's invocation of the heavenly πατρίς, therefore, was frequently inflected with a highly philosophical and ascetic edge, providing a powerful philosophical reinforcement to the Christian appropriation of civic patriotic terminology and contestation of its broader presuppositions.

Basil could also employ a more philosophical tone when necessary in his letters, although the difference with his preaching is marked. Encouraging a Christian philosopher named Maximus to visit him in Caesarea, Basil playfully invoked the Cynic ideal of world-citizenship, after imploring him not to imitate the anti-social attitude of the famous Cynic Diogenes.[73] 'And since, at the same time, you have made yourself a 'citizen of the inhabited world' [πολίτην σεαυτὸν τῆς οἰκουμένης ποιήσας], you would be justified in coming to visit us at this place, a part of your own country as it were [ὡς εἰς μέρος τῆς σεαυτοῦ]'.[74] It is noticeable that Basil here used a specifically Cynic figure ('inhabited world', οἰκουμένη) rather than a more explicitly Christian one, although Basil was generally less interested than Gregory in explicitly philosophical readings of heavenly citizenship.

Cynic notions of citizenship of the inhabited world [οἰκουμένη] and universe [κόσμος] were the one area in which Julian approached his Cappadocian contemporaries' enthusiasm for the use of civic language as a means of rejecting local loyalties.[75] In his *Oration Againt the Cynic Heracleios*, Julian characterised Diogenes as an ascetic wanderer who obeyed the divine command to abandon his home in order to teach others the contempt for worldly goods. 'He preferred to live in Athens; since however the *daimon* had sent him away to Corinth, even after the man who had brought him set him free he thought it necessary to remain.'[76] A little later, when discussing the problematic story that Diogenes rejected initiation into the Eleusinian Mysteries, Julian argued that this was connected to his universal aspirations. Initiation, Julian suggested, required one to be enrolled as a citizen of Athens,

[73] Branham 2007; Chin 2016. It is possible that this is the same Maximus the Cynic with whom Gregory quarrelled at Constantinople – Pouchet 1992, 121–5.
[74] Basil, *Ep*. 9.3 (Courtonne 1.40).
[75] Branham 2007, 72 views Cynic citizenship as disruptive; see also Chin 2016, 146.
[76] Julian, *Contr. Herac.* 212D–213A. Ἐκλείπειν could perhaps be understood transitively with reference to Athens implied.

Diogenes himself being from Sinope. Diogenes, however, 'considering that he was a citizen of the universe [νομίζων αὐτὸν εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου πολίτην]' viewed it proper 'to be a citizen' [συμπολιτεύεσθαι] 'with all the divine beings of the gods who govern the universe [κόσμος] in common, and not just with those natures which govern its parts'.[77] Julian's justification shared the sense that universal belonging was superior to the local on the basis of the latter's circumscription.[78] And the language of having one's citizenship with the divine beings themselves reflected Basil and Gregory's insistence on the co-citizenship of the saints (and, for Gregory, Christ himself). As well as this, Julian made plain the material benefits of Diogenes' remaining unattached. Otherwise he might have had to 'enslave himself to the laws of a single city and submit himself to all that must needs befall one who had become an Athenian citizen.'[79] The rhetoric of slavery echoes Gregory's sense that curial service was a type of servitude.[80] In his *Letter to Themistius* Julian further emphasised the problems of earthly belonging, quoting Diogenes to the effect that true happiness involved releasing oneself from earthly concerns which are dependent upon Fortune, being instead 'without city, without home, bereft of a fatherland [ἄπολιν, ἄοικον, πατρίδος ἐστερημένον]'.[81]

Yet Julian's embrace of this language was rare and far from unqualified. After all, the *Letter to Themistius* was a *recusatio imperii*. Indeed, Julian negated the reticence the letter expressed towards assuming power in the very act of becoming Caesar – and then usurping the throne. And when discussing in his *Consolation on the Departure of Sallustius* the attitude of Pericles whom the Athenians had forcibly separated from his teacher Anaxagoras, Julian detailed how the statesman ultimately obeyed the commands of his country over those of friendship:

> The universe is my city and my fatherland [ἐμοὶ πόλις μέν ἐστι καὶ πατρὶς ὁ κόσμος], and my friends are the gods and lesser divinities and all good men whoever and wherever they may be. Yet one must also respect the land where I was born, since this is the divine law, and to obey all its commands and not oppose them.[82]

The sentiments Julian voiced through Pericles were the mirror of those which the Cappadocians so often invoked: πατρίς here trumped philosophy, even if her commands were foolish and arbitrary. And this was despite the fact that, like Diogenes, Pericles' true companions were found in the society of higher spirits and good men in general. The divine ordnance [νόμος θεῖος] was nevertheless obedience to one's fatherland, not rebellion. As such, world-citizenship was a far less intellectually

---

[77] Julian, *Contr. Herac.* 238C.
[78] See also his use of a quotation attributed to Diogenes by Diogenes Laertius and comparison of Diogenes to the gods in *Contr. Herac.* 195B.
[79] Julian, *Contr. Herac.* 238D; cf. 239A.
[80] Gregory, *Ep.* 146.5 (Gallay 2.37–8); see ch. 2 p. 47–8. See McLynn 2006, 289.
[81] Julian, *Ep. ad Them.* 256D.
[82] Julian, *Consol. Sall.* 246A–B.

(and socially) disruptive force, because it sat in harmony with that of one's πατρίς rather than in opposition to it.[83]

Basil and Gregory, unlike Julian, offered a strongly oppositional reading of the πατρίς at certain points in their careers and writings. They drew on an established Christian language of heavenly citizenship. Writers before them had elaborated this language redefining the terms of civic patriotic language, producing an ideology that used civic patriotism's terms even as it renounced of civic ideas. Here it is worth highlighting the disjuncture between political thought and political language this redefinition created: though the terms remained the same, their significance within a broader network of concepts was radically changed. Though Basil and Gregory did draw on this by now traditional Christian language, they also used it in distinct ways. Basil applied common Aristotelian ideas of the city to explore the meaning of the Christian community, whilst Gregory developed a distinctive philosophical vocabulary to discuss πατρίς belonging. Though Julian at times embraced a Cynic heritage of scepticism about the πατρίς, he nowhere attacked it outright in the same stark terms. Indeed, as we shall see, he criticised Cynics for deserting their ancestral obligations.[84] As a result, though Basil and Gregory were less consistent by alternately embracing and rejecting secular patriotism, the Christian redefinition of civic language enabled them to advocate an empire-wide vision of religious community, which Julian's less flexible attitude made harder.

The Results of Rejecting the Earthly Πατρίς

Basil and Gregory followed their Christian exemplars and embraced a redefined civic language in the cause of the heavenly πόλις. This elevation of Church over city had several practical effects visible in their writings, which proved influential in differentiating their vision of Christianity from contemporary pagan religious institutions. The first was a popularisation of exile and the suffering it entailed. In a letter to Eusebius of Samosata, Gregory praised him for persisting in faith despite his exile.[85] 'You have risen superior to your persecutors by nobly departing from the land which bore you.'[86] By invoking persecution, Gregory cast exile as a type of martyrdom. 'And others indeed possess their paternal soil, but we the heavenly city [καὶ ἄλλοι μὲν τὸ πατρῷον ἔδαφος ἔχουσιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν ἄνω πόλιν]; others perhaps have our throne, but we have Christ!'[87] Gregory's explicit contrast of 'paternal soil' (πατρῷον ἔδαφος) and 'heavenly city' (ἄνω πόλιν) did not deny the emotive or moral

[83] For earlier precedents for this, see Chin 2016.
[84] See ch. 6 pp. 129–30, 139–40.
[85] In addition to the following, see *Or*. 26.12–14 (254–60). Valens was castigated by Nicene writers after his death as an Arian and a persecutor, though it is debated how far and why he enforced Homoiousianism. See Snee 1985, 413–19; Lenski 2003, 234–63.
[86] Gregory, *Ep.* 65.3 (Gallay 1.85).
[87] Gregory, *Ep*. 65.4 (Gallay 1.85).

force of the former. Indeed, his praise of Eusebius sprang precisely from his recognition of the force of patriotic ties. But it nonetheless established a clear hierarchy ordering heavenly and earthly loyalties. It also joined him and Eusebius as members of a common persecuted community (even though Gregory himself had not been displaced) just as it homogenised imperial and ecclesiastical opponents as seizing earthly gain. Likewise in his funeral oration for Basil, Gregory portrayed him as contemptuously defying imperial threats:

> I do not recognise exile, not being bound by one land and not counting my own the place I currently inhabit or any place to which I might be thrown. But rather [I think] everything is God's and whose sojourner and foreigner I am [πάροικος ἐγὼ καὶ παρεπίδημος].[88]

The choice of terms for one's condition again recalled both New Testament and patristic precedents, as well as Classical arguments against the significance of exile (albeit the more forceful ones of Plutarch who had likewise attacked attachment to one's native land entirely in *On Exile*).[89] Basil himself did not make this contrast between earthly and heavenly so notably with reference to exile, though in the course of his letters more generally he noted the opportunity for witness which it presented.[90] Gregory, meanwhile, held up the model of Christ and the apostles. 'But our herald [ie. Christ] was a foreigner and a guest, [ξένος ἡμῖν ὁ κῆρυξ καὶ ὑπερόριος] indeed one might say that he is such to those who have narrow horizons and love the flesh. And were not the apostles strangers to all the peoples and cities [ξένοι τῶν πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τε καὶ πόλεων] to which they were allotted so that the Gospel might spread rapidly everywhere?'[91]

Secondly, and in a directly connected fashion, it encouraged Christians to identify with the cult of the saints. Martyr piety has long been seen as a popular and important aspect of fourth-century civic religious devotion, particularly when connected to the cult of locally prominent holy men and women.[92] While the substantial civic patriotic aspects of this worship will be addressed in Part Three, it is worth also emphasising that martyrs were not simply icons of local piety.[93] This is particularly marked,

---

[88] Gregory, *Or*. 43.49 (Bernardi 1992, 230).
[89] Plut. *Mor. de exil.* 600E–F (Paton, Pohlenz & Sieveking 1972, 515–16). Philo, *De Abrahamo* 60–88 praised the patriarch for leaving his fatherland and its cities (Cohn 1902, 14–21) – for comment, see Runia 2000, 371–2).
[90] For example, *Ep.* 139.1 (Courtonne 2.57), 265.1 (Courtonne 3.128).
[91] Gregory, *Or*. 33.11 (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 180).
[92] For helpful discussion on this connection, see, for example, Jones 1964, 2.961; Dagron 1977; Brown 1982, 93–105; Pietri 1984, 311; Mitchell 1993, 64–70; Van Uytfanghe 1996, 164–5, 172–3, 187–8; Curran 2002, 148–57; Leemans et al. 2003, 9; Limberis 2011, 10; Bernier-Farella 2015, 56–7. Delehaye by contrast tended not to emphasise this local function (thus his treatment of the Forty Martyrs at Delehaye 1933, 73–4), perhaps due to his desire to play down links between hero veneration and martyr piety. For local martyr piety in the Cappadocians, see ch. 5 n. 53.
[93] This productive tension between universal and local is eloquently, if briefly, described in Brown 2015, 383; see also Destephen 2015, 74–6.

interestingly, in Gregory's treatment of martyrs.[94] Giving his *Oration in Praise of the Maccabees*, Gregory had praised the martyrs for having rejected earthly homelands, and for instead preferring that of the heavenly Jerusalem. According to Gregory, while the martyrs admitted that earthly life and religious worship was pleasant, it paled in comparison with the truth of heavenly bliss:

> For there is also another world for us [the martyrs], much higher and more permanent [ὑψηλότερός τε καὶ μονιμώτερος] than the visible; the heavenly Jerusalem is our fatherland [πατρίς τε ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ] which no Antiochus will besiege, nor will expect to bring it over by force, for it is staunch and impregnable.[95]

This substitution was particularly noteworthy because Maccabees II and IV were the only books in the Septuagint which engaged with civic patriotic ideology at any length, but focused entirely on the (earthly) πόλις of Jerusalem and the πατρίς of Israel.[96] Indeed, Julian himself had praised the Maccabees for defending their (earthly) ancestral customs.[97] In Gregory's *Oration on Cyprian*, delivered in Constantinople, he likewise highlighted the martyr's detachment. Cyprian thought that 'there is one fatherland for the highest, that intellectual Jerusalem, not those here which are divided by petty limits, and changing in respect of their many changing inhabitants [μίαν μὲν γὰρ εἶναι πατρίδα τοῖς ὑψηλοῖς, τὴν νοουμένην Ἱερουσαλὴμ, οὐ τὰς μικροῖς ὁρίοις ἐνταῦθα διειλημμένας, καὶ πολλοὺς ἀμειβούσας οἰκήτορας].'[98] The key elements of Gregory's characterisation of heavenly Jerusalem remained consistent – heavenly Jerusalem was 'intellectual' (νοουμένη), its borders were unlimited, its nature and composition were eternal, and it belonged to 'the highest' (τοῖς ὑψηλοῖς). Cyprian had completely rejected the earthly fatherland in pursuit of the heavenly. ('Cyprian' here was an amorphous figure: Gregory seems to have confused the real Cyprian of Carthage with the legendary Cyprian of Antioch, a former sorcerer who subsequently converted and was martyred.)[99] Basil could also draw more universalist lessons from martyrs' actions, as with the forty martyrs of Sebaste which I will examine in Chapter Five.[100] In all these cases, there were contingent reasons to stress the martyrs' universalist credentials over their local ones.[101] Nonetheless, the fact that martyrs could and were used

---

[94] In addition to the following, see *Or*. 19.5 (PG 35.1048C–49A), 11.7 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 344–6), 35.1 [*dubia*] (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 228–30).
[95] Gregory, *Or*. 15.5 (PG 31.920B–C).
[96] See II Maccabees 5:6–10, 5:15, 8:21, 8:31, 13:3, 13:10, 13:14; IV Maccabees 1:11, 4:1, 4:5, 4:20–3, 17:21. Gregory seems to rely on IV Maccabees for his account – Vinson 1994, 166.
[97] Julian, *Ep*. 20 453C–54B (*Ep.* 89a Bidez-Cumont). For comment, see Finkelstein 2018, 128–36.
[98] Gregory, *Or*. 24.15 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1981, 72–4).
[99] Bernardi 1968, 161.
[100] See ch. 5 p. 113–14.
[101] See also Gregory, *Or*. 19.5 (PG 35.1048C–49A), 43.67 (Bernardi 1992, 276). The praise of Cyprian was given at Constantinople, which had no direct connection to either Cyprian, and where Gregory was himself an interloper. If Vinson is right in seeing Gregory's Maccabean Oration as a response to Julian's attempt to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem, it makes sense that Gregory would seek to downplay the importance of the earthly (and in late–antique Christian eyes Jewish) Israel. Finally, Basil's homily on the Forty was not given at their cult site in Sebaste in neighbouring Armenia, but at Caesarea, though there was perhaps a local tradition that the martyrs were

to make these anti-localist arguments is telling. One should not lose sight of the fact that turning martyrs into local heroes was an inherently paradoxical move, for it made heroes of people who had rejected their locality's customs and been executed for it. Martyrs could function as patterns of personal behaviour, benevolent intercessors or occasions to render thanks to God irrespective of whether their local or universal identities were emphasised.[102]

Finally, it emphasised connections between Christian communities as part of a universal Church. Frequently in Basil's letters this was expressed as regret when individuals or churches failed to live up to this standard. Thus in a letter to Amphilochius of Iconium he lamented that 'we are circumscribed city by city [κατὰ πόλεις περιγεγράμμεθα], and we each hold our neighbour in suspicion. For what else shall we say than that we have let our charity grow cold, by which alone our Lord has said His disciples are distinguished.'[103] Circumscription was a common criticism by both Basil and Gregory of earthly πατρίδες. Instead, as Basil expressed in a letter to the coastal ('maritime') bishops of Pontus, all should 'be fellow-citizens and neighbours to all [καὶ πάντας πᾶσι πολίτας καὶ οἰκείους εἶναι]'.[104] One notes, too, the application of other aspects of civic language to these entreaties. When Basil wrote to the bishops of the West, he invoked metaphors familiar from the petitions he had employed on behalf of Caesarea. 'Therefore we urge you now at least to stretch out a hand to the churches in the East which have already fallen to their knees [εἰς γόνυ κλιθείσαις ἤδη].'[105] This was a familiar trope of the language of petitions, and not specifically civic – Basil on another occasion employed it of a struggling household.[106] Gregory also found a use for this rhetoric when preaching to a congregation which included Alexandrian sailors in Constantinople.[107] Addressing the sailors, he emphasised how they as Egyptians represented a long and famous tradition of orthodoxy embodied by Athanasius. 'But you spiritually nurture not just a single people, nor indeed any city circumscribed by narrow borders no matter how famous it may be thought, but the entire inhabited world from something small.'[108] Likewise when preaching on Basil's ecumenical activity, he dwelt on how Basil 'fled the disaster of impiety and made his city into an ark of salvation, deftly sailing over the heretics, from which he

---

of Cappadocian stock. Vinson 1994; Maraval 1999. See also Rizos, *Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity* E01303; idem, CSLA–E00255.

[102] On the first, see Brown 1983; functions more broadly, Pietri 1984; Van Uytfanghe 1996, 189–90; Rapp 2005, 85–6.

[103] Basil, *Ep.* 191 (Courtonne 2.145). Compare also Ep. 113–14 (Courtonne 2.16–19).

[104] Basil, *Ep.* 203.3 (Courtonne 2.171); on these letters and the role of the universal Church in Basil's theology, see Fedwick 1978, 114–18; Pouchet 1992, 467–88. Note however his appeal elsewhere to more concrete ties between the regions given the Pontic veneration of the Cappadocian martyrs Eupsychius (see CSLA–S00470) and Damas (CSLA–S00471) – Basil, *Ep.* 252 (Courtonne 3.93).

[105] Basil, *Ep.* 242 (Courtonne 3.67); cf. *Ep.* 102 (Courtonne 2.3) on the church of Satala.

[106] Basil, *Ep.* 109 (Courtonne 2.11). See also Gascou 1997, 194.

[107] On Gregory's view of the universal Church, see Muraille 1968.

[108] Gregory, *Or.* 34.2 (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 200). Compare his invocation of Basil's superiority to Joseph, as a provider of spiritual rather than physical sustenance, and to the world rather than a single people (*Or.* 43.72 (Bernardi 1992, 286)).

restored the whole world to health'.[109] If Basil's proper ministry was to 'the whole world', what place was there for a bounded loyalty to a mere single πόλις like Caesarea?

* * * * *

Christian rhetoric thus posed an obvious challenge to civic patriotic language. The challenge was the more serious because it was couched in the same language of πόλις and πατρίς, and employed the same nexus of assumptions about the need for loyalty to one's fatherland and the desirability of city living. The power of these associations, even when πατρίς was redefined as the heavenly Jerusalem, testifies to the continuing force of civic patriotic terms ideas in late Roman society. Basil and Gregory were not new or unique in following earlier Christian adaptations of patriotic language, but the fact that they continued to use this language is indirect evidence of the continuing power of secular civic patriotism. In many respects, Basil and Gregory used this language in a fairly traditional way. Nonetheless, there are intriguing differences. Gregory's language was overtly philosophical, emphasising the permanence and boundlessness of the heavenly city compared to the earthly πατρίς. In this respect it was individualistic: although Gorgonia (for instance) was cast as a pillar of her local community, her citizenship was acted out in Heaven, not on earth. Basil, by contrast, seems to have embraced the more communal (in this world) aspects of heavenly citizenship: applying it to the Church and to the monastic vocation, though intriguingly not to the monastery itself. Nonetheless, common to both was a vocal rejection of worldly identity and belonging – an opposition particular to Christians, and found almost nowhere in Julian's own work.

This conviction of outsider status is striking given that Basil and Gregory came from wealthy curial families, received the best education the Greco-Roman world could provide, and were deeply connected to imperial aristocratic networks. Both spent their entire lives in an empire governed by Christian monarchs, with eighteen short months under Julian the sole exception. Such emperors did tolerate or enforce heretical doctrine, perhaps cementing this sense of outsider status: but equally, the conviction of outsider status supplied by heavenly citizenship fuelled the doctrinal debate which led to these divisions. Pious Christians felt the need to draw boundaries between a pure ecclesiastical community within and the heretics and heathens without.[110] Likewise, the rhetoric of heavenly citizenship reinforced the bonds between Christian communities, encouraged individual Christians to embrace exile and martyrdom in the service of the saints, and to venerate those confessors as universal patrons. Under Theodosius, Christian belonging would come to define Roman citizenship,

[109] Gregory, *Or*. 43.70 (Bernardi 1992, 282–4); compare Gregory *Vit. sua* ll. 1079–84 (White 90). See conversely Basil's enemies' attempt to seize Caesarea, thence to corrupt the world – *Or*. 43.68 (Bernardi 1992, 276).

[110] On the rhetorical role of citizenship in discussions of heresy, see MacCormack 1997; Flierman and Rose 2020.

reversing the direction of intellectual influence prevalent hitherto.[111] The redefinition of civic patriotic language into a language of heavenly citizenship thus had powerful social effects. Moreover, it posed an overt and public challenge to the civic patriotic ideas which had inspired it. Both Basil and Gregory had local audiences of various social positions who considered and engaged with their words, if not always in the ways speakers liked or anticipated.[112] The tension between heavenly and earthly πατρίς was felt in both popular and elite circles – though it was probably in the latter that impact of the clash between heavenly and earthly patriotic language on philosophy, asceticism, anthropology and cosmic history was most felt. Such a theme will occupy the subsequent discussion chapter.

[111] Lo Nero 2001; Humfress 2008; Garnsey 2006; Rivas 2017.

[112] Against the sceptical opinion of MacMullen 1989, who argues that audiences were limited to the elite and paid little attention to what homilists preached, I prefer the more optimistic view of Rousseau 1998. For studies showing evidence of interaction between homilist and audience, see, for example, those collected in Cunningham and Allen 1998; Van Nuffelen 2014; and wonderfully evoked in Brown 2012, 339–58. For the Cappadocians specifically, see Meredith 1998; Van Dam 2003a, 101–50; Daunton-Fear 2017.

Chapter Four – Civilisation, Anthropology and Divine Providence

As I suggested in Chapter Three, unlike Julian, the Cappadocians espoused a conflicted attitude to civic patriotic ideas and language. On the one hand, they employed civic patriotism enthusiastically when engaging in social and political activities with other members of the elite. On the other, they vociferously objected to any shred of emotive or intellectual attachment to them in sermons and advice to ascetics. This rejection is even more stark in comparison to Julian's relatively easy acceptance, because they shared with him many convictions about how individuals and cities should behave. For a number of general spiritual considerations united Neoplatonic pagans and Christians in late Antiquity, and many were unfavourable to life in cities.[1] Principally, the importance of cultivating purity of mind and soul often entailed the rejection of things associated with the body or the world, which might encompass services provided by urban amenities or prestige garnered in urban settings.[2] The soul was more closely connected to divinity – whether as an image of God or by participating in the divine through reason and contemplation.[3] Although salvation was thus a deeply personal affair, both traditions suggested the importance of worship, liturgy and ritual action.[4] Though this gave a community dimension to personal salvation, this did not entail approval of 'the world' more generally. In both traditions there was a profound sense that wealth, reputation, and family were fleeting, compared to the eternal rewards of the philosophic life.[5] This contrast was all the more problematic because philosophers were held to possess *parrhesia* – the ability to 'speak truth to power' – which made them valued as civic intercessors.[6] Precisely those attributes which pulled the philosopher away from the world made him attractive to those still in it.

---

[1] Common ascetic tendencies (though noting differences): Amand de Mendieta 1957, 36; Meredith 1976, 330–2; Fowden 1982; G. Clark 2000. This is not to deny that significant issues of theology divided Christian philosophers from their Neoplatonic pagan counterparts: the eternity of the world, the graduation of divinity, the status of the soul after death, the manner of divine revelation and soteriological agency, and (as I will emphasise in this chapter) their orientation toward localism and cultic diversity. For a succinct summary of differences, see Armstrong 1973. Individuals nonetheless often took positions at odds with their co-religionists, which led internal diversity and overlap – for such cross-fertilisation and discussion, see Stead 1994, 63–75; Kobusch 2008.

[2] In older studies the significance of the desert was emphasised: Lowther Clarke 1913, 30–1; Gribomont 1965, 8; Chitty 1966, 6. Asceticism need not however be conducted in wilderness settings – see Elm 1994, 14, 331–72.

[3] Armstrong 1957; Thomas 2019.

[4] This could be disputed, however: Porphyry and Iamblichus famously argued over theurgy and sacrifice, as detailed in Shaw 1995; Addey 2012. Christianity was probably more committed to this aspect of communal religious action – see, for instance, comparison in Fowden 1982. For the sacraments in early Christianity, see J. N. D. Kelly 1977, 189–220, 423–55.

[5] For comparison, see, for example, G. Clark 2000.

[6] Brown 1992, 61–71.

Added to this sense of the inferiority of visible affairs was the belief that contemplation of the divine required stillness and calm, away from the bustle and distraction of civic affairs. Elijah, John the Baptist and Christ were all frequently invoked by Gregory as showing the holiness which could be derived from time spent in solitary contemplation.[7] Basil likewise embraced the flight from the world as a means of self-improvement. In his letters to Gregory he encouraged him to come to his retreat at Annesi, emphasising the quiet and beauty of his estate compared to the 'countless evils' of civic life.[8] Julian also envisaged the true Cynic as having to retreat from the world for a time before returning to face its challenges, through an analogy with the behaviour of young bulls that spent time away from the herd, gathering strength, before returning to face their elders.[9] Nonetheless, it is notable that his own sense of the Cynic programme concentrated less on flight from the world and more on self-examination and self-discipline – perhaps indicative of a more Iamblichean view of the philosopher's immediate social responsibilities and the importance of *paideia*.[10]

To some extent, too, there was a rhetorical difference in how asceticism stood in relation to the philosopher's role as a public figure.[11] Both Basil and Gregory equated otherwise unlearned Christian sages with pagan philosophers, expressing scepticism of 'foreign' learning.[12] This attitude, as Brown explores, led ultimately to the migration of the right of *parrhesia* from pagan philosophers to Christian holy men.[13] While Julian also valued the life of retreat and abandonment of worldly goods (which he associated both with the Cynics and with Christian monks) it is clear that he did not see it as the highest form of excellence.[14] 'It seems in some ways to be a universal philosophy, and the most natural, and to require no special study whatsoever [αὕτη γὰρ ἡ φιλοσοφία κοινή πως ἔοικεν εἶναι καὶ φυσικωτάτη καὶ δεῖσθαι οὐδ᾽ ἡστινοσοῦν πραγματείας].'[15] That it was universal and natural certainly recommended it. However, Julian did not regard this kind of training as incompatible with *paideia*, and seems to have preferred the wisdom so acquired to be perfected through philosophy and the

[7] Gregory, *Or*. 10.1 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 316–18), 14.4 (PG 31.861C), 26.7 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1981, 240–2), 33.10 (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 176–80), *Ep*. 99.1 (Gallay 1.117).
[8] Basil, *Ep*. 2.1 (Courtonne 1.5). Cf. Basil, *Ep*. 291 (Courtonne 3.163–4), *Hom. in Gord.* 3 (PG 31.492B–96C), *Reg. Fus.* 6 (925A–27B); compare ch. 3 n. 39. For this episode in Basil's life see Rousseau 1994, 61–92.
[9] Julian, *Contr. Cyn.* 201D.
[10] G. Clark 2000; Elm 2012b, 139.
[11] Rubenson 2000; more generally, the papers in Larsen and Rubenson 2018.
[12] Gregory, *Vit. sua* 292–5 (White 30–2). Compare *Carmina* 1.2.2 ll. 152ff (PG 37.520A); 1.2.10 ll. 508–23 (717A–18B), Basil, *Hom. in Gord.* 2–3 (PG 31.492B–97C).
[13] See Brown 1992, 106–8, 133–5, 140–1; with the observation of its limits in Rousseau 2002, 51. For earlier philosophical movements which sought to renounce *paideia,* see Johnsén 2018, 220; later history of *paideia,* Van Renswoude 2019.
[14] For monks, see 224B–C; contrast his attacks on (total) renunciation of the world as socially impractical (Neumann *Fragment* 12 from *Contr. Gal.*; see Wright 3.430).
[15] Julian, *Contr. Cyn.* 187D.

schools.[16] Moreover, the Cappadocians themselves did not in practice reject education or the city. Basil's *Address to the Young Men* became a classic account of how Christians could continue to study the traditional curriculum,[17] while Gregory himself lauded various cities as centres of education and culture.[18] Indeed, Gregory's own model of retreat differed substantially from the physical version of Basil, resembling a much more traditional aristocratic *otium*.[19]

As well as this emphasis on asceticism, all three figures suggested that cities were breeding grounds of vice and various other sorts of luxury. All three believed that these tendencies were amplified by impure spectacles, particularly in the form of theatre shows and chariot races.[20] If cities were to be healed, then pious occupations were necessary. In his encomium to Athanasius of Alexandria given at Constantinople, Gregory stressed his superiority in winning the city's affection, for it was 'a city which could hardly be saved by many examples of virtue, making sport, as it does, of divine things, no less than the horse-race and the theatre [ὥσπερ τοὺς ἱππικοὺς καὶ τὰ θέατρα, οὕτω δὴ καὶ τὰ θεῖα παίζουσαν]'.[21] Playing with divine matters was something Gregory condemned elsewhere in his corpus as fundamentally inappropriate for such divine subjects.[22] Gregory condemned city life again in the aftermath of the "Maximus Affair" some months later, attacking the city's noise, crowds, markets, theatres, wealth and disturbances, crowning a series of appositions by identifying all with 'the matter of evil, the broiling world [ὕλη κακίας, κόσμου βράσματι], with its tightly turning changes like those of the Euripus or the winds'.[23] Gregory combined apposition and metaphor to heighten the sense of the chaos of the urban world – using a succession of fluid metaphors (the tides of the Euripus, the 'broiling' world) which in turn concluded a series of paired opposites (injuring and being injured, rejoicing and crying, and so on). In mentioning, too, the 'matter of evil' Gregory perhaps alluded to Platonic metaphysics, which contrasted the corruption of the material with the stillness, perfection and eternal changelessness of the good.[24] By contrast, he framed himself as a philosopher

[16] Compare his mockery of the Cynic Heracleios for rejecting the Lyceum and the Academy in favour of 'the vestibules of the palace' (*Contr. Herac.* 225A). See further on education, Athanassiadi 1981, 127–31; Marcone 2012, 247; Elm 2012b, 136–9 with further references.
[17] For discussion, see Naldini 1976; Naldini 1978; Fortin 1981; Helleman 1990; Rousseau 1994, 48–57; Van Dam 2002, 181–8. It is worth noting that McLynn 2010b sees Basil's account as somewhat insincere or mocking.
[18] Gregory, *Or*. 43.13–14 (Bernardi 1992, 142–8); compare Basil, *Ep*. 76 (Courtonne 1.178). On their differing attitudes to Athens, see Rubenson 2006; cf Wenzel 2010.
[19] See below p. 94.
[20] On *theoria* generally, see MacDougall 2016.
[21] Gregory, *Or*. 21.5 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1980, 118–20).
[22] Gregory, *Or*. 21.12 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1990, 134); cf. *Or*. 22.8 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1990, 236), 29.2 (Gallay and Jourjon 1978, 178), *Vit. sua* ll. 1212–17 (White 100). For the cultural context of these disputations, see Lim 1995b.
[23] Gregory, *Or*. 26.1 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1981, 226). The narrow Straight of Euripus between Euboia and Boeotia was proverbial for the strength and variability of its tidal currents – and, intriguingly, gave its name to the *spina* of Constantinople's Hippodrome (Mango 1938). Compare Basil's association of cities with excessive wealth and legal troubles in *Hom. in Mam.* 3 (PG 31.592C–93B).
[24] For these as commonly agreed characteristics of divine perfection, see Stead 1994, 120–1.

who rejected such changeable distractions from God and who followed the path as laid out by the Old Testament prophets and Christ himself.[25]

In Julian's case, this anti-city animus was most exemplified by the *Misopogon,* which played on tropes of virtuous rusticity (ἀγροικία) in order to condemn Antiochene luxury. Julian likened his refusal to attend the theatre to that of a rustic (ἄγροικος) unwilling to pay taxes,[26] his sleeping alone to his 'savage and uncivilised spirit [τὸν ἄγριον καὶ ἀνήμερον... θύμον]',[27] and accused himself of 'proverbial Mykonian boorishness [ἀγροικία] and ignorance and stupidity'.[28] Discoursing on the frugality of his own lifestyle, he noted sardonically that 'whereas the rusticity [ἀγροικία] of the Celts bears this easily, a fortunate and blessed and populous city naturally resents it [πόλις δ' εὐδαίμων καὶ μακαρία καὶ πολυάνθρωπος εἰκότως ἄχθεται]'.[29] Tracing this character back to the vices of its namesake Antiochus, Julian ironically praised the citizens for their pious continuation of that legacy – 'I say that on the contrary it is in the place of an encomium that I ascribe to you emulation of your forefathers' – and sarcastically quoted *Iliad* 24.261 and *Odyssey* 19.396 to reinforce his point.[30] By contrast, Pannonia and the Danube regions 'whence indeed my family hails' produced people 'totally rustic, harsh, awkward, sexually unattractive, remaining unchangeable in their judgements: all things which are the signs of fearful boorishness.'[31] (This, of course, amounted to a list of Julian's philosophical virtues.) Julian's denunciations might have been rhetorical, and aimed particularly at Antioch, but they embodied a Classical view of the deleterious effects of prosperity upon moral character. His scorn was particularly (and famously) reserved for the theatre, and the spectacles which were associated with it.[32] Nonetheless, Julian's condemnation was here of a particular city, albeit drawing on generic tropes of urban immorality, rather than of civic life more generally.

Basil likewise connected urban vices to popular entertainments. In the *Hexaemeron,* he detailed how 'there are certain cities which feast their eyes with all kinds of spectacles of manufactured wonders from twilit dawn even until the evening.'[33] Basil's language of 'feasting the eyes' [ἑστιῶσαι τὰς ὄψεις], mixing a metaphor of consumption with one of sight, was perhaps intended as to contrast with the proper direction of vision toward God, an authentic wonder, rather

[25] Gregory, *Or*. 26.7 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1981, 240–42).
[26] Julian, *Misop.* 345D. On the *Misop.*, see ch. 2 n. 76.
[27] Julian, *Misop.* 339D.
[28] Julian, *Misop.* 349D.
[29] Julian, *Misop.* 342A–B. See also 359A–B.
[30] Julian, *Misop.* 349A.
[31] Julian, *Misop.* 348D.
[32] Julian, *Misop.* 349B, 344A, 344B, 339D. Horse races 340A. On Julian's view of the theatre, see Elm 2012a, 11.
[33] Basil, *Hex. IV* 1 (Amand de Mendieta and Rudberg 1997, 57).

than pretended or manufactured spectacles [θεάμασι θαυματοποιῶν].[34] Continuing, Basil decried the popularity of such entertainments:

> And many think these peoples happy, because they leave the trading of the market or plans to make a living from craft, and spend their allotted time of life in all leisure and pleasure, not seeing that the theatre, flourishing with impure sights, is the common and public teacher of licentiousness to those sitting there.[35]

Leisure and freedom from the demands of labour were the other side of consumption, and Basil's promotion of an element of industry in his ascetic foundations was connected with this link between luxury, idleness and impiety. It suggested, too, that the theatre was at the centre of this process, underlining the importance of viewing as an influence on the individual soul. Though this emphasis on the influence of spectacle suggested elsewhere to Basil the potential for benign examples to inspire reform, Basil was generally sanguine about the spectrum of negative behaviours that cities encouraged.[36] 'Do you not see the fornicators who sit in the marketplace, and laugh at the temperate, and describe their vile works which are worthy of darkness?', Basil asked his congregation in his exposition of Psalm 1, elsewhere singling out drunkenness as posing a particular problem for civic order.[37]

In sum, the various forms of asceticism advanced by Basil, Julian and Gregory could sit uneasily with life in cities, albeit to varying degrees. Cities were bustling places which threw up a variety of worldly cares which inhibited one's ability to contemplate the divine. The services they provided and structures they contained were ultimately superfluous to this purpose. Moreover, they were frequently homes of lewdness and disorder. Both in what they promoted and what they lacked, cities could be faulted as inimical to the philosophic life. Yet none promoted a life of solitude. This was not for want of precedents. On the Christian side, the eremites of the Egyptian desert posed a potentially anti-social challenge. Although even the *Life of Anthony* did not portray its hero as totally without social contact, asceticism offered the opportunity to advance more solitary conceptions of the ascetic-philosopher's role.[38] On the pagan side, Porphyry's model philosopher was also reticent from

[34] Cf. Basil, *In Ps. XLV* 4 (PG 29.424A–B), *Hex. IX* 2 (Amand de Mendieta and Rudberg 1997, 148–9), *Hom. in Gord.* 2–3 (PG 31.492B–97C); compare ch. 3 pp. 72–3.
[35] Basil, *Hex. IV* 1 (Amand de Mendieta and Rudberg 1997, 57).
[36] For the theatre in the *Hom. in Gord.* 2–3 (PG 31.492B–97C), see Chiriatti 2017.
[37] Basil, *In Ps. I* 6 (PG 29.225B). See *De Baptisma* 2.8.2 1600D (Ducatillon 1989, 248), *Reg. Fus.* 22.3 (PG 31.980B–C) for the impropriety of eating and drinking in the agora, and the *Hom. in ebr.* (PG 31.444–63) more generally. For the prevalence of fighting in public, see Basil *Reg. Fus.* 22.3 (PG 31.980B). Compare the sense of vibrant *agora* life in Chrysostom's homilies: L. Lavan 2007b.
[38] Rubenson 2013; cf. Tamas 2020.

public life.[39] By contrast, Basil, Julian and Gregory espoused a notion of philosophical leadership which saw the philosopher's role as imitating the divine. As the divine had assisted humans to improve in virtue in the past, there were possible models for social involvement even for the most otherworldly Neoplatonist, to say nothing of the examples of worldly teaching and ministry of Christ and his disciples.[40] Philosophers might thus have a duty to instruct their inferiors, as well as to ensure through teaching and insight that social order was maintained.

Both of these arguments, however, envisaged society as a burden to be borne, rather than a positive arena for the philosopher's flourishing. In Christian circles, a more positive account of human association was provided by the scriptural metaphor of the Church as a body, in which all the different members needed to co-operate else they perish individually.[41] For example, Basil in a letter to the council of Tyana remarked on how:

> From the very constitution of our bodies the Lord has taught us the necessity of the community [ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν κατασκευῆς τὸ ἀναγκαῖον τῆς κοινωνίας ὁ Κύριος ἡμᾶς ἐδίδαξεν]. For whenever I look upon these very limbs of ours, and see that no one of them is sufficient in itself to produce action, how can I reason that I of myself suffice to cope with the affairs of life [τὰ τοῦ βίου πράγματα]?[42]

The link to the rhetoric of the body politic further anchored the message: common Christian activity, and common prayer specifically, was essential both for social cohesion and for the individual to realise fully their own potential.[43] God had encouraged sociability through the natural disposition of the human form, which embodied broader universal truths in its particular constitution.

Basil and Julian, however, went further in embracing the virtues of society. They employed the famous Aristotelian maxim that man 'is by nature a political animal [φύσει πολιτικὸν ζῷον]',[44] writing consciously in relation to asceticism. In his *Longer Responses*, Basil devoted one of his discussions to the commandment to love thy neighbour.[45] Justifying his rejection of eremitic monasticism, Basil pointed out the social nature of humans. 'Who does not know that man is a civilised and gregarious

---

[39] G. Clark 2000, 40; cf. discussion in Fowden 1982.
[40] See the framework for a socially engaged Neoplatonism outlined in Armstrong 1957.
[41] Particularly frequent in Basil: see, for instance, *Ep.* 67 (Courtonne 1.159), 203.3 (2.170), 219 (3.3), *Reg. Fus.* 7.2 (PG 31.929C–30A). For it as a means of supporting clerical leadership, see Gregory, *Or.* 2.3 (Bernardi 1985, 88–90), Basil, *Reg. Fus.* 24 (PG 31.981C–84B), 35.1 (1004A–D). For the pre-Christian rhetoric of the body politic, see Brock 2000; Meister 2012.
[42] Basil, *Ep.* 97 (Courtonne 1.210). Basil developed the metaphor quoting 1 Corinthians 13, interestingly omitting to mention the head – perhaps a deliberate choice so as not to appear overly authoritarian.
[43] Fedwick 1978, 29–32.
[44] Arist., *Pol.* 1.2.9 1253A (Aubonnet 1960, 14). For commentary, see Cooper 1990.
[45] Basil, *Reg. Fus.* 3 (PG 31.916C). Basil also cited John 13:34–5, 15:12, Exodus 32:32, Romans 9:3, but not (interestingly) Luke 10:25–39 and the parable of the Good Samaritan, although citing a similar elaboration of the requirement for generosity regardless of the recipient in the parable of the sheep and the goats (Matthew 25:31–46).

animal, neither savage nor a lover of solitude? [ἥμερον καὶ κοινωνικὸν ζῶον ὁ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ οὐχὶ μοναστικὸν, οὐδὲ ἄγριον;].'[46] The discussion was placed early in the *Longer Responses*, signalling its importance. Indeed, Basil revised the text to separate it from the longer discussion of the commandment to love God (where it falls in the *Small Asketikon*) and then elaborated on it in his later revision of the text. All this suggests its substantial significance in his ascetic philosophy.[47] Strongly disavowing 'solitary' (μοναστικὸν) and 'savage' (ἄγριον) characterisations of human nature, with which he implicitly tarnished the eremitic life, Basil followed immediately by avowing that 'nothing, indeed, is so compatible with our nature as living in common with others [οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτως ἴδιον τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν ὡς τῷ κοινωνεῖν ἀλλήλοις], in needing them, and the love of our own kind [ἀγαπᾷν τὸ ὁμόφυλον].'[48] Here was a strongly positive account of association as important for even the most otherworldly of philosophers. Despite its Aristotelian framework, however, Basil's choice of vocabulary was significant: he eschewed the label 'political' (πολιτικός) in favour of the more neutral 'sociable' (κοινωνικός). In the Latin this is rendered *communicabilis*, rather than *ciuilis*, *urbanus* or the direct borrowing *politicus*, suggesting that this was a consistent preference.[49] This suggests that, for Basil and unlike for Julian, one could have sociability without having cities (as understood in a demographic or economic sense).[50] Perhaps most distinctive, however, was Basil's reference to 'loving' (ἀγαπάω) others as a fundamental characteristic of social engagement, a Christian vocabulary not present in the *Politics*.[51]

---

[46] Basil, *Reg. Fus.* 3.2 (PG 31.917A). Garnier, whose edition was reprinted in the PG, noted minor variants in the *Codex Colbertinus* 3093 (Paris *Bib. Nat. fonds grec* 503) at this point (PG 31.917 n. 80) which do not alter the meaning.

[47] See discussion at Rousseau 1994, 355–9, Silvas 2005, 131. Basil's *Longer Responses* and *Shorter Responses*, which together make up the so-called *Asketikon*, have a complicated textual history. Initially they existed as a single set of responses to questions (known subsequently as the *Small Asketikon*) compiled probably c. 365–366, which was the text translated by Rufinus of Aquileia and an anonymous Syriac source. The material of the *Small Asketikon* was then separated by Basil into the *Longer* and *Shorter Responses*, and underwent addition, revision and some deletion. These two texts form the *Great Asketikon*. Complications are increased by the fact that different versions of the *Great Asketikon* seemingly existed in Basil's own lifetime, the result of gradual revision and editing in different locations. As a result, there survived several different recensions – Caesarean, Pontic and 'eastern' manuscripts being mentioned by a fifth- or sixth-century editor, whose revised text ('Ask. 4') forms the main basis for Garnier's edition (reprinted in the PG) and Silvas' translation, and is thus the text used here. It is probably reflective of the *Asketikon* as it stood towards the end of Basil's life. For further details, see Silvas 2005, 1–18; cf. Gribomont 1957a.

[48] Basil, *Reg. Fus.* 3.2 (PG 31.917A); compare the exhortations to community in *Reg. Fus*. 7 (928B–33C). The Latin texts of this and the previous quotation are almost identical in substance, substituting μοναστικός and omitting 'own kind' – see Rufinus, *Regula Basilii* 2.61–2 (trans. Silvas 2013, 53); cf. Silvas 2005, 172 n. 95. On ἀγάπη, see ch. 6 pp. 143–4.

[49] Rufinus, *Regula Basilii* 2.61 (trans. Silvas 2013, 53). Because Basil refraining from using πολίτικος and cognates as terms for monastic living, I disagree with Nikolaou 1981, which argues that the Church as the community of all believers replaced the πόλις for Basil.

[50] A view, as Cooper points out, seemingly shared by Aristotle himself when he discussed political animals, though Basil rejects Aristotle's political terminology – see Cooper 1990, 226.

[51] Ἀγάπη does not occur at all in the *Politics* while ἀγαπάω only appears twice, in unrelated contexts, according to my search of the TLG. A Stoic understanding of the city as held together by love may be a parallel development or even a potential influence. There the vocabulary (and bonds) is of ἔρως which encompasses

This argument from nature was tied fundamentally to a view of God as deliberately moulding human psychology, and to Basil's ethics more generally. A key element of his view of natural instinct and divine positive law was that the two were complementary.[52] It would have been unreasonable of God to command that which was contrary to human nature, given that he had created it.[53] Sociability was thus a necessary precondition for the fulfilment of the divine ordnance. 'This being so, therefore, the Lord himself, anticipating this, gave us the commandment… saying: "I give to you a fresh commandment, that you love one another [cf. John 13:35]".'[54] Fulfilment of the commandments was thus good for the soul as well as merely good by virtue of obeying God, proved by the scriptural intertwining of the commandment to love thy neighbour with the primary commandment to love God, for 'again, whoever loves his neighbour [ἀγαπῶντα δὲ πάλιν τὸν πλησίον] satisfies his love for God'.'[55] Community was also necessary for self-improvement, because neither confession nor encouragement were possible without others.[56] Although such a long analysis was reserved for the ascetic context where viable alternatives to coenobitic living were current, Basil expressed this view of sociability elsewhere. Preaching on Psalm 14 (Masoretic 15) he likewise noted that 'man is a political and gregarious animal [πολιτικὸν γὰρ ζῶον καὶ συναγελαστικὸν ὁ ἄνθρωπος]', employing a more consciously Aristotelian vocabulary.[57] The reoccurrence of the maxim, and of echoes to it in his definition of the city, suggests its broader significance.

Julian's most interesting discussion of sociability came in his programmatic *Letter to a Priest*. Laying out his vision of the Hellenic priest's activities, and contrasting it with contemporary practices, Julian emphasised his social nature: 'it is proper also to bear in mind how many words have been expended by men in the past concerning the fact that man is by nature a social animal [περὶ τοῦ φύσει κοινωνικὸν εἶναι ζῷον τὸν ἄνθρωπον]'.[58] Continuing, Julian emphasised the authority that such tradition possessed. 'And shall we, after asserting this and enjoining it, conduct ourselves antisocially towards our neighbours [ἀκοινωνήτως πρὸς τοὺς πλησίον ἔξομεν]?'[59] Like Basil, Julian derived social

---

romantic affection (unlike Christian ἀγάπη), albeit not envisaged as a passion or desire (ἐπιθυμία or πάθος). Schofield 1991, 22–56 esp. 28–35.

[52] Indeed, Kustas suggests that φύσις and λόγος were identical for Basil on the basis of *Hex. V* 10 (Amand de Mendieta and Rudberg 1997, 86), underlining the fundamental order of Creation: Kustas 1979, 241; see also Rousseau 1994, 221–2.

[53] Cf. Basil, *Reg. Fus.* 2.1–2 (PG 31.908B–13A).

[54] Basil, *Reg. Fus.* 3.1 (PG 31.917A). The Latin text is slightly different here, but retains the scriptural reference and logic behind voluntary association: Rufinus, *Regula Basilii* 2.63–4 (trans. Silvas 2013, 53). For ἀγάπη and its links with society and order, see Kustas 1979, 254–6.

[55] Basil, *Reg. Fus.* 3.2 (PG 31.917C). Identical in Rufinus, *Regula Basilii* 2.69 (trans. Silvas 2013, 54); *Regius Primus* (Paris *Bib. Nat. fonds grec* 505) gives ἀποδεχόμενον instead of ὑποδεχομένου (PG 31.917C n. 84). Cf. (thematically) *Reg. Brev.* 162–3 (PG 31.1188B–89B)).

[56] Basil, *Hom. in illud* 1 (PG 31.197C), *Reg. Fus.* 7.1 (PG 31.928C–29C). Compare the Aristotelian emphasis on language as defining human communities against animal groupings at *Pol.* 1.2.11–12 1253A (Aubonnet 1960, 14–15).

[57] Basil, *In Ps. XIV (A)* 6 (PG 29.262C).

[58] Julian, *Ad Sacer.* 292D. Cf. *Contr. Cyn.* 201C, for which see below.

[59] Julian, *Ad Sacer.* 292D.

obligations from nature, and intriguingly employed the term 'neighbour' (ὁ πλησίον) familiar from the New Testament.[60] Though this plausibly reflects his Christian upbringing, Julian did not employ the distinctly Christian vocabulary of ἀγάπη.[61] Like Basil, Julian saw social obligation as proceeding from a distinct divine plan in favour of society. Indeed, Christian ascetics' refusal to recognise the bonds of society demonstrated their inferiority. 'And there are those who pursue the wildernesses instead of the cities though man is by nature a political and civilised animal [ὄντος ἀνθρώπου φύσει πολιτικοῦ ζῴου καὶ ἡμέρου], having been given over to wicked demons and led by them into hating mankind.'[62] Like Basil stressing the 'tame' or 'civilised' (ἥμερος) nature of humans, Julian juxtaposed civility with the monks' alleged antisocial hatred (μισανθρωπία) of humans. Indeed, Julian's opposition of the desert not only to the civilised but also the 'political' (πολιτικός) element of human nature compares strikingly with the Basilian insistence that the monk's life should be 'sociable' (κοινονικός) and 'civilised' (ἥμερος).

This similarity in the works' terminology and topics is suggestive in light of their respective dates. Julian's *Letter to a Priest* is thought to have circulated in 363; Basil's *Small Asketikon* (where the discussion of the πολιτικόν ζῷον first appeared) is believed have been composed around 365–366.[63] Basil's suggestion that his asceticism fulfilled man's status as a 'civilised' and social animal directly responds to Julian's condemnation of Christian monasticism, using a similar vocabulary, and it is thus not unlikely that Basil could have been responding to Julian directly. At the very least, we know that this was a common criticism of Christian asceticism, and Basil's exhortation to ascetics to prefer the social life probably responded to such criticisms as well as to ascetics who genuinely preferred solitude.[64] Both Basil and Julian, then, viewed ascetic practice within a common, Aristotle-inflected framework, even as they adapted this framework to justify different ways of life. In Julian's critique the city was assumed to be the natural arena for the πολιτικὸς ἀνηρ, while Basil's rules contended that a κοινωνικός life could be achieved in a smaller community, which he consciously avoided terming a πόλις, by implication suggesting that the ascetic lifestyle might make the πολιτικός life of the city unnecessary.

While much of Gregory's work did assume a universal impulse to society, he was less explicitly committed to an Aristotelian framework, and rarely discussed natural sociability at length. A partial exception was in his treatment of Basil and Athanasius as monastic reformers. Of the latter,

---

[60] On Christian influence generally on Julian, see Greenwood, 2021.
[61] For hints of Julian's Christian upbringing in his work, see Greenwood 2017.
[62] Julian, *Ad Sacer.* 288B. See his comparison of Cynics to monks (see below ch. 6 pp. 128–9).
[63] Van Nuffelen 2002, 143 n. 66; Silvas 2005, 2. The *Small Asketikon* tends to be placed in these years because Basil spent a period of time preaching and answering ascetics' questions in 363–365 and it is assumed he was occupied with the *Contra Eunomium* until its publication in 364. Any earlier dating runs into Basil's relative inexperience and lack of clout as he only took up asceticism in 357.
[64] Compare Lib., *Or.* 30.8 (trans. Norman 1977, 106–8).

he remarked how cenobites 'cherish the law of love in community, and thus live both as solitaries and in community [οἱ δὲ νόμον ἀγάπης τῇ κοινωνίᾳ στέργοντες, ἐρημικοί τε ὁμοῦ καὶ μιγάδες], being dead to other men and to affairs [πράγμασι]'.[65] Employing the New Testament register of ἀγάπη, Gregory did not add natural instinct into the mix, rather emphasising charity and compassion as ways of emulating God.[66] In discussing Basil's monastics, he likewise praised the combination of sociability and contemplation Basil's regime afforded. 'He joined them as neighbours and yoked them together, so that the philosophical life might not be unsocial nor the practical life without philosophy [μήτε τὸ φιλόσοφον ἀκοινώνητον ᾖ μήτε τὸ πρακτικὸν ἀφιλόσοφον].'[67] Though not employing an Aristotelian definition, Gregory was aware of debate around proper asceticism and its relationship to society. The absence of Aristotle may also reflect an individualist strain in his thought and a preference for a more solitary, aristocratic asceticism – hence the explicit contrasts between the 'philosophical' life and the 'practical' one.[68] While Gregory did praise other leaders for embracing social action as the result of their philosophy,[69] Gregory was notable less eager to endorse social life as an arena for the philosopher's flourishing itself.[70] Nonetheless, his remarks on asceticism evince a general commitment to the importance of social life, if not theorised in the explicitly positive, Aristotelian fashion of his contemporaries.

God, Civilisation and History

Generic association was not the limit of such bonds. Part of what made humans superior to animals was their possession of reason, and it was reason that produced civilisation. Negatively, the destruction of cities and the exile of their populations was glossed as an affliction, implying a commonsense attitude toward their value. More positively Basil, consoling the poor, urged them to be attentive to the gift of intellect which God had provided, and the power to strive toward virtue which it enabled. 'And have you not discovered technical arts, and founded cities, and devised things for the production of necessities and luxuries [ὅσα ἀναγκαῖα καὶ ὅσα πρὸς τρυφὴν]?'[71] That even 'luxuries' (ὅσα πρὸς τρυφὴν) were included by Basil is perhaps surprising. So too is the avowal that the civilisation was

[65] Gregory, *Or*. 21.19 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1980, 148).
[66] Gregory, *Or*. 14.8 (PG 35.867A–B); cf. 14.11 (869C–72B), emphasising the plight of lepers and stressing how they were pitifully cast out from the society of others – see Holman 1999. *Or*. 22.3–4 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1980, 224–8) also argued that society relied on love to function in an orderly manner.
[67] Gregory, *Or*. 43.62 (Bernardi 1992, 260); thus *Or*. 21.19 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1980, 148–50).
[68] McGuckin 2001, 94–6. Cf. Sterk 2004, 126.
[69] Elm 2013.
[70] See *Or*. 4.71 (Bernardi 1983, 182–4), though note 4.73 (188) which envisages ascetics 'vying together in continence'.
[71] Basil, *Hom. in illud* 6 (PG 31.212C). Compare *Ep*. 94 on the Basileiados as 'transforming the solitudes into cities' (ch. 3 p. 69). The dubiously Basilian *Ennaratio in Isaiam Prophetam* contains a more positive endorsement of civilisation as the result of the divine gift of reason, enabling 'building, weaving, agriculture, metalworking, so that the soul compensated for what was lacking in men's bodies' (*Proem.* PG 30.128B). For discussion of the text, see above ch. 3 n. 22.

itself an occasion of thankfulness to God, when Basil elsewhere decried such civilisation as a distraction from the divine. The key was moderation – that is, such things were to be viewed as temporary and without inherent value. It was in this vein that Basil had chastised those who rejoiced in earthly status. A few lines earlier he put it thus: 'and do you glory in your fatherland and beauty of body, and in honours from all? Give heed to yourself, because you are mortal.'[72] The intellectual foundation for this position was found in one of his letters to (his fellow-bishop) Amphilochius, in which Basil glossed a number of things as being indifferent to salvation.[73] Applied to civilisation, this translated to a sense that much human achievement belonged to the sphere of things indifferent. 'Neither are the middling arts [μέσαι τέχναι] truly praiseworthy, governors, doctors, rhetors, or architects who build cities or pyramids or labyrinths or other such extravagant or excessive masses of buildings.'[74] Although here denigrating the kinds of occupations and constructions which formed such an important element in contemporary civic patriotic ideology, Basil did so with a measure of restraint: they were 'not truly praiseworthy' (οὐδὲ… τὸ ἀληθινῶς ἐπαινετὸν), but did not appear in as negative a light as some of his other denunciations.

In the *Homily on Gordius*, meanwhile, the persecution of Christianity was presented as part and parcel of the disruption of civic order: Gordius 'considered life with wild beasts to be more civilized [ἡμερώτερον] than society with idol-worshippers [τῆς πρὸς τοὺς εἰδωλολατροῦντας κοινωνίας]'.[75] In Basil's portrayal, Gordius followed the Old Testament example of Elijah by retreating to the mountain and seeking God, receiving divine illumination within a cave. Basil portrayed Elijah and Gordius as Classical ascetic philosophers, and effectively inverted the expectations of κοινωνία and the ἥμερος βίος. Meanwhile, the deleterious effects of unbelief made themselves felt in the city. Persecution was a battle against the truth and was fundamentally irrational, with the knock-on effect that civilisation was inverted. 'As a result of madness induced by the Devil everyone did not recognise each other, and a frightful night descended upon human life'.[76] Basil's utterances on civilisation were thus somewhat contradictory, and expressed a deeper tension in the Christian view of cities. Christianity was reasonable, and reason produced cities, but cities by their nature produced distractions from God.[77]

If Basil could offer on occasion a restrained endorsement of civilised life, Gregory was generally more positive. In a homily given in connection with Basil's charitable endeavours, Gregory encouraged his audience to fulfil the commandment to charity because of the gratitude they owed to

[72] Basil, *Hom. in illud* 5 (PG 31.209C–D).
[73] Basil, *Ep*. 236.7 (Courtonne 3.54).
[74] Basil, *In Ps. XXXIII* 2 (PG 29.336A).
[75] Basil, *Hom. in Gord.* 2 (PG 31.496B).
[76] Basil, *Hom in Gord* 2 (PG 31.496A). Compare his account of persecutions in *Ep.* 243.2 (Courtonne 3.69–70).
[77] For Basil's view of the reasonableness of Christianity, see *Reg. Brev.* 248 (PG 31.1248C–49A)).

God.[78] 'Who gave you rain, farming, nourishment, arts, dwellings, laws, commonwealths, civilised life, society with your kin [τέχνας, οἰκήσεις, νόμους, πολιτείας, βίον ἥμερον, οἰκείωσιν πρὸς τὸ συγγενές]… Is it not he, who now for and in exchange for these requires from you the love of your fellow man [τὸ φιλάνθρωπον]?'[79] In his poems, Gregory further elaborated on God's generosity, giving reason to men so that they might found civilised communities. 'Who gave laws to cities? And before that, who raised the cities, and revealed hitherto unseen arts? Who filled the marketplaces and houses, and the places of contest?'[80] Though all the result of human agency, God's gift of reason was ultimately the source. Likewise, 'Abraham was the father of cities and peoples [Ἀβραὰμ δὲ πατὴρ πτόλιων καὶ ἐθνῶν]', even while appearing elsewhere in Gregory's work as an otherworldly philosopher.[81]

On a more practical note, Gregory mocked Basil's retreat in Annesi, criticising its lack of amenities, the backwardness of its rustic isolation and even the quality of the food.[82] McGuckin has noted the more leisured, comfortable bent of Gregory's asceticism, which is more in keeping with aristocratic notions of *otium* and less focused on physical labour and hardship.[83] Moreover, one of his main reasons for rejecting the bishopric of Sasima thrust upon him by Basil was its obscurity. Gregory sarcastically referred to it in a letter to Basil as 'the metropolis of famous Sasima'[84] and attacked it in his autobiography as 'without water, without vegetation, completely uncivilised [οὐκ ὅλως ἐλεύθερος], an utterly cramped and dreadful little settlement'.[85] Gregory's attitude to civilisation, while sharing with Basil the ultimate view that it was morally neutral and possibly a distraction from God, thus seems somewhat more positive.

Julian also demonstrated a more straightforwardly positive attitude to civilisation. In his treatise addressed to the Cynic Heracleios, Julian went further than either Cappadocian by highlighting the direct role of the gods in guiding human development:

> But when it was the will of Zeus to bestow on all mankind in common the foundation of a new order, and to bring them from the nomadic to the most civilised mode of life [καὶ μεταβαλεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ νομαδικοῦ βίου πρὸς τὸν ἡμερώτατον], Dionysus came from India and revealed

[78] On the context and contents of this homily, see Bernardi 1968, 104–6; Holman 1999, 199–200 with bibliography; Caner 2021, 51–55.
[79] Gregory, *Or*. 14.23 (PG 35.888B).
[80] Gregory, *Carm.* 1.2.1 ll. 251–3 (PG 37.541A–42A). See also Gregory, *Carm.* 1.2.1 ll. 429–31 (PG 37.554A).
[81] Gregory, *Carm.* 1.2.1 l. 311 (PG 36.546A).
[82] Gregory, *Ep*. 4–5 (Gallay 1.3–7).
[83] McGuckin 2001, 95.
[84] Gregory, *Ep*. 48.8 (Gallay 1.63).
[85] Gregory, *Vit. sua* ll. 441–2 (White 42). See McGuckin 2001, 197–202; Elm 2012, 157.

> himself as very god made visible, going about cities and leading with him a great host of beings in some sort divine.[86]

Nomadism was connected with barbarity, in line with venerable Classical tradition,[87] although Julian seems to have allowed that 'nomadic life' (νομαδικὸς βίος) allowed some measure of community given that the peoples Dionysius visited already possessed 'cities'. The participation of 'a host of beings in some way divine' (στρατιὰν πολλὴν δαιμονίων τινῶν)' perhaps also alluded to the agency of regional gods in guiding humanity. In the *Hymn to King Helios* Julian likewise extolled the divine powers for their role in civilising humans, both indirectly through the grant of reason and directly through the institution of certain crafts and skills. 'Moreover to mankind Athena gives the blessings of wisdom and intelligence and creative arts [τὰς δημιουργικὰς τέχνας]. And surely she dwells in the acropolises of cities because, through her wisdom, she has established the political community [καταστησαμένη τὴν πολιτικὴν διὰ σοφίας κοινωνίαν].'[88] Julian thus envisaged different instances of divine intervention in the civilising process, which took place in stages and to differing degrees – certain peoples had the whole truth revealed to them, while others had different levels revealed at different times.

This civilisation reached its highest pinnacle in Rome, which had been guided by the gods to pre-eminence. First, Julian emphasised, Helios prepared the ground by the expansion of the Greek race, the Romans' kin.[89] '[Helios] civilised the greater part of the inhabited world by means of Greek colonies [οὗτος ἡμέρωσε μὲν διὰ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ἀποικιῶν τὰ πλεῖστα τῆς οἰκουμένης], and prepared it to more easily obey the Roman power.'[90] The universal monarchy of the Romans, Julian emphasised, was merited by the Romans because, unlike the members of other nations, 'our forefathers, from the time of the most divine king Numa, paid still greater reverence to this god [Helios]' than had foreigners.[91] Helios was a universal god, who had been universally acknowledged – the particular worship paid to him by the Roman people, along with the excellence of their constitution, had merited his special favour. And just as Helios had singled out Rome for special attention, so had he chosen Julian as his divine instrument. 'For he cares both for the whole human race in common and especially for my own city [ἐπιμελόμενός τε τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένους ἰδίᾳ τε τῆς ἡμετέρας πόλεως], even as also he brought into being my soul from eternity, and made it his follower.'[92] Although employing throughout the oration a language of empire which mirrored that of local civic patriotism,

---

[86] Julian, *Contr. Herac.* 221A–B. Vines were thus symbols of civilisation, and one may compare Julian's jovial epigram against beer: Julian, *Epigrams* 1.
[87] Basil, *Ep*. 74.3 (Courtonne 1.175), *In Ps. VII* 5 (PG 29.240C–D). See Shaw 1982.
[88] Julian, *In Sol*. 150A–B. See also *Ad Sacer.* 289D, disparaging the Hebrew God's only having taught humans how to make coats of skin (Genesis 3:21). Compare *Contra Cyn.* 183C–D.
[89] 'I myself recognise that [Rome] is Greek in its descent and constitution [Ἑλληνίδα γένος τε καὶ πολιτείαν]': Julian, *In Sol.* 153A.
[90] Julian, *In Sol*. 152D.
[91] Julian, *In Sol*. 155D. Julian nonetheless held that non-Romans had recognised Helios' importance in the form of Sun-worship (*In Sol.* 155B–C).
[92] Julian, *In Sol*. 157A.

Julian's focus on the 'inhabited world' (οἰκουμένη) and cosmic frame of reference indicates the universal bent of his account.

Perhaps inevitably, Julian's embrace of Roman identity was stronger than either of his Greek compatriots. Basil, notably, seems to have been fairly indifferent to the Roman Empire as a source of identity or moral obligation.[93] Gregory showed greater allegiance to and interest in Rome, as Susanna Elm outlines.[94] However, this seems to have come most to the fore in opposition to Julian. The anti-Julianic *Orations* 4 and 5 are generally the most concerned with the Roman Empire when compared to the rest of his work. The lengthy and programmatic *Oration* 2, a treatise on Christian and particularly clerical leadership, does not contain a single non-scriptural reference to Rome or Romans or even to the οἰκουμένη, often a synonym for the Empire. Nonetheless, Gregory's anti-Julianic orations did explicitly connect the good of the Empire with correct philosophy and religion. Thus Constantius saw that 'the interests of the Romans flourished together with those of the Christians, and that their rule came in together with the presence of Christ [καὶ συνεισῆλθε τῇ ἐπιδημίᾳ Χριστοῦ τὸ κράτος]'.[95] By linking Christ's advent with that of Rome (a common apologetic observation), Gregory brought Rome into a narrative of the upward development of human history.[96] In this vision, human history represented an improvement from the collapse occasioned by the Fall, as part of the progressive redemption of humanity.[97] Different stages of human intellectual and historical development required different levels of Revelation, Gregory emphasised, Christ only coming when the world was prepared for the final truth.[98] By contrast, Julian's attacks on the Christians were bad for Rome – 'the attempt… was nothing other than to shake about the Roman Empire and to endanger the whole common good [τῷ κοινῷ παντὶ κινδυνεύειν]'.[99]

Gregory was thus often content to endorse a vision of Rome as the highest stage in an ongoing process of cosmic historical development. However, he differed substantially from Julian in his attitude towards what had come before it. The avowedly teleological bent in Julian's thought regarding Rome was moderated by a greater desire to stress continuities with the past, and the constant and consistent policy of the gods through time.[100] Julian argued in favour of the creation narrative of the *Timaeus* compared to that of Genesis 1–2, 'as it seems that if we were descended from one man and one woman

---

[93] Fedwick 1978, 39.
[94] The general argument of Elm 2012b; before her, see Dvornik 1966, 684–5.
[95] Gregory, *Or*. 4.37 (Bernardi 1983, 136).
[96] See Eus., *Hist. eccl.* 1.2.22–3 (Bardy 1986, 11–12). This distinctive attitude towards the direction of time, and the re-conceptualisation of the moral valence of the past, is highlighted in Markus 1990.
[97] Gregory, *Or*. 2.22–5 (Bernardi 1978, 118–24), 31.25 (Gallay and Jourjon 1978, 322–4). Contrast however *Or*. 38.12–13 (Moreschini and Gallay 1990, 126–34), which suggests rather that Christ's coming was occasioned by the failure of previous warnings and the growing sinfulness of humans.
[98] Gregory, *Poem. arcana* 3 409A–410A (Moreschini and Sykes 1997, 10–12).
[99] Gregory, *Or*. 4.74 (Bernardi 1983, 192). Cf. *Or*. 4.109 (264), 5.41 (Bernardi 1983, 380).
[100] Julian, *Contr. Gal.* 143C.

it is not likely that our laws diverge so greatly'.[101] Expanding on this line of argument, Julian maintained that there was no way in which one could dismiss the varying customs of the many different peoples of the world as mere superstition, because such an argument would amount to a denial of the divine guidance of history – or positing the divinity's indifference to the vast majority of humans, past and present.[102] Such a point was pressed extensively in his polemical *Against the Galilaeans*.[103] God in the Christian account 'watched for countless years (or, if you prefer, thousands of years) while men in this ignorance [of Him] worshipped what you call idols, from where the sun rises to where it sets and from the Arctic regions to the south.'[104] Save, of course, 'from a small people who for less than two thousand years dwelt in one part of Palestine'.[105] Upholding the wisdom of Divine Providence necessitated, in Julian's eyes, a support for local and particular religious traditions.

Julian's argument was further enhanced by an emphasis on the particular and enduring characteristics of individual peoples. Espousing the principle that 'lawmakers have succeeded in adding little through guidance to the natures and customs' of peoples,[106] he gave various examples of such diversity even within the empire (Greeks and Romans being 'political' and humane, Celts and Germans fierce).[107] 'Where, therefore', asked Julian, 'did this difference between the peoples in customs and laws come from?'[108] Scoffing at the notion that the Tower of Babel provided an adequate historical account, Julian looked elsewhere.[109] Diversity between the nations could be linked to a diversity of 'gods and kindly patrons' appointed by the supreme being,[110] with climate and land as other influences.[111] Thus for every people there was 'a certain national ruler, a god [ἐθνάρχης τις θεός] who administers, and under him an angel and a *daimon* and a hero and a particular race of spirits'.[112] Julian even argued from

---

[101] Julian, *Ad Sacer.* 292C, compare *Contr. Gal.* 49B. On Julian's account of creation, see Opsomer 2008.
[102] On Julian's historical-religious polemic in the broader context of his historical thought, see Kaegi 1964, 32.
[103] This has like the *Ad Sacer.* been dated to his stay in Antioch in summer 362–spring 363 – thus Elm 2012, 321 with bibliography. On the *Contr. Gal.*, see R. B. E. Smith 1995, 189–207; Robert 2008; Riedweg 2020; and papers in Huber-Rebenich and Rebenich 2019.
[104] Julian, *Contr. Gal.* 106D. Cf. *Contr. Gal.* 99E, 106B, and compare Sallustius' remarks concerning Divine Providence at *De Deis et Mundo* 9.7–8 (Rochefort 1960, 14–15). On Julian's relationship with Sallustius, see Rochefort 1956.
[105] Julian, *Contr. Gal.* 106D.
[106] Julian, *Contr. Gal.* 131C, cf. Julian, *Misop.* 348B–49A. For the permanence of ethnic characteristics, see also Porphyry as reported in Macarius, *Apocriticus* 4.24 (Volp 2013, 404–6) with Johnson 2013, 189–220, esp. 195–204.
[107] Julian, *Contr. Gal.* 116A, cf. 138B.
[108] Julian, *Contr. Gal.* 131D.
[109] For Babel being used to supply an explanation of diversity, see Origen, *Contr. Cels.* 5.30–2 (Borret 1969, 88–96) (= *Philocalia* 22.7–11) – for a general account of Origen's views on ethnic difference and salvation, see den Dulk 2020, albeit rather unhelpfully analysed in terms of his 'racism'. Though Basil and Gregory were probably aware of the Babel argument they did not employ it.
[110] Julian, *Contr. Gal.* 141C, cf. Iamblichus, *De mysteriis* 5.25 (Saffrey, Segonds and Lecerf 2013, 175–6). See Rosen 2006, 306.
[111] Julian, *Contr. Gal.* 143D–E, cf. 115D–E.
[112] Julian, *Contr. Gal.* 143A–B, 148B–C, 290B–C. Cf. *Ep. ad Them.* 258B–D, *In Sol.* 141B–D, 145C–D. For multiple gods in Porphyry, see also Macarius, *Apocriticus* 4.20 (Volp 2013, 394); for the Iamblichean precedent for Julian's views, see Shaw 1995, 134.

the plural subjunctive 'let us go down' of Genesis 11:7 that the God of Moses had been accompanied by other deities when he went to confound the tongues at Babel, indicating that the Hebrew tradition itself supported polytheism.[113] Moreover, Julian pointed to the relative fates and wisdom of the various nations to assert the superiority of the polytheistic model. Babylonians, Phoenicians and Egyptians alongside Greeks and Romans were all sources of philosophical wisdom, proving God's consideration for all nations,[114] though, Rome retained a special place in this scheme.[115] The glories of Greece and Rome themselves proved the truth of their divinities, when compared to the fate of the Hebrews, who were frequently 'enslaved to foreign races [τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις δουλεύοντες]' and only 'occupied their own land [ᾤκησαν γοῦν τὴν ἑαυτῶν] and tilled it for a little over three hundred years' before being exiled to Babylon and subsequently being again enslaved to other peoples.[116] That the Israelites had 'served as slaves' (δουλεύοντες) and not even been able to dwell freely in their own country proved to Julian the inferiority of their religion, closely demonstrating the tie between political success, public piety and the defence of one's homeland.

This view of separate national gods does not seem to have been maintained uniformly. In the *Hymn to King Helios* Julian explained that Apollo was responsible for guiding civilisation, preferring there to assimilate foreign gods to the Greco-Roman hierarchy.[117] Throughout his corpus, the superiority of Greco-Roman notions of divinity is assumed, not least in his view that Rome's success must have been due to its greater piety having merited divine favour. Nonetheless, Julian argued in both the *Hymn* and *Against the Galilaeans* that divine wisdom and guidance had been available in some form, from some configuration of gods, to all peoples. And contrasting sharply with Gregory's condemnation of pagans as 'slaves to ancestral law and the irrationality of desire rather than to reason',[118] Julian's argument for the normativity of various and ancient rites was predicated precisely upon the validity of customs founded by 'our fathers', with the excellence of those customs in turn showing their divine origin.[119] Julian had earlier insisted in his *Hymn to the Mother of the Gods* that the miraculous account of the entry of Cybele into Rome was to be relied upon for similar reasons: 'I rather

---

[113] Julian, *Contr. Gal.* 148A. See his elaboration at 290B–C, 290E.
[114] Julian, *Contr. Gal.* 176A–B. For the Hellenistic and Imperial background to this ecumenical view of philosophy and religion, see Van Nuffelen 2011. Porphyry and Iamblichus seem to have been more committed in practice than Julian to the value of these traditions, the former sometimes actively critical of the Greeks' belief: Johnson 2013, 243–57.
[115] Julian, *Contr. Gal.* 193C–D, 194B.
[116] Julian, *Contr. Gal.* 209E–10A; compare *Ep.* 47 433A–B (*Ep.* 111 Bidez-Cumont).
[117] Julian, *In Sol.* 152D–53A, 150A–D. For the debate over how to identify foreign gods as ontologically separate entities versus as aspects of the gods known at Rome (*interpretatio Romana*), see Ando 2008, 43–58, esp. 57.
[118] *Or.* 7.16 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 220).
[119] Julian, *Ad Sacer.* 293A, cf. 302B, *Ep*. 20 453B–C (*Ep.* 89a Bidez-Cumont) which may have been originally part of the former; see also *Misop.* 357D. One may contrast his repeated attacks on the Christians as having deserted the ancestral customs of both Jews and Greeks – *Contr. Gal.* 43A, 238D, *Contr. Herac.* 228B–C.

trust the traditions of cities than those over-ingenious people'.[120] This respect for tradition, belief in enduring ethnic characteristics, and affirmation of the universal benevolence of the divinity to all peoples were core elements in Julian's polemic. All told in favour of a fundamentally localist conception of religion and city.

By contrast, Basil and Gregory's cosmology contained little scope for such regional specificity of belief. Gregory did remark on different climes possessing guardian angels, 'overseeing all men and cities and peoples' whose counterparts were the fallen angels of Lucifer,[121] while an excerpt from Origen's *Against Celsus* included in the *Philocalia* advanced the view that angels guided the human race after the collapse of Babel, although their function was the punishment of human hubris according to the particular characteristics of the peoples involved.[122] Yet while agreeing that spirits did intervene in human history, Basil and Gregory viewed their agency generally in negative terms. Julian himself observed this wider Christian tendency, when he mocked those Christians who believed that Classical authors had been inspired by Satan, despite the fact that they encouraged virtue.[123] Conversely, Gregory characterised Julian as misled by demons or even a demon himself.[124] For Basil and Gregory, the Devil and his agents inspired heretics and apostates to sin,[125] afflicted the righteous with physical and mental ailments,[126] and deceived pagans into worshipping idols.[127] This agency could thus be turned to allow an alternative account of history, one which undermined the normative value of traditions in religion, with knock-on effects for ideas of loyalty to the ancestral city. In his *Hexaemeron*, Basil expounded the creation of the heavenly lights as signs, casting himself as guide to the city of the stars. 'Indeed therefore, just as people unused to cities, being taken by the hand, are guided about, I myself will guide you strangers to the hidden wonders of this great city.'[128] Continuing, Basil detailed how the misery of man's present condition could be traced directly to satanic agency. 'In this city is our ancient fatherland [τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, ἐν ᾗ ἡ ἀρχαία πατρὶς ἡμῶν], that country from which the man-murdering

---

[120] Julian, *In Matr. D.* 161B, compare emphasis on civic religious tradition in *Misop.* 346C. On this text, see Liebeschuetz 2012; Tougher 2020. Compare however *Contra Cyn.* 195C–97A.
[121] Gregory, *Poem. arcana* 4 440A (Moreschini and Sykes 1997, 28). See Rousse 1965.
[122] Origen, *Contr. Cels.* 5.29–32 (Borret 1969, 84–96) (= *Philocalia* 22.9 (Robinson 1893, 184–5)).
[123] Julian, *Contr. Gal.* 230A. Wicked spirits did exist in Julian's schema (see *Ad Sacer.* 288B), though they played a less significant role than in his Christian counterparts. Within Neoplatonic theology more broadly the morality of demons was the occasion of some dispute, and linked to questions about the propriety of sacrifice. See Alt 2005; Martin 2007, 187–206; Rives 2011, 189, 195–6; Johnson 2013, 83–100.
[124] See, for example, Gregory, *Or.* 4.49 (Bernardi 1983, 152), 4.55–8 (158–64), 4.74 (190–2), 4.77 (196–8), *Carm.* 1.2.1 ll. 457–8 (PG 37.556A–57A).
[125] Basil, *Reg. Brev.* 75 (PG 31.1133D–36C).
[126] Gregory, *Or.* 6.13 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 156), 4.104 (Bernardi 1983, 254), 39.7 (Moreschini and Gallay 1990, 160–2), and *Carm.* 2.1.54–61 generally (PG 37.1397A–1404A), Basil, *Ep.* 5.1 (Courtonne 1.17). For an overview of the place of demons in Cappadocian theology, see Ludlow 2012; cf. Kalleres 2007. More generally on demons, Brakke 2006; Kalleres 2015; Elm and Hartman 2020.
[127] See Gregory, *Or.* 38.6 (Moreschini and Gallay 1990, 112–14), *Poem. Arcana* 8 458A (Moreschini and Sykes 1997, 42).
[128] Basil, *Hex. VI* 1 (Mendieta and Rudberg 1997, 88). The notion of the κόσμος as a city was a Stoic concept, albeit first attested in Philo – see Runia 2000.

demon removed us, selling man into slavery with his lures.'[129] Explicitly attacking the argument for the supervision of a variety of differing spirits, Gregory argued for the superiority of monarchy, contrasting it with the 'Babel' which ensued from a system of regional gods. 'Having many rulers seems to me to be entirely equal to a warring anarchy [ἶσον γὰρ πολύαρχον ἐμοὶ καὶ πάμπαν ἄναρχον μαρνάμενον]'.[130] Endorsing such a vision, Gregory maintained, necessarily entailed moral relativism because various peoples disagreed over moral issues, a position incompatible with the notion of a single truth and a supreme divinity.[131] While agreeing with Julian that 'philosophy is one and truth is one', Gregory and his Christian counterparts chose to stress oneness in the present rather than over time - a preference for synchronic rather than diachronic unity.[132]

This revaluation of history meshed with the doctrine of the Fall and the need for the radical divine interventions of Incarnation and Crucifixion. If history did represent an upward movement toward Christian revelation, then it relegated customs and institutions based on traditional and regionally specific justifications. If the reverse was true, and human history represented a downward movement from the Fall reversed by the coming of Christ, then Classical religion stood equally condemned.[133] What both concepts had in common, however, was a firm denial that the customs of previous ages had inherent worth. They were at best misguided traditions that needed to be filleted and replaced, and at worst the deliberate snares of evil powers. These differences, I suggest, reflected fundamental issues of theodicy created by changes in society in the fourth century. Fourth-century thinkers sought to defend the Classical heritage of πόλις and πατρίς that were embedded in the *paideia* with which they were brought up, but also to explain the increasingly unified and uniform character of the Empire they inhabited. (Substantial diversity continued to exist, naturally, but the relative change still impressed contemporaries.) Put bluntly, the type of divine order they espoused reflected the clash between these imperatives. If one posited a multitude of regionally distinct gods one preserved the πόλις and tradition at the cost finding it harder to account for why the divinely-guarded οἰκουμένη was now organised under an aspirant universalist autocracy, or why Greek or Roman customs and beliefs were superior to the varied practices of their subjects and enemies. Exclusive monotheists faced the opposite problem: accounting for why Providence ignored or damned the vast majority of humanity,

---

[129] Basil, *Hex. VI* 1 (Mendieta and Rudberg 1997, 88). Compare Basil, *Hom. in Lac.* (PG 31.1456A), Gregory, *Poem. Arcana* 6 443A–46A (Moreschini and Sykes 1997, 30–2); 7 (455A) (38–40); 8 (457A) (42).
[130] Gregory, *Poem. Arcana* 3 414A (Moreschini and Sykes 1997, 14). Anarchy condemned in *Vit. sua* l. 1744 (White 138), *Or*. 32.4 (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 88–92). For the importance of monarchy for Gregory, see ch. 2 pp. 56–7.
[131] Gregory, *Or*. 4.119–20 (Bernardi 1983, 284–6), 14.29 (PG 31.896D–97A).
[132] Julian, *Contr. Cyn.* 185C. For an observation of this fundamental problem of how to understand the divine and the divine purpose, see Momigliano 1986.
[133] In addition to Gregory himself at *Or*. 38.12–13 (Moreschini and Gallay 1990, 126–34), thus Gregory of Nyssa's view in the *Oratio Catechetica* 29; cf. *De tridua inter mortem et resurrectionem Domini nostri Iesu Christi* 608 M. (Heil, Van Heck, Gebhardt and Spira 1967, 282–3).

and how the beliefs and customs of the ancients could be good if they had lacked divine guidance.[134] Both sides naturally sought to play down the disadvantages of their particular solution to this inconsistency or propose accounts which integrated or negated it in various ways. In any case, this division had substantial implications for civic patriotism, because the path one preferred had strong implications for one's account of human nature, ethnic difference, the value of tradition, and local identity. If humans were by nature fundamentally divided by custom and habit, if they stubbornly inherited these differences in defiance of the prescriptions of lawmakers, if they had a moral duty to respect the beliefs and customs of their ancestors simply for ancestral piety's sake as well as due to divine sanction, then these principles all told in favour of a more localist, fragmented view of moral obligation and social identity.

A comparative analysis of Julian, Basil and Gregory reveals several important commonalities in their attitudes towards civilisation – a key component in any ideology of city-focused patriotic loyalty. All three had reservations, although all ultimately endorsed sociability and (in particular) civilised sociability. Nonetheless, there were substantial differences in enthusiasm. Julian and Basil both embraced an Aristotelian justification of the need for society, the latter giving it soteriological significance. Gregory, by contrast, was more limited in his endorsement of its benefits. Yet he shared a more teleological account of Rome and civilisation with Julian compared to Basil, whose enthusiasm was somewhat lukewarm, and whose model of asceticism less overtly philosophical. Yet the positive analysis of history that Julian offered was not reflected by Basil and Gregory's insistence on the agency of demons and the supersession of false pagan customs. That reluctance towards tradition formed part of an embrace of a more comprehensive and exclusive notion of religious truth – reflecting further the anti-localist trends within Christianity more broadly. Arguably, this made Basil and Gregory's arguments for radical reform more effective. As Limberis observes, Julian's rhetorical support for the customs of the past conflicted with his desire to reform those he encountered in the present along philosophical lines, though it appealed to the conservative instincts of a society with a high degree of respect for tradition and for the heritage of the πατρίς.[135] Despite these trends, however, these πατρίς loyalties proved too significant to ignore. The ground was thus prepared for the elaboration of competing religious visions of civic patriotism.

[134] For this reason I disagree with Martin's argument that late Antiquity saw the retreat of the philosophical assumption of an 'optimal world' if applied to the universe and divine activity as a whole – Martin 2007, 226–43. Rather, disagreement between Iamblichean and Christian theologians occurred precisely because both parties believed in divine omni-benevolence and the goodness of the world. For this assumption, see, for example, Ludlow 2012, 186.

[135] Limberis 2000, 386. For the importance of tradition as a guarantor of doctrinal orthodoxy for Basil, see Rousseau 1994, 117–25, 275–6.

Part Three – Religious Civic Patriotism

'Because of the foolishness of the Galilaeans almost everything has been overturned, but through the favour of the gods we are all saved. Because of this fact it is necessary to honour the gods and the men and cities who respect them.'[1] Julian's trenchant statement to Atarbius, governor of Euphratensis, was emblematic of his reign.[2] Cities that embraced Julian's restoration of the worship of the gods were to be favoured; those that resisted were to be punished.[3] In this latter category stood Cappadocian Caesarea, – a city which was demoted by Julian shortly after his accession after a local riot destroyed the sanctuary of the city's Tyche.[4] Along with the machinery of imperial government, Julian sought to invoke his subjects' localist civic identity to this purpose – to convince them that they should 'return' to his vision of traditional religion to preserve their cities. Scholars have sometimes seen this embrace of local identity as outmoded, linking old-fashioned governance with traditional cultic observance.[5] Yet as I have argued civic patriotism remained a powerful, if contested, element of political discourse in the fourth century. Some cities took up Julian's invitations with relish, although many did not.[6] Julian's invocation of civic patriotic language was therefore not an anachronism, but a considered and carefully calibrated attempt to tap into strong feelings of local loyalty and to channel them into support for his religious reforms.

Julian was not alone in seeking to tie together religious change and civic identity.[7] Basil and Gregory, despite their strong criticisms highlighted in the previous two chapters, saw merit in adopting civic patriotic postures when it helped them push for religious reforms, elaborating a version of Christianity that would sit well with local elites' civic patriotic impulses.[8] By invoking the Bible and contemporary theology to enjoin local loyalty, both were able to produce rationales for civic patriotism in specifically Christian terms. I suggest that all three figures used civic interests to justify particular beliefs and practices. Likewise, all three sought to link civic identity and religious conformity, to expel religious 'others', and to redirect elite spending. All three also attempted to

---

[1] Julian, *Ep.* 37 376C–B (*Ep.* 83 Bidez-Cumont).
[2] PLRE 1.120 (Atarbius).
[3] Teitler 2017, 68–9; compare Constantine's policy as described in Lenski 2016, 18–22; cf. Bransbourg 2009, 30–2.
[4] The episode does not appear in Basil or Julian's works (save a possible allusion in Julian, *Ep.* 35 375C (*Ep.* 78 Bidez-Cumont)) though it is remarked on in Gregory, *Or.* 4.92 (Bernardi 1983, 232). *Or*. 18.34 (PG 31.1029B–31A) seems to discuss a separate but related incident. There is a somewhat more strident account in Soz. 5.4.1 (Bidez and Hansen 1995, 196–7) and the incident is invoked at Lib., *Or.* 16.14 (trans. Norman 1969, 218). Van Dam 2002, 99–100, 173–5 is useful although does not fully explore the contrasts between the accounts of Sozomen and Gregory.
[5] See Introduction n. 44.
[6] Athanassiadi 1981, 111; Van Dam 2007, 200–206.
[7] Part of his attempts to tie culture more generally to pagan religion: see, for example, Downey 1959.
[8] More generally, see Falcasantos 2020, 181.

persuade elites, both priestly and secular, of the religious dimensions of localism and the local prestige of spiritual duty. Nonetheless, this language was not sufficient to achieve what either Julian or the Cappadocians desired, and could thus be ignored or denied when it was inconvenient. Indeed, as reformers they may have sought to persuade people that local identity was closely tied to religion, but this does not mean that they succeeded. Rather, the urgency and combativeness of their language, as well as the survival of a religiously neutral patriotic idiom, may indicate that many people ignored the prescriptions of their religious leaders.[9]

This spiritualised civic patriotism, I argue, forms a third and distinctive way of approaching civic patriotism. Basil, Gregory and Julian all sought to tap into patriotic loyalties in order to promote religious change, despite potential inconsistencies with other elements of their philosophical beliefs. This spiritualised civic patriotism was not a new invention. In the pre-Constantinian era it had been taken for granted that religious observance and local loyalty were tightly linked, and even early Constantinian proclamations of universal toleration for all varieties of theism had been accompanied by condemnations of public sacrifice, closures of temples and the confiscation of their lands, and explicit state support for the Christian Church and Christian cities in disputes with their neighbours.[10] But Julian's reassertion of the link between πόλις and piety was a radical step in the context of the Constantinian religious detente. It prompted, in turn, his Christian counterparts to develop and theorise a civic patriotic response which became deeply influential for later justifications of saint cults, new forms of patronage and the civic leadership roles of elite and clergy.[11] All three, therefore, performed functions like those of Quentin Skinner's 'innovating ideologists'. Religious civic patriotism did not completely replace secular civic patriotism, nor neutralise entirely the universalist attack on it. Particularly in the Christian case, tensions remained unresolved. This situation may paradoxically have actually strengthened Basil and Gregory's rhetorical position. Leaving civic patriotic and universalist ascetic languages unreconciled enabled both men to apply them to differing degrees when dealing with different interest groups, maximising their potential social advantage. As a result, spiritualised civic patriotism would never completely eclipse the other two languages, even as it emerged as a powerful force in its own right.

[9] Sandwell 2007; Rebillard 2012.
[10] The severity of the Constantinians' prohibition of sacrifice is disputed: Barnes 1989, 210, 246; Barnes 2011, 109–11 argues for a complete suppression of sacrifice under Constantine though others have preferred to read the laws as primarily rhetorical or persecution as intensifying under his successors – see Bradbury 1994; Drake 2000; Watts 2015, 86–8; Lenski 2016, 231–4.
[11] For the subsequent impact of this marriage of civic patriotism and Christian spirituality in the eastern context, see Saradi 2006, 102–17.

Chapter Five – Civic Identity and Religious Practice

The Civic Aspects of Collective Devotion

Civic identity in the ancient world was thought to arise from a place's history, its divinities, its natural and man-made topography, its institutions, and its inhabitants and their customs.[1] For Basil, Julian and Gregory, however, all of these considerations were subordinate to piety, and were only relevant insofar as they displayed proper consideration for the divine. Civic history was interpreted and rewritten with these considerations in mind.[2] As with Part II, many of these efforts were aimed at a broad section of the public: imperial letters to cities would have been circulated more widely or even posted publicly whilst orations and sermons naturally addressed broader audiences. This makes sense: Basil, Julian and Gregory sought to remodel collective identity, which change required broad social support. It was in this vein that Julian wrote to cities individually, encouraging them to support his policies.[3] A notable instance of this tailored, city-by-city policy was in his letter to Alexandria. A riot at the start of Julian's reign had killed Constantius' choice of bishop (and replacement for Athanasius), George of Cappadocia.[4] Although Julian scolded the Alexandrians for taking the law into their own hands so savagely, he made it quite clear that George had deserved their wrath. Crucially, he also refrained from any kind of concrete legal punishment in cases of pagan mob violence, such as those at Gaza, Ancyra, Hieropolis and Caesarea – contrasting with his punitive action against Christians involved in disorder at Edessa, Antioch, Phrygian Misos and Caesarea.[5] His letter thus marked out an ambiguous position, simultaneously condemning and justifying pagan violence against egregious Christian activity.[6] In his opening chastisement, Julian invoked at once the ties of lineage and ancestry to the founder of the city, piety towards the gods, and affection for 'the welfare of your community' (τοῦ κοινοῦ ὑμᾶς): 'if you do not revere the memory of Alexander, your founder [τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν οἰκιστὴν ὑμῶν], and yet more than him the great, the most holy god Serapis [τὸν θεὸν τὸν μέγαν τὸν ἁγιώτατον Σάραπιν], how did no thought come to you of the welfare

[1] Thus the template for an urban panegyric in Men. Rhet., 344–367 (Russell & Wilson 1981, 29–75). For a discussion of urban identity from an anthropological perspective, see Lalli 1992.
[2] Van Dam 2003a, 88–97; Busine 2014; Busine 2015.
[3] See Lib., *Or.* 18.129 (trans. Norman 1969, 362), Soz. 5.3.4 (Bidez and Hansen 1995, 195).
[4] Julian, *Ep.* 21 378C–80D (*Ep.* 60 Bidez-Cumont). George had been Julian's guardian while Julian was housed at the imperial residence of Macellum in Cappadocia during his teens, and Julian seems to have disliked him. For George's biography and time in Alexandria, see Barnes 1993, 119–20, 123–5, 155. On religious violence in late Antiquity more generally, see Gaddis 2005; Sizgorich 2008; papers in Parts III and IV of Drake 2009; Shaw 2011; Kalleres 2015.
[5] See Julian, *Ep.* 40 424C–25A (*Ep.* 115 Bidez-Cumont), Soz. 5.11 (Bidez and Hansen 1995, 208–10), Gregory, *Or.* 4.90 (Bernardi 1983, 226–8), 93 (232–4), Lenski 2016, 243–4 (noting that Julian was following Constantinian precedent here). Hans Teitler, who eschews the label of 'persecution' for Julian's actions, acknowledges that Julian's failure to punish the rioters encouraged other pagans to 'settle accounts': Teitler 2017, 40; compare Bowersock 1978, 91.
[6] See Mayer 2020.

of your community, of humanity, of what was right?'[7] Pious and civic interests were complementary, along with 'what was right' (τὰ πρέποντα) and 'humanity' (τὸ ἀνθρώπινον). As the specific use of the second person indicates, Julian's remark was intended to stir particularist and local associations in the minds of his audience, rather than to invoke concerns for civilised behaviour generically. By this, Julian attempted to equate civic patriotism with honouring of the gods, which in the religiously divided city of Alexandria meant essentially ignoring or excluding its Christian and Jewish populace.

When discussing the misdeeds of Bishop George, Julian also shifted the issue from George's offences against the city to his offences against its gods. Julian castigated the bishop as one of those 'who esteem the gods lightly and regard as nothing such cities as yours and flourishing peoples', again stressing the immediacy of these concerns to the Alexandrians.[8] George's impiety was linked with his disrespect for Alexandria, which Julian encouraged the Alexandrians to consider as counter to their patriotic instinct. Julian invited the Alexandrians to see themselves in his terms: pagan patriots who had gone too far in their zeal for their gods. We should thus see this text as an attempt by Julian to promote publicly a particular narrative of events, which set out to present a positive version of mob violence by casting the Alexandrians as a united pagan citizen body intent on resisting Christian violence and impurity.[9] This narrative was potentially appealing for both sides. For the Alexandrians, it offered the reassurance of imperial sanction (or at least forgiveness). For Julian, it allowed him to avoid punishing the city's leading men for disorder, which would sour his relations with the city at a crucial early stage in his rule. Though Julian hardly invented pagan animosity towards George, there were other Christian groups who disliked the bishop and possibly participated in violence against him, not least the partisans of Athanasius.[10] Moreover, temples might be valued on aesthetic and cultural grounds, or simply out of respect for due process.[11] Julian's account, therefore, must be read as a political intervention and not simply as a factual recounting of events. the emperor thus redefined the political language of πόλις and πατρίς, making it the pagan property of a pagan δῆμος.

Yet Julian's attempt at redefinition failed. In a subsequent missive he castigated the Alexandrians for failing to uphold the religious norms of their ancestors by deserting traditional beliefs and requesting the return of the bishop Athanasius, whose exile Julian confirmed in response.[12]

---

[7] Julian, *Ep.* 21 378C–D (*Ep.* 60 Bidez-Cumont).
[8] Julian, *Ep.* 21 379D (*Ep.* 60 Bidez-Cumont).
[9] Compare *Misop.* 348B–D and 357C where Julian acknowledged the Antiochenes' opposition to him, but isolated it as unusual by contrasting it with other cities and peoples which had better morals and conformed to his own way of thinking.
[10] Thus Amm. Marc. 22.11 (Seyfarth, Jacob-Karau, Ulmann 1978, 275–7), Philostorgius 7.2 (Bidez and Winkelmann 1981, 77), see, in response, Socr. 3.2–3 (Hansen 1995, 193–6), Soz. 5.7.7–9 (Bidez and Hansen 1995, 202–203). For comment, see Barnes 1993, 155, though I differ here in viewing Julian's reference to rioters as pagan as deliberate.
[11] Vaes 1990; Schuddeboom 2017.
[12] Julian, *Ep.* 47 435A–D (*Ep.* 111 Bidez-Cumont).

In another episode Julian removed an obelisk from the city, which he viewed as a pagan sacred artefact that was being disrespected by local religious practice. 'For men who see those persons sleeping there, with so much filth and licentious behaviour as occurs in that place, that they believe that it is not sacred and (by the superstition of those who devote themselves to it) become more sceptical of the gods.'[13] As discussed in Chapter One, Julian here revived a policy of Constantius in moving the monument to Constantinople, but framed it as part of a programme of pagan reform. The perception among many Christians was that Constantinople had been founded as a Christian city, free from idolatry, a view of which Julian was very aware.[14] Though the reality was probably more complicated, with the city containing substantial non-Christian minorities and equipped with the full panoply of Roman buildings together with their sacred associations, the point was that Christian apologists *perceived* it to be such a Christian capital. By moving the obelisk, Julian concretely undermined the triumphalist Eusebian narrative of a new Christian capital. He also punished Alexandria for its impiety, and recast the direction of dynastic history by making the city of birth and his dynasty's greatest achievement a showcase for his pagan revival.[15]

Yet Julian's measure it also meant overriding local religious practice in favour of his own concept of proper worship, undermining his own image as a champion of traditional piety. One might compare his disparaging attitude towards the Antiochenes' celebration of the Maiouma as riotous and unchaste.[16] Though Alexandria retained a boisterous pagan community for many subsequent generations, this seemingly had little to do with Julian's own actions. As emperor, Julian possessed immense normative power to define the terms of civic political discussion – but ultimately it was a discussion, and his own views would not automatically command assent.

Intriguingly, Gregory himself attempted to redefine civic patriotism in Christian terms in his orations given while bishop of Constantinople. Like Julian, Gregory sought to claim the city for Christianity, glossing over potentially troubling pagan, Jewish or unorthodox elements in its heritage and population.[17] In his *Farewell Oration*, Gregory addressed his congregation at Constantinople for

---

[13] Julian, *Ep.* 48 443C (*Ep.* 59 Bidez-Cumont). Julian also referred to the obelisk as an ἀνάθεμα, a term denoting a votive offering set up in a temple (443B). Wright 153 n. 3 interprets this as referring to Christians practising incubation but from Julian's language this seems unlikely.

[14] Eus., *VC* 3.48.2 (Winkelmann 1975, 104)). For Julian's considered reaction to Christian claims such as those concerning the rebuilding of the Temple see Greenwood 2017; on his pagan building programme in Constantinople, see idem 2021, 95–9; compare Dagron 1974, 90 who expresses scepticism of the testimony concerning Julian's building activities. See also Falcasantos 2020, 46–73, who argues that the city's traditional temples, and Constantine's statues and temple to the city's *Tyche* and other public buildings would have given the city a pagan character; compare Lenski and Ramskold 2012, 44–5.

[15] See Julian's portrayal of himself as called to rectify the sins of his relatives in *Caes.* 335D–36C (on its religious function, see Pack 1946) and the long mythical account in *Contr. Herac.* 227C–34C on which, see Nesselrath 2008; more broadly on Julian's attitude to his dynasty, see Greenwood 2021, 37–40. Compare too Himerius' praise of Julian as introducing new religious rites to Constantinople in *Or.* 41.8 (Colonna 1951, 172).

[16] Julian, *Misop.* 362D, cf. Lib., *Or.* 50.11 (trans. Norman 1977, 68).

[17] See Falcasantos 2020, 46–73.

the last time,[18] after he had been effectively forced from his seat at the Council of Constantinople in 381.[19] After praising the various elements of his congregation (widows, poor, matrons, virgin, choristers, and so on) Gregory bade farewell to the 'mighty and Christ-loving city [μεγαλόπολι καὶ φιλόχριστε]' with a series of short, sharp rhetorical admonitions to 'approach the truth; be converted at this late hour; honour God more than you have been accustomed [τιμήσατε Θεὸν, πλέον τῆς συνηθείας]'.[20] This address to the whole city at the culmination of his oration came just after Gregory had extolled the deeds of his flock and the splendour of Constantinople's churches. Despite representing himself as a virtuous philosopher too holy for the intrigues and pleasures of the capital, Gregory clearly showcased his affection and concern for it – cleverly marrying philosophical detachment with patriotic involvement.[21]

Yet it was in his earlier *Oration on Himself and on the See of Constantinople* that Gregory made his point more forcefully. The oration was Gregory's first as bishop of the city, and was probably preached in the emperor's presence.[22] Gregory's position was insecure. Despite imperial support Gregory had been unsettled by the the attempted consecration of Maximus, while the deposed Arian bishop Demophilus had been popular in the city. As suggested above, moreover, the city was not exclusively Christian, and for Gregory to increase his influence in the city he needed to reframe citizenship of Constantinople as an essentially or exclusively Christian identity. Like Julian, Gregory appealed to his audience's civic patriotic instincts to justify himself and his religious preferences. Gregory first asked his congregation rhetorically why they were interested in hearing his sermons specifically, including as part of his answer that 'it is natural to be entirely favourable to one's own [φύσις δὲ αὕτη πρὸς τὸ οἰκεῖον ἅπαν εὐμενῶς ἔχειν]',[23] even if he himself was merely 'a poor old foreigner'. Having claimed a place as 'one of their own' and thus asserted a right to address them, Gregory embarked on a sermon whose general theme was the advantages of good order (and the disruption to it that came with heresy). Concluding his address, Gregory issued another exhortation that the Constantinopolitans behave and act collectively in a pious fashion. 'You who are this great city, the first after the first [Rome] [Ὑμεῖς ἡ μεγάλη πόλις, οἱ πρῶτοι μετὰ τὴν πρώτην εὐθέως] – perhaps you

[18] McGuckin has suggested that this particular oration was polished by Gregory after his retirement, as part of his subsequent curation of the history of his final days at Constantinople, though Daunton-Fear has highlighted remnants of extemporaneous speech in the homily: McGuckin 2001, 361, n. 368; Daunton-Fear 2017. Contrast Bernardi, who believes the oration was never preached: Bernardi 1988, 1992, 7–17; a position followed in Elm, 1999. In any case, a Constantinopolitan audience in one form or another was clearly intended – see in addition Elm 2000, 418–21.
[19] See Introduction n. 84, ch. 1 n. 45.
[20] Gregory, *Or.* 42.27 (Bernardi 1992, 112).
[21] Gregory, *Or.* 42.22 (Bernardi 1992, 96–100); see earlier at 42.7 (64–6). For Gregory's focus on the Constantinopolitan elite, see Elm 2000.
[22] See Bernardi 1968, 192–8; Bernardi 1995, 204–5; McGuckin 2001, 329–32.
[23] Gregory, *Or.* 36.3 (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 246).

might not even concede the place – show me that you are the first, not in wickedness but in virtue.'[24] Explicitly equating his congregation with the city itself – 'you who are this great city' – Gregory sought to encourage a new form of civic competition with Rome in a contest of piety, to which he urged his audience with a series of short, sharp exhortations:

> You should spit upon these [sinful] things, be a city of God [Ταῦτα διαπτύοιτε, θεοῦ πόλις εἴητε]. You will be ornamented by the Lord's hands, you will be set with my help beside your great founder [Constantine] as shining lights in ages to come [ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ Κυρίου ζωγραφηθείητε, καὶ παραστήσαισθε σὺν ἡμῖν τῷ μεγάλῳ πολιστῇ λαμπροὶ λαμπρῶς ὕστερον].[25]

Gregory invoked several precedents in his attempt to elevate the significance of his congregation's Christian identity, which recalled those of Julian. He employed emotive and emphatic terms like 'spitting upon' (διαπτύω) in an elegant series of short, punchy injunctions.[26] He stressed again the identity between his congregants and their city through the repeated and emphatic use of the second person, shifting freely between the plural and singular forms of adjectives. He invoked Constantinople's worldly leadership as the motive for his congregation to seek to make it pre-eminent spiritually, employing both the city's rivalry with Rome (as part of its status as a 'New Rome') and its prominence above other (unnamed) cities to suggest that it had a duty to lead by example.[27] Finally, he invoked 'your great founder' Constantine (ὁ μεγάλος πολιστής), whose pious example it was the natural duty of the Constantinopolitans to follow. The result was to redefine the terms of civic patriotism, by redefining the πόλις as a community of Christians whose patriotic duty was the emulation of their pious ancestors.[28] Gregory like Julian addressed the city collectively in the second-person plural, appealing to its comparative status, duty to follow its founder and serve the divine. Gregory like Julian exploited civic identity to promote his religious vision, his personal position, and to redefine civic patriotism in expressly religious terms. Both were innovating ideologists of substantial skill and subtlety, although it was ultimately Gregory's redefined civic patriotism that would go on to provide the model for the Byzantine vision of Constantinople as the premier Christian capital.[29]

---

[24] Gregory, *Or.* 36.12 (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 269). For the complex fourth-century relations between the statuses of Rome and Constantinople, see Grig 2012. Compare also *Vit. sua* ll. 562–7 (White 52); competition with Alexandria at *Or.* 25.3 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1981, 162).
[25] Gregory, *Or.* 36.12 (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 269). Compare the praise and lament over the city in *Carm.* 2.1.10 (PG 37.1028A–29A).
[26] Gregory also criticised the Constantinoplitans for 'playing' with spiritual matters – compare ch. 4 n. 22.
[27] For the background to the language of 'New Rome', see Van Dam 2007, 35–78; Kaldellis 2020. On the role of the city (along with Rome and Alexandria) in leading the Christian οἰκουμένη, see Muraille 1968, 175–8.
[28] Compare his praise of the Cappadocians in his encomium on Basil: 'nothing is as particularly theirs as being trustworthy and genuine and steadfast of faith in the Trinity'. Gregory, *Or.* 43.33 (Bernardi 1992, 198); cf. *Carm.* 2.1.12 ll. 93–4 (PG 37.1175A).
[29] On the formation of Constantinople's identity as a Christian city in the fourth century, see now Falcasantos 2020.

Linked to this redefinition of civic patriotic language was the promotion of rival cultic figures. Whether Christian martyrs or pagan local heroes ought to be the focus of veneration was a subject of intense dispute, and framed explicitly in patriotic terms as to which figures would provide more benefit to the city.[30] Martyr piety was a rapidly growing force in the fourth century, propelled at least in part by the desire of many Christians to venerate local figures.[31] This was a significant areas of conflict, particularly given Neoplatonic belief in the ritual impurity of corpses and the directly confrontational relationship between martyrs and local pagan cultic heroes. For Julian, the veneration of martyrs' physical remains was so abominable that he had the daytime procession of their relics outlawed.[32] By contrast, both Basil and Gregory encouraged martyr veneration, although they drew different conclusions about its relevance for local patriotism – Gregory, unlike Basil or other Christian homilists, not portraying martyrs as patriotic figures.[33] For Basil and Julian, these cultic figures were enlisted in a contest over what true civic patriotism meant – whether the city's ancestors and heroes were pagan or Christian. Additionally, Basil at least also had to negotiate a branch of Christian opinion (represented by Gregory, but which he himself sometimes endorsed) which held that the martyrs were symbols of opposition to the city and thus stood against the locally limited character of civic patriotism. Martyr piety could thus question the very framework of the civic patriotism – a more radical step than merely redefining it in Christian terms.

Julian was aware of the ties between proper cult and local pride. In addition to the legislation and criticism cited above, he purposefully removed the bones of the martyr Babylas from the Grove of Apollo at Daphne near Antioch, where they had been introduced some time earlier.[34] Though neither of his laws mentioned saints or civic patriotism explicitly, it is clear from other accounts that Julian understood this function of martyr piety and found it thoroughly distasteful. This was most explicit in a letter concerning Pelagius, the bishop of Troy, whom Julian had met in 354 while travelling to court

[30] For a comparison of the two, see Bernier-Farella 2015.
[31] For historiography, see ch. 3 n. 92. For the related development of holy sites, see Markus 1994.
[32] Julian, *Ep.* 56 (*Ep.* 136b Bidez-Cumont, 195–8), *CTh* 9.17.5; cf. criticism of martyr piety in *Contr. Gal.* 201E, 335B–D, 339E–40A, perhaps 224E. Compare Eunapius' account of Iamblichus' avoidance of corpse-pollution in Eunap. *VS* 5.1.12–15 (Goulet 2014, 2.13–14). More broadly on Julian's attacks on the cult of the martyrs and their relation to civic space, see Torres 2009; Shepherdson 2014, 58–91; Finkelstein 2018, 115–37; W. Mayer 2020.
[33] Gregory's encomia of family members and close friends, particularly of Basil and his father, were closer to this 'local heroes' pattern, though he did not suggest that they be treated as heavenly intercessors.
[34] See Amm. Marc. 22.12.8 (Seyfarth, Jacob-Karau, Ulmann 1978, 268), Soz. 5.19.4–19 (Bidez and Hansen 1995, 223–6), John Chrysostom, *Hom. in martyrem Babylam* 87–90 (Schatkin, Blanc and Grillet 1990, 208–14), commentary in Bowersock 1978, 99; Elm 2012b, 277–9. Compare Julian's mockery of the Antiochenes' 'loving Christ and having him as guardian deity instead of Zeus and Daphne and Calliope [ἔχετε πολιοῦχον ἀντὶ τοῦ Διὸς καὶ τοῦ Δαφναίου καὶ τῆς Καλλιόπης]', which he contrasted with the destruction of martyrs' tombs at nearby Emesa – *Misop.* 357C–D.

in Milan, and whom he described to his correspondent as (essentially) a crypto-pagan.[35] Julian's purpose in writing the letter seems to have been to justify his patronage of Pegasius to a pagan correspondent who was sceptical of whether the former bishop was a reliable convert.[36] Invoking himself as witness, Julian detailed his encounter with the bishop while the former was still nominally Christian.[37] Julian had questioned Pegasius on the continued veneration of the cult of Hector at Troy. Pegasius had supposedly asked him in response 'whether it was not normal that [the Trojans] should worship a good man who was their own citizen, just as we worship the martyrs [ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν ἑαυτῶν πολίτην, ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς," ἔφη, "τοὺς μάρτυρας, εἰ θεραπεύουσιν;"]?'[38] Julian bridled at the comparison with Christian martyr cult, but tellingly offered this quotation as part of his justification of Pegasius' conduct. Hero cult, at least according to Julian's account of Pegasius, was a natural outgrowth of pious feelings towards one's homeland, making it part of the normative fabric of civic life.[39] It would be overly simplistic to characterise martyr piety and hero cult as equivalent phenomena.[40] The martyrs could provide potent examples of rejecting the earthly πατρίς. They also did not necessarily perform the same theological functions or occupy the same theological position. Finally, there seems to be less evidence for the cult of local heroes in late antiquity, either compared to the cult of the martyrs or to earlier periods, although Jones suggests that their cult did continue into late antiquity.[41] Nonetheless, it was evidently possible to see them as straightforwardly equivalent, and many like Pegasius probably did so.[42] Julian was aware of the comparison, the links between hero cult and local patriotism it implied, and chose to quote it in a letter aimed at increasing Pegasius' standing as a new pagan convert. Coupled with the localist theology of his *Against the Galilaeans* and its attacks on martyrs,[43] it seems clear that Julian saw the worship of local worthies as an important part of reclaiming civic patriotism as a pagan political language.

Basil's *Homily on Gordius* is an excellent example of the Christian response, which transformed civic patriotic rhetoric in a classically Skinnerian fashion.[44] The homily was given during winter or early spring at the festival of the Licinian martyr Gordius while Basil was bishop of

---

[35] See also Julian, *Ep.* 47 432D–34D (*Ep.* 111 Bidez-Cumont), which accuses the Alexandrians of ingratitude to the gods and their ancestors for failing to venerate those figures who have blessed them.
[36] Julian's reign saw a number of men publicly profess pagan loyalties including former Christians such as Pegasius and the Egyptian bishop Heron. Ecclesiastical historians usually mention these newly-minted public pagans when accusing them of apostasy from Christianity and even then predominantly record those who suffered unpleasant fates. See Philostorgius 7.10 (Bidez and Winkelmann 1981, 154), 13; Socr. 3.13 (Hansen 1995, 207–8), Soz. 5.8.2–4 (Bidez-Hansen 1995, 203–4).
[37] Julian, *Ep.* 19 (*Ep.* 79 Bidez-Cumont, 92).
[38] Julian, *Ep.* 19 (Bidez-Cumont, 93).
[39] See for instance on hero cult and the movement of remains in Classical Greece, Boedeker 1998.
[40] As argued by Delehaye 1933, 461–70; Van Uytfanghe 1996, 145–6; Rapp 2007, 458–9. Contrast the emphasis of Bernier-Farella 2015.
[41] C. P. Jones 2010, 84–9.
[42] Compare attacks on martyr cults as idolatry mounted by Vigilantius as reported (polemically) by Jerome, *Contr. Vig.* 4 (Feiertag 2005, 9–11); compare the attacks noted in Delehaye 1933, 472.
[43] See ch. 4 pp. 96–9. For attacks on martyrs in the *Contr. Gal.* see Torres 2009, 210–11
[44] On the homily, see Rousseau 1994, 188ff; Leemans et al. 2003, 27; Busine 2017; Chiriatti 2017.

Caesarea, at the shrine of the martyrs located just outside the city walls.[45] The festival occasion swelled the crowd of attendants beyond the usual congregation of the faithful, attracting large numbers from the surrounding countryside who came to sell their goods at the markets associated with the festival.[46] As a result, it was an eminently civic occasion, a symbolic moment for the instantiation of the community. Had Basil chosen to, he could have given a fairly standard panegyric, praising the city's environs, monuments and citizens in the course of glorifying the martyr. But he decided to go off script.[47] He told his audience that he was aware of what they expected: 'the law of encomium is to examine the native land [ἐγκωμίων μὲν γὰρ νόμος πατρίδα διερευνάσθαι], and investigate pedigree, and discourse on upbringing'.[48] But this was not the Christian νόμος. 'For why am I more august on this account, if the city which once bore the burden of grievous and huge struggles set up famous trophies over its enemies [εἰ ἡ πόλις ποτὲ χαλεπούς καὶ μεγάλους ἀγώνας διενεγκοῦσα, λαμπρὰ κατὰ τῶν πολεμίων ἀνέστησε τρόπαια]?'[49] Basil referenced general panegyrical practice, but rejected its tropes in favour of 'that which is best able to bring us to human virtue'.[50] Nonetheless, Basil then went on to list precisely all the worldly things that were glorious about Caesarea (beauty, climate, the strength of its people and horses) – and pronounced them all irrelevant, for failing to contribute to human virtue. In giving what was essentially a mini-panegyric, Basil demonstrated his command of the genre, both to satisfy the demands of his audience for praise of their city and to strengthen his authority as he subsequently rejected it.

Having rejected the traditional definition of civic excellence, Basil offered his listeners a different focus for local identity and loyalty: the martyr Gordius.[51] Gordius' relevance to the Caesarean audience was his local significance: he 'was born in our city, which is why we love him more, because he is our own ornament [ὅθεν καὶ μᾶλλον αὐτὸν ἀγαπῶμεν, διότι οἰκεῖος ἡμῖν ὁ κόσμος ἐστίν]'.[52] Instead of the cattle or horses which Caesarea raised, Gordius was the true fruit of the land: and 'beautiful indeed are the exotic fruits when they are both sweet and nutritious, but much sweeter than the foreign fruits are the native and home-grown [ἡμεδαποὶ καὶ ἐγχώριοι], which … have an added attraction in our eyes because they are our own [πρὸς τῇ ἀπολαύσει ἔτι καὶ καλλωπισμόν

[45] See Bernardi 1968, 80 (who suggests 373 specifically); Fedwick 1979, 10 n. 40; Leemans et al. 2003, 56–7.
[46] As a result, Basil elsewhere advised his ascetics to avoid martyrs' feasts because of the impropriety of those who celebrated them (Silvas 2005, 35 with further references) and even devoted one surviving homily to castigating the drunkenness which was prevalent at such occasions (*Hom. in ebr.*, PG 31.443–64); compare Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.166–75 (Beckby 530–4). On such feasts, see Leemans et al. 2003, 19–20.
[47] See here, Busine 2015, 238–41.
[48] Basil, *Hom. in Gord.* 2 (PG 31.492C). On Christian responses to encomium, see ch. 3 n. 51.
[49] Basil, *Hom. in Gord.* 2 (PG 31.492C).
[50] Basil, *Hom. in Gord.* 2 (PG 31.492D). Compare Basil, *Hom. in Mam.* 2 (PG 31.589D–92A). For the importance of spectacle in inculcating virtue, see Chiriatti 2017, 193.
[51] Rousseau 1994, 186–7; Busine 2017, 211.
[52] Basil, *Hom. in Gord.* 2 (PG 31.493B). Compare Basil, *Ep.* 95 (Courtonne 1.207) on Cappadocian Phargamos, 'made illustrious by the glory of martyrs and by the well-attended synod held there every year'; cf. Basil, *Ep.* 165 (Courtonne 2.100–1).

τινα ἡμῖν διὰ τῆς οἰκειότητος χαριζόμενοι].'[53] Basil therefore suggested to his audience an alternative civic identity in which they could take pride: membership of a city of piety, glorified by pious products. Local allegiance, a key part of πόλις rhetoric, was strongly affirmed. Basil did not dispute the idea that a city was glorified by its products, but in the manner of a skilled negotiator of political language he switched the referents of 'glorified' and 'products'. True glory was the glory that the martyr's sacrifice offered to God ('he is our own ornament', οἰκεῖος ἡμῖν ὁ κόσμος ἐστίν). And good products were those which aided that end, rather than those ends which pertained to the earth. Hence Basil was able to insist that he did not follow pagan rules of rhetoric, which sought to glorify the πατρίς, for he could present the praise he offered as going directly to God, even as it also fulfilled his listeners' desire for praise of their city. Basil also asked another correspondent to send relics back to Cappadocia.[54] Relics thus formed an element of his broader patriotic promotion of martyr piety.[55]

Yet like Gregory, Basil could also express reserve on the question of martyrs' local allegiance, employing martyr cult to underline the universal dimensions of Christian belonging. In his *Homily on the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste*, he stressed that these men were 'citizens without a city, or rather citizens of the world [ἀπόλιδας αὐτοὺς εἴπωμεν, ἢ τῆς οἰκουμένης πολίτας]'.[56] He explained this by reference to their varied geographical origins: 'the holy ones were not from a single fatherland, for each came from another place [οὐκ ἦν μία πατρὶς τοῖς ἁγίοις · ἄλλος γὰρ ἀλλαχόθεν ὥρμητο]'.[57] Moreover, Basil's treatment of the martyrs contrasts with that of his brother, Gregory of Nyssa. The latter included the Forty Martyrs as part of Cappadocia's heroic Christian legacy: 'for who does not see your fruit, for you have brought forth such a prolific crop of martyrs'.[58] Basil could have chosen to employ this rhetoric, and stress how the Forty's death in Cappadocia made it their πατρίς, as the contemporary Pope Damasus' epigrams described the martyrs of Rome.[59] Basil's decision not to do so was partly motivated, I suggest, by the circumstances of his preaching. His sermon seems to have been given in Caesarea, whereas his brother's sermon was given at the martyrs' cultic centre at Sebaste.[60] As Van Dam points out, the see of Sebaste was at that time occupied by Basil's rival and erstwhile mentor, Eustathius.[61] Ecclesiastical politics thus militated against emphasising the martyrs' Sebastean origins. However, Basil's choice to treat the Forty as universal rather than local figures underlines an important and sometimes overlooked point about martyr piety – that it was not always localist. The same martyrs could be presented as figureheads of local piety in one instance and

---

[53] Basil, *Hom. in Gord.* 2 (PG 31.493B).
[54] Basil, *Ep.* 155 (Courtonne 2.81).
[55] For the Cappadocian context specifically, see Girardi 1990; Mitchell 1993, 64–70; Leemans et al. 2003, 56–7, 67–8; Driver 2005; Limberis 2011; Destephen 2015, 68–70; Busine 2017.
[56] Basil, *Hom. in XL mart.* 2 (PG 31.509B).
[57] Basil, *Hom. in XL mart.* 2 (PG 31.509B).
[58] Gregory of Nyssa, *Hom. in XL mart. Ia* (Cavernos, Heil and Lendle 1990, 141).
[59] Curran 2002, 153.
[60] Maraval 1999, 195–9.
[61] Van Dam 2003a, 137–41.

exemplars of the denial of πατρίς in another. This versatility on Basil's part, however, emphasises the competing status of civic patriotism and ascetic universalism as political languages – both had adherents, and both might be useful in different circumstances to their practitioners. Basil's ability to use both as necessary testifies to his skill as a rhetorician as well as to the ideological fragmentation of the fourth-century world.

In other homilies on the local saints Mamas and Julitta, Basil struck a middle course. Though he made no reference to their Cappadocian origins as occasions for civic pride he encouraged emulation of their pious actions and suggested their local importance in other ways.[62] The spring at Julitta's tomb, he suggested, was evidence of the earth's respect for the martyr's power, which nourished the bodies of the people 'just like the martyr, as a mother nourishes with her milk those in the city *en masse* [ὥστε τὴν μάρτυρα ἀντὶ μητρὸς γενομένην οἷόν τινι γάλακτι κοινῷ τιθηνεῖσθαι τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει]'.[63] Julitta's sacrifice resulted from the expulsion of Christians from 'law courts, laws and any other kind of commonwealth [πολιτεία]' during the persecutions, which paved the way for her assumption to Paradise.[64] On the martyr Mamas, Basil used the saint's example as an occasion to launch an attack on euergetic public entertainments and their epigraphic memorials. 'Do you see the famous horsebreeders? Do you see their marble memorials? How the stones lie unnoticed?'[65] Basil mocked such men's reliance on wealth in the futile pursuit of eternal glory, rather than winning fame through deeds of self-renunciation and service to God. Instead, he celebrated how the Cappadocian love of equestrian exhibitions was eclipsed (at least temporarily) by the people's enthusiasm for the martyr's celebration. 'The whole countryside is aroused by the memory of the martyr, and the whole city shifts itself to his festival [πᾶσα δὲ πόλις πρὸς ἑορτὴν μεταπεποίηται].'[66] The conversion of the 'whole city'stressed unity and singlemindedness, which were important for Basil's definitions of πόλις and πολιτεία as characterised by common activity. Like Julitta, Mamas was portrayed in the role of a civic parent, and the citizens were urged to honour him by rejecting temporal and greedy love of wealth, just as the martyr had done while a shepherd.[67]

Civic patriotism was thus a powerful means of reinforcing local religious identity. In particular, the marked growth of martyr piety in the fourth century and subsequently suggests that civic patriotic presuppositions had a substantial influence on the shape of Christian belief and practice.[68] Martyr piety, indeed, reflected the particularly fourth-century form of secular civic

---

[62] Rousseau 1994, 185–6.
[63] Basil, *Hom. in Jul.* 2 (PG 31.241B).
[64] Basil, *Hom. in Jul.* 1 (PG 31.240A).
[65] Basil, *Hom. in Mam.* 2 (PG 31.592B).
[66] Basil, *Hom. in Mam.* 2 (PG 31.592B). Compare the emphasis on the city's collective migration in *Hom. in Gord.*, 6 (PG 31.591B).
[67] Basil, *Hom. in Mam.* 2 (PG 31.592C).
[68] For the Cappadocians' involvement with martyr piety, see above n. 55. For their influence on Asterius of Amasea, see Driver 2005.

patriotism discussed in Part I: a political language which celebrated morally pre-eminent local patrons who could intercede with higher powers on behalf of the localities to which they were connected.[69] Indeed, it reflected the roles which bishops themselves sought as intercessors for their communities.[70] Yet martyrs could also be cast as universal patrons dissociated from any one place – as Gregory himself became. The different types of martyr piety observed thus reflect the diverging trends towards local and universal loyalties seen more broadly in fourth century Roman society.

By contrast with this ambiguous balance between universal and local,[71] it is notable that that traditional religion often endured the longest where it was associated with the distinctiveness of a particular city – such as the case of Carrhae/Harran, which remained majority pagan well into the Islamic period, and (less enduringly) in centres like Athens, Mamre and Heliopolis/Baalbek.[72] Julian's own efforts seem to have made little difference to these locally-rooted paganisms, although hidden or even openly pagan members of the elite remained common into the fifth century AD.

Praising martyrs formed a second way for Christians to redefine the community, though not an unambiguous one, through redefining civic patriotic language. This spiritualised civic patriotism was a third and distinctive way of approaching the language of πόλις and πατρίς: it synthesised the more secular language analysed in Part I and the ascetic philosophical rejection of it in Part II. Spiritualised civic patriotism was a political language designed to allow for – and indeed encourage – local feeling, but to prune it of religiously problematic connotations. If this seems a Christian preoccupation, it is worth recalling that Julian was also an ascetic reformer of traditional religion. Julian's defiant reassertion of the traditional bonds between pagan devotion and civic spirit brought the issue to the forefront of religious politics, both confronting popular pagan interpretations of patriotism and challenging Christians' place in the city. Though the content of their redefined political languages differed, both Julian and his contemporaries sought to execute the same ideological move by making local and religious loyalties synonymous.

From Euergetism to Charity?

Redefining civic patriotic language was an important part of claiming the city's identity for Neoplatonic paganism or Christianity. Shifting how elites spent their money was its practical counterpart. Wealthy citizens needed to be convinced that the truly patriotic thing to do was to

[69] Compare the role of images of the imperial court in forming late-antique ideas of Heaven: see Kelly 2004, 232–45. More broadly on saints as intercessors, Brown 1971.
[70] Van Uytfanghe 1996, 147–8.
[71] Brown 2015, 383.
[72] Recent scholarship has in tandem emphasised the need to be cautious about how normative and universal martyr piety actually was: Rousseau 2002, 51; papers in Dal Santo, Sarris and Booth 2013.

support specific spiritual causes – rather than games, races and public buildings. More ambitiously, they might be persuaded into supporting a new type of giving, which bypassed civic rationales entirely by focusing on the spiritual demands of serving the divine and universal human need. As with martyr piety, therefore, religious reformers like Basil, Julian and Gregory could either redefine civic patriotic language or (particularly for Christians) reject it altogether. As will be familiar from previous discussions, they usually chose a mix of rationales.

Historians have often emphasised how Christianity changed the value attached to civic giving. In Peter Brown's formulation, civic giving evolved from a collective, city-focused and horizontal 'civic euergetism' to a personal, spiritually-directed and vertical 'charity'.[73] The Cappadocian Fathers, in particular, have been seen as early proponents of this shift, as before and during Basil's episcopate they collectively agitated for famine relief, leper hospitals, aid for needy clerics, the protection of widows and orphans and other sundry types of relief.[74] For some, the justification of giving on the grounds of universal human need has seemed an early chapter in the history of human rights.[75] This obligation was often couched in terms of *philanthropia*, or the love of one's fellow man.[76] Viewed from this perspective, a decline in euergetic epigraphy appears the natural counterpart of this shift.[77] While many scholars view the distinction between different types of giving as blurry in practice, they still accept the basic logic of a division into two models of giving, divided by religious affiliation.[78] Though there is some utility in this more cautious approach, the teleology of reactionary, localist pagans against forward-thinking, universalist Christians is potentially misleading.[79] Outright opposition of euergetism to charity also threatens to accept at face value a Christian criticism of euergetism as placating the masses for one's own glory, rather than the philosophically-justified benefactions that they sometimes were.[80] At least in Basil, Julian and Gregory, there seems to be no straightforward distinction between – or transition from – pagan euergetism and Christian charity.

---

[73] Moving away from the somewhat undecided position articulated in Brown 1992, 118–22, 154–6; Brown 2002, 84–9; for the West, Brown 2012; Brown 2013. See Introduction pp. 10–11. On euergetism generally, see Gauthier 1985; Migeotte 1992. For the early medieval West, see also Ward-Perkins 1984, 65–84.
[74] Meredith 1998; Daley 1999. On the development of the hospital more generally, see Van Minnen 1995; Miller 1997; Crislip 2005; Horden 2004; Horden 2012. See also ch. 3 n. 36.
[75] Holman 2000; Holman 2001b; recently for a popular audience Holland 2020, 119–26. In older scholarship this was sometimes analysed in terms of resemblance (or not) to communism: thus Giet 1941; Gribomont 1977. As well as the inherent need of the beneficiaries, however, it is worth noting that the giver was encouraged to think of their immortal soul and their duty to honour and imitate God and the saints.
[76] On which see Downey 1955; Daley 1999; McGuckin 2010.
[77] MacMullen 1982; for further bibliography, see Part I n. 6–7. For the fundamentally fourth-century character of of Christian *philanthropia* see Caner 2021, 43–51.
[78] Mitchell 1993, 81–4; Smith 2003, 159–62; Salzman 2017a. For treatment of church-building as euergetic, see Begass 2014; more broadly, see Haensch 2006; Caillet 2012; Caner 2020; Goddard 2020; Caner 2021, 20–22, 39–43. For a sophisticated analysis of this question, see Finn 2006.
[79] Intriguingly, the belief in the obligation to aid humanity on the basis of need rather than civic obligation is foreshadowed in the epigraphy of the Hellenistic and imperial πόλις – see Gray 2013; 2017.
[80] See here Roskam 2014, 157–9; further Zuiderhoek 2007.

Rather, all three used both euergetic and charitable paradigms when appropriate.[81] Though it is true that the universalist and anti- 'world' stance of Basil and Gregory made charity more congenial to them, Julian was not himself particularly favourable to euergetism.

Julian aimed some attacks at contemporary euergetism but refrained from the more fundamental criticisms of his Christian contemporaries. During his stay in Antioch it was at public occasions like races that he received the most criticism from the populace.[82] Its citizens showed their lawlessness and corruption 'especially in the markets and theatres', 'the people by their clapping and shouting', while 'the magistrates are more widely known and talked of by all on account of the sums they expended on these festivities' than Solon was for speaking with Croesus.[83] Julian linked the cries and applause of the city's δῆμος with the magistrates' spending, showing his awareness of the direct nexus between the officials' largesse and the citizens' approval. Both were culpable for the city's excess.[84] A neat comparison with Solon and Croesus cemented this condemnation. According to Herodotus, Solon had told Croesus to count no man happy until he was dead, denying the latter's claims to blessedness on account of his worldly fortune.[85] Yet in Antioch, Julian implied, such a virtuous reputation was inferior to one won by frivolous entertainments and lavish spending. This criticism was also a religious one, as Julian castigated their lack of spending on sacrifices, finding the Antiochenes' preference for private banquets shocking.[86] Indeed, although Julian does not invoke the πατρίς directly during the oration, it is replete with references (genuine and sarcastic) to ancestral custom and ethnographic observation, clearly situating the emperor's remarks in a civic patriotic context.[87] And even when the people of Antioch had attended his sacrifices, Julian complained, they had only done so out of desire for imperial favour, and not true piety – a criticism which echoed earlier philosophical critiques.[88]

Though rehearsing older criticisms of euergetic ideals, Julian's attacks echoed those of his Christian contemporaries by denouncing the activities sponsored, the donors' desire for reputation and the insolence and disorder of the people. He also contended that the reputation from some gifts was not always deserved, singling out public construction in his *Saturnalia* as a prime source of unmerited

---

[81] Brown acknowledges Basil's flexible use of euergetic language, but sees his initiatives as connected in reality with the absolutist and socially-controlling ambitions of the Roman state – Brown 2002, 39–44.
[82] On Julian's stay at Antioch, see Downey 1939; Elm 2012b, 327–55; Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011; see also ch. 2 pp. 53–5. On the *Misop.* see ch. 2 n. 76.
[83] Julian, *Misop.* 342C. Compare his view of the vanity of such acclaim in *Contra Cyn.* 200C.
[84] Condemnation of excess was a more general aspect of Julian's self-presentation, shown particularly in his purge of Constantius' palace staff after his accession and minimisation of ceremonial, see Amm. Marc. 22.4 (Seyfarth, Jacob-Karau, Ulmann 1978, 254–6) with discussion in Bowersock 1978, 71–2; Elm 2012b, 88–9ff. Compare also his attack on wasteful spending in *In Const. II* 83C–D, like Basil (*In Ps. XXXIII* 2 (PG 29.356A)) and Gregory (*Or*. 43.63 (Bernardi 1992, 262)) mentioning the pyramids as examples of excess.
[85] Herodotus, *Res Gesta* 1.32–3 (trans. Godley 1920, 36–40).
[86] Julian, *Misop.* 362D, 363B.
[87] See Julian, *Misop.* 346C, 348D–49A, 357D, 361D, 362C.
[88] Julian, *Misop.* 344B–C. See above n. 78.

fame. 'For it was not by the works of others [that Rome's heroes became famous], as happens with public buildings [πολιτικαῖς οἰκοδομίαις]… [when] the latest official though he has only whitewashed the walls has his name inscribed on the building.'[89] Rather, these heroes were 'themselves the architects and builders [ἀρχιτέκτονες δὲ αὐτοὶ καὶ δημιουργοί]' of their deeds.[90] Julian is sometimes characterised as uniquely interested in the restoration of the health of the cities through a return to a second-century *status quo*, but his writings and legislation show little interest in the promotion of euergetic benefaction.[91] While Julian did restore cities' incomes that had been diverted to the imperial treasury under Constantine and his successors, the text of his laws rarely refers to private munificence, even when discussing the restoration of *curiales* to their cities.[92] By contrast, his argument focused more on the benefits that Antioch had received from him: posing himself as an unjustly scorned benefactor now justly entitled to visit his wrath upon an ungrateful city.[93]

By contrast with Julian's moderately critical attitude, Basil was more openly and frequently hostile. This formed the other side of his promotion of famine relief in 368/369 and his investment in the Basileiados in subsequent years.[94] Expounding Psalm 62 (Septuagint Ps. 61), Basil argued that earthly reputation was worthless.[95] 'And at present many are glorified in their body, devoting their time to gymnastic contests, and likewise many who swell with the height of youthful passion. And many for courage against the enemy, they who make virtue killing those of their own tribe [οἱ καὶ τὸ φονεύειν τοὺς ὁμοφύλους ἀρετὴν τιθέμενοι]', in whose honour 'trophies are set up by their commander and their cities [τὰ τρόπαια ὑπὸ στρατηγοῦ καὶ πόλεων ἐγειρόμενα]'.[96] Basil's description of military virtue as 'the killing of those of their own tribe' (τὸ φονεύειν τοὺς ὁμοφύλους) emphatically denounced it by affirming the common bond of all people as members of the same 'tribe'. This minimised the difference between nations and races that strengthened local patriotic ideals, but also showed awareness of the traditional ideological link between the application of physical excellence both to athletics and to war.[97] Still other members of the elite, Basil continued, 'are glorified, throwing walls around cities, and others by building aqueducts, and others by the

[89] Julian, *Caes.* 323A–B.
[90] Julian, *Caes.* 323B.
[91] See Introduction n. 44.
[92] As I detail elsewhere (ch. 2 n. 5), it is uncertain which incomes Julian actually restored because it is uncertain which ones Constantine and his successors confiscated, though it is clear that public cult was defunded and certain temple lands and buildings confiscated: Delmaire 1989, 641–5; Schmidt-Hofner 2006; Bransbourg 2009; Lenski 2016, 173–5. It is also the case that early imperial civic building relied significantly more on public funds than the inscriptions trumpeting private largesse imply; see Zuiderhoek 2009, 37–52.
[93] Julian, *Misop.* 365A–71C.
[94] Rousseau 1994, 136–40; though as Finn remarks the confusion between euergetic and charitable roles may well have been what alarmed Basil's contemporaries; Finn 2006, 225–8.
[95] For dating, see Bernardi 1968, 28–9, who suggests 368–375 as an approximate range for the composition of the homilies on the psalms generally. Compare also Basil, *In Ps. XLVIII* 7 (PG 29.448B–49A), on glory *Reg. Brev.* 33–6 (PG 31.1104C–5C), 54 (1120A).
[96] Basil, *In Ps. LXI* 4 (PG 29.476C).
[97] Compare Gregory's exhortation to charity to 'those of your blood' (*Or*. 16.20 (PG 35.982C)).

structures of great gymnasia'.[98] Indeed, here Basil was far more explicitly critical of traditional euergetism and not merely its imperial official incarnation, condemning 'he who pours out his wealth on beast fights, being elevated by the vain acclamations of the people [ταῖς ματαίαις τῶν δήμων φωναῖς ἐπαγαλλόμενος], being puffed up by their praise… having glory in his disgrace [τὴν δόξαν ἔχων ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτοῦ]'.[99] Significantly, Basil termed the act of euergetism itself a 'disgrace' (αἰσχύνη), rather than merely the vain celebration of it. The criticism undermined several elements of civic patriotic language – civic solidarity, the importance of monuments, and the normative character of praise from one's fellow-citizens.

He drove the point home, moreover, by denigrating the source of such glory. Characterising the acclamations of the δῆμος as 'vain' or 'empty' (ματαίας) fitted into an elite sense of popular irrationality and lack of judgement, and necessarily tainted any glory the populace might bestow.[100] It perhaps also recalled the refrain of *Ecclesiastes* ('vanity of vanities', ματαιότης ματαιοτήτων) and its pessimistic outlook on the impermanence of worldly wealth, glory and pleasure.[101] Even those who attempted permanence were to be disappointed, Basil condemning the person 'who even reveals his sin in written form in the conspicuous parts of the city on the notice-boards [ὅς γε καὶ ἔγγραφον ἐν τοῖς περιφανέσι τῆς πόλεως τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἁμαρτίαν ἐπὶ τῶν πινάκων δείκνυσιν]'.[102] Condemning epigraphy as a display of sin underscored that euergetism was fundamentally worldly and public-facing nature, and ultimately futile. Although contemporary celebrations of benefactors tended to be conducted more by chanting and acclamation than by inscriptions, Basil's attack condemned both kinds of celebration.[103] Interestingly, though, Basil chose to focus on the motivation of the individual and the source of glory in his homilies, rather than attack the idea that the πατρίς itself did not deserve gifts. Nonetheless, he still argued that the primary motivation for giving ought not to be with reference to fellow citizens, but rather with reference both to one's own interests (to gain heavenly glory) and for the glory of God. The tenor of his preaching as observed in the homilies was generally hostile to euergetism and the patriotism it depended upon. Basil here actively rejected such language, rather than transforming or accommodating it.

Gregory shared Basil's negative attitude towards the motivation for euergetism. In his encomium of his father upon his death in 375, Gregory argued for a difference between proper Christian spending and worldly disbursement, drawing attention to his father's construction of a

---

[98] Basil, *In Ps. LXI* 4 (*PG* 29.477A).
[99] Basil, *In Ps. LXI* 4 (*PG* 29.477A). See also *De humil.* 1 (*PG* 31.525D).
[100] Compare the characterisation of popular awards as 'the empty glory of dreams [ματαιοτέραν φασμάτων νυκτερινῶν], which is confirmed and removed by the nod of the people' at *De humil.* 1 (PG 31.528A); see ch. 2 p. 58.
[101] Referenced explicitly in the *Hom. quod reb. mund.* (PG 31.540–64), though Basil might also have been invoking Psalm 39:6.
[102] Basil, *In Ps. LXI* 4 (*PG* 29.477A); compare again *In Ps. XLVIII* 7 (PG 29.448B–49A).
[103] See p. 113 above.

church and giving to the poor.[104] 'For greatness of mind [μεγαλόψυχον] as concerns money, one may without difficulty find it among others, both in that which is wasted on public and political honours [κοινὰς καὶ πολιτικὰς ἀπόλλυται φιλοτιμίας], and that which is lent to God through the poor, and which alone is stored up through expenditure.'[105] Foregrounding the importance of the poor and of God as the recipients of donation in the Christian case, Gregory emphasised the superiority of charitable over euergetic giving, and thus his father's virtue, by stressing that 'the honourable and greatest thing of all was that he also added humility to his magnanimity [μεγαλοψύχῳ προσῆν καὶ τὸ ἀφιλότιμον].'[106] Like Basil disdaining the opinions of 'the many' (οἱ πολλοί), Gregory emphasised the hidden nature of his father's giving, positioning him as a charitable benefactor concerned solely for heavenly merit.

Yet he made sure to suggest that his father was also glorious according to euergetic schema, re-defining the terms of civic political language rather than simply abandoning them. 'And since it was necessary for his life to leave a memorial of his greatness of soul [μνημόσυνον τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλοψυχίας], what is required other than this temple, which he raised for God and for us [ὃν Θεῷ τε ἤγειρε καὶ ἡμῖν]?'[107] Yet leaving a 'memorial' (μνημόσυνος) was precisely what Basil had condemned as futile in his homilies. Gregory too had warned of the futility of attempts to guarantee the perpetuation of one's name and property in other writings, indicating his fundamentally flexible attitude to the intellectual presuppositions of civic patriotic language.[108] Likewise, the positive treatment of 'greatness of spirit' or 'magnanimity' (μεγαλοψυχία), a staple term of euergetic discourse, indicates a willingness to adopt the traditional means of praising benefactors.[109] The referent of 'we' was also inclusive – Gregory addressed his congregation both as congregants in 'this temple' and as citizens of Nazianzus, whose city his father's generosity had made famous.[110] The language of 'adornment' and works cast Gregory the Elder's church in terms of a patriotic enhancement to the locality as well as an offering 'to God' and an aid to the piety of the congregants, blending a mix of rationales in praise of his father's contribution.[111] Likewise, euergetic and charitable were blended in his description of the Basileiados in his encomium of Basil:

> Love of fellow man is a good thing, as is love of the poor and the assistance of human need [καλὸν φιλανθρωπία καὶ πτωχοτροφία καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἀσθενείας βοήθημα]. Go a little

[104] On this oration, see Bernardi 1968, 124–31; Bernardi 1995, 145–9; McGuckin 2001, 222–4.
[105] Gregory, *Or.* 18.21 (PG 35.1009C).
[106] Gregory, *Or.* 18.21 (PG 35.1009A).
[107] Gregory, *Or.* 18.39 (PG 35.1038A).
[108] See Gregory, *Or.* 14.16 (PG 35.876D–77B).
[109] For Gregory's presentation of this building as civic patriotic, see Kopecek 1974b, 293–7; cf. Caner 2020, 269–70.
[110] Gregory, *Or.* 18.39 (PG 35.1037C).
[111] Finn 2006, 207.

> out of the city [Caesarea] and view the new city, the storehouse of piety, the common treasury of the wealthy [τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐχόντων θησαύρισμα], in which is the excess of their wealth.[112]

Φιλανθρωπία was glossed here as equivalent to the care of the poor (πτωχοτροφία), a charitable rather than a euergetic virtue. By casting the Basileiados as the 'common treasury of the wealthy', Gregory invited his listeners to store up treasure in heaven by giving to the poor (and in this case, rather than by spending on their own glory. Constructions like the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus, the walls of Babylon or the pyramids of Egypt were ultimately useless, for they 'benefited their builders by nothing save a little glory'.[113] Nonetheless, 'the new city' was also, as Basil had glossed it in one of his letters, an adornment to Caesarea, and thus fulfilled precisely the euergetic function of providing glory which Gregory had decried.[114] Building and donation thus occupied an indistinct position between charitable and patriotic, capable of being celebrated as either (or even both) as the case demanded.

In rejecting euergetic motives for giving, the Cappadocians needed to advance alternative reasons for the wealthy elite to donate to their desired causes. Universal humanity was one of the ideas invoked to this end.[115] 'To every man belongs by nature equality of like honour with all men [ὁμοτιμίας ἰσότης ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν]', Basil proclaimed in a letter, denouncing differentiation by family, body or wealth in favour of piety.[116] Poor or rich, Gregory wrote, 'both alike, [Scripture] says, are the image of God'.[117] Indeed, in the same homily Gregory argued against the division between rich and poor, claiming that it was as irrational to cite divine prescription in favour of deviant religious worship as to deny help to the poor on the basis of God's supposed benevolence to the rich.[118] In Gregory's argument, pity towards one's fellow man was both a tool of confessional polemic and an argument for charitable relief. Nonetheless Gregory still made use of the idea of reciprocity, and this respect his argument approached a more patriotic, euergetic rationale. Gregory suggested that God was the author of benefits. He thus deserved obedience – and men should therefore obey his commands to charity.[119]

Basil took such an argument one step further. Preaching on the Parable of the Rich Fool (Luke 12:18) as part of his attempt to organise famine relief, he imagined charitable giving as itself a kind of

---

[112] Gregory, *Or.* 43.63 (Bernardi 1992, 260–2). On the Basileiados, see ch. 3 pp. 70–1.
[113] Gregory, *Or.* 43.63 (Bernardi 1992, 262); compare 43.31 (194–6). One may contrast the positive treatment of the Mausoleum at Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.184 (Beckby 540).
[114] Basil, *Ep.* 94 (Courtonne 1.206).
[115] Daley 1999; Holman 2000; Holman 2001b.
[116] Basil, *Ep.* 262.1 (Courtonne 3.119), compare *Reg. Brev.* 187–9 (PG 31.1207B–9D), 216 (1225B).
[117] Gregory, *Or.* 14.36 (PG 36.905C). For the importance of this concept in Gregory, see Thomas 2019.
[118] This equation of immorality and paganism was a more general charge; as McLynn 2009c argues, Christian authors defined paganism as much by generic moral laxity as by formal devotion to idols and cults.
[119] Gregory, *Or.* 14.23 (PG 35.838A–D).

heavenly euergetism. Instead of vainly storing up wealth on earth, or dispersing it on earthly entertainments for the masses, the rich were invited to seek heavenly glory.

> Return your love of your glory [φιλοτιμία] for good works to the Master, until the whole people surrounding you by common consent may acknowledge you provider and benefactor [ὅταν δῆμος ὅλος, ἐπὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ κριτοῦ περιστάντες σε, τροφέα καὶ εὐεργέτην… ἀποκαλῶσιν] and all your titles of generosity.[120]

Basil clarified a few lines later that this δῆμος was a heavenly one, composed of angels and martyrs. Basil's statement was replete with the language and imagery of euergetic giving. The rich man was acclaimed τροφεύς and εὐεργέτης, praised for his φιλανθρωπία and φιλοτιμία, and invited to imagine himself surrounded by a heavenly δῆμος which 'by common judgement' (ἐπὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ κριτοῦ) of its 'whole' (ὅλος) membership would acclaim him.[121] By contrast, the absence of the virtuous from public entertainments made the crowd's praises worthless. 'You will not see those [virtuous] in the theatres, among the wrestlers and mimes and beast-fighting men, and would it not profane one to watch, on account of their little honour and the wasting of wealth for the yelling and clapping of the people [τῶν παρὰ τοῦ δήμου θορύβων καὶ κρότων]?'[122] The contrast between heavenly and earthly assemblies is striking – indeed, it suggested that charity was really a better form of euergetism. This idea was mirrored in the *Homily on Gordius*, which presented its protagonist as a superior athlete who led the people to 'this revered and very beautiful stadium of the martyrs [τῶν μαρτύρων στάδιον]'[123] from the 'theatre' of their worldly circus entertainments,[124] converting 'the entire city' by his efforts. This likewise appropriated the language and imagery of euergetic games.[125] Likewise, Basil's defence of the Basileiados to governor Elias in a letter from 372 blended rationales, emphasising the facilities it would offer to travellers, the governor's staff, the poor and the sick, as well as the buildings' status as 'an ornament to the locality and a source of pride to our governor, since their fame redounds to your benefit'.[126] Basil and Gregory thus blended a range of arguments to justify charitable giving, in a pragmatic and flexible fashion, though the consequence was that they did not offer a fully worked-out, coherent rationale for giving.

How does this flexible blending of political languages compare with Julian's policy? As we saw, Julian displayed relatively little interest in traditional euergetism, echoing philosophical and Christian criticisms of it. By contrast, Julian like the Cappadocians was interested in φιλανθρωπία,

---

[120] Basil, *Hom. in evang. Luc.* 3 (PG 31.265D).
[121] Compare John Chrysostom, *Hom. in Ep. 1 ad Cor.* 10.4 (PG 61.471–4) analysed in Roskam 2014, 167–8.
[122] Basil, *Hom. in evang. Luc.* 3 (PG 31.265D–68A), see comments in Caner 2021, 34, 64. Compare John Chrysostom, *Hom. de inani gloria* 4–6 (Malingrey 1972, 74–80) with Roskam 2014, 149–55.
[123] Basil, *Hom. in Gord.* 1 (PG 31.489C). On the bee imagery in this passage, see ch. 2 p. 58.
[124] Basil, *Hom. in Gord.* 6 (PG 31.501B). On the significance of the theatre and viewing generally, see above ch. 4 pp. 86–7. On the *Homily on Gordius,* see Busine 2017; Chiriatti 2017.
[125] Basil, *Hom. in Gord.* 6 (PG 31.501B).
[126] Basil, *Ep.* 94 (Courtonne 1.206).

often analysed by scholars in relation to his 'pagan church'.[127] According to a (possibly forged) letter to the provincial high priest of Asia, Arsacius,[128] Julian assigned revenues from state funds for priests to divert towards establishing hospitals and hostels (ξενοδοχία) and providing other kinds of charity for the upkeep of the poor, beggars and strangers.[129] The writer encouraged such charity from fellow pagans and cited *Odyssey* 14.56–8 in support of his argument, suggesting moreover that it was the Christians' giving that attracted the poor to their cause.[130] If forged, the forger probably used Julian's fragmentary (but genuine) *Letter to a Priest* as a template.[131] This employed the same quotation and exhorted giving to the poor and strangers out of φιλανθρωπία, even to the wicked, 'for we give to the humanity [ἀνθρωπίνῳ] and not the lifestyle.'[132] Common humanity was established by humans' divine descent.[133] Julian's use of the Christian language of generosity towards one's 'neighbour' (πλησίον) and attack on the Christian account of human history in the same letter clearly set up his proposals in competition with Christian activity, as did his call for pagan charity.[134] And if *Ep.* 20 (to Theodorus) was the preamble to *Letter to a Priest* (as is often assumed), then references in that text further suggest a Christian context for Julian's proposals.[135]

Intriguing, too, was Julian's attack on those who argued that divine providence was responsible for inequality, and that that inequality reflected divine intentions – a view that Gregory also criticised.[136] Moreover, in Gregory's account of Julian's measures, what is noticeable are the proposals' universal (or at least Empire-wide) scope. Alongside hostels for travellers, Julian

---

[127] Koch 1927; Bowder 1978, 99–102; Mitchell 1993, 90–1; Nicholson 1994; Bouffartigue 2005; Borelli 2018. Smith 1995, 110–11; Mazza 1998; Van Nuffelen 2002; and Elm 2012b, 326–27, 381–82 express scepticism. Elm's objection to 'pagan church' is mainly grounded on an argument that Julian found the ideology and model for it outside Christianity, which Greenwood 2017 contests; see also idem 2021, 100–3. Even if the precedent had been non-Christian, increased pagan organisation (as with that under Maximin Daia) was occasioned by the need to combat Christianity in addition to developments within pagan religious thought. 'Pagan church' as a label suffers from its polemical associations, but does reflect this competitive context, the probability of some inspiration from Christianity and the similar features assumed by both Christian and Julianic institutions. Scholarly debates over whether 'Catholic Renewal', 'Catholic Reform' or 'Counter-Reformation' best characterise sixteenth-century developments within Roman Christianity constitute an interesting parallel: see, for example, Reinhard 1989; Laven 2006.

[128] Thus Van Nuffelen 2002; with Bouffartigue 2005 arguing for authenticity; see also Greenwood 2017. The most convincing argument against authenticity that Nuffelen raises is the inconsistency of Julian's proposals in this letter with those of his *Letter to a Priest*.

[129] On *xenodocheia* specifically, see Kislinger 1984.

[130] Julian, *Ep.* 22 430B–31B (*Ep.* 84a Bidez-Cumont). 'Julian' in this letter also threatened the citizens of Pessinus with his enmity if they did not expel the Christians in their midst (431D–32A).

[131] This text, found incongruously lodged within the *Letter to Themistius*, has been argued to be a latter part of *Ep.* 20 to High Priest Theodorus, the beginning of a programmatic epistle to pagan clergy (see Bidez and Cumont 1922, 127–8; Van Nuffelen 2002, 136; Elm 2012b, 321 n. 203).

[132] Julian, *Ad Sacer.* 291A.

[133] In addition to the above, see Julian's insistence that 'every man, whether he affirms it or not, is kin to every other man', and the gods – 'Zeus and the gods are called "of kindred [ὁμόγνιος]" by us' – Julian, *Ad Sacer.* 291D. For the monarch's emulation of Zeus in this respect see Dio Chrys. *Or. 1* 39 (De Arnim 1962, 1.7); broader analysis highlighting the context of Classical *philanthropia* in Caner 2021, 39–43.

[134] *Ad Sacer.* 292D, 305B–D.

[135] Julian, *Ep.* 20 453C, 454A (*Ep.* 84a Bidez-Cumont). See also on Christian charity, Julian, *Misop.* 363A.

[136] Julian, *Ad Sacer.* 290A–B; Gregory, *Or*. 14.29 (PG 35.896C–97B)).

supposedly tried to create a system of mutual support through writing letters between communities, building a network of inns (καταγώγια) and guesthouses (ξενῶνας), and ransoming prisoners.[137] This is also consistent with the generic quality of Julian's exhortations to priests in the genuine material, examined in the next chapter. Whether or not we accept Gregory's characterisation of a 'pagan church',[138] then, it is evident that common appeals to universal humanity as a basis for generic (and not necessarily local) giving were effective across religious boundaries.[139] Julian's universalist vision was therefore not simply imitative of Christianity, but clearly did react to it.[140] Large-scale Christian charitable institutions were only incipient when Julian took the throne, but there were precedents for Christian charity on a smaller scale from an earlier period, of which he would have been aware. Christians were already making effective use of this universalist political language of human need and charitable giving before Basil and Gregory launched their appeals later in the 360s and 370s. To combat its appeal, Julian displayed the same flexibility: adopting a political language of universalist charity at odds with the localist elements of his programme. Although Christian Scripture and preaching pushed Basil and Gregory more firmly towards universalism compared to the pagan classics, there was clearly scope for thinker in either tradition to move between different justifications when advantageous. Nonetheless, he never seems to have endorsed rejection of the most radical kind as employed by Basil and Gregory – depriving himself of a powerful argument for changing the *status quo*.

* * * * *

The paradigm of transition from euergetism to charity is useful as a loose heuristic tool rather than a straightforward description of social activity. Reformers used many rationales for giving. These inevitably included euergetic ideals of glorifying the city or perpetuating one's memory as a glorious donor. Likewise, appeals to universal humanity can be observed in the epigraphy of earlier periods, further complicating any straightforward equation between Christianity, charity and the end of euergetism.[141] Criticisms of contemporary spending were also cross-confessional. For Basil, Julian and Gregory this spending was marred by its popularity and mob approval, focused on gaining worldly reputation and honour, and on funding frivolous entertainment rather than social good or personal improvement. Not of all these criticisms were unique to a particular spiritual or religious mindset. The animus against popularity and denigration of honours conferred by the people was a

[137] Gregory, *Or*. 4.111 (Bernardi 1983, 266–8). Interestingly, Soz. 5.16.2 (Biden and Hansen 1995, 216–17) adds that these institutions were also for poor relief, a detail not mentioned in Gregory.
[138] Though Elm as mentioned above is sceptical, she does note that the policies described by Gregory resembled Julian's actual measures pretty closely, suggesting at most it was Gregory's view of their aim that was unfounded (Elm 2012, 382 n. 12).
[139] Daley 1999.
[140] For the influence of Christian ideas here, see Greenwood 2017; idem 2021, 100–3.
[141] Gray 2013.

feature of political discussions more widely, and reflected the stratified structure of late Roman society.[142]

Nonetheless, Christian Scripture and theological principle provided resources for remodelling the city, either in terms of its general identity or the spending of its elites. It was this general tendency and spirit of opposition, rather than a clear and avowed commitment to one set of arguments over another, that characterised Basil and Gregory's ethos compared to Julian's. By virtue of his relative traditionalism, Julian lacked their more radical arguments for change. In contrast, the flexible and perhaps more incoherent attitude towards civic patriotism displayed by Basil and Gregory could have made their calls for reform more effective. They were more brazen in using civic patriotism instrumentally as a political language to effect change, modifying, embracing or contesting it as the situation demanded. It precisely because they treated civic patriotism as a political language, in the Cambridge School sense, that they were successful agents of change. Yet the fact that they endorsed that language, albeit sporadically, would influence the Christian Roman and Post-Roman worlds. Later Christian devotion would be closely tied to the city and viewed in a fundamentally patriotic spirit, with the civic community and congregation coterminous, churches as glorious civic monuments, charity as a patriotic service to the local poor, the saints as local protectors, and bishops and other local elites performing their duties according to patriotic rationales. Basil, Gregory and Julian thus ensured that the Christian centuries that followed would remain profoundly influenced by civic patriotism.

[142] See above, ch. 2 pp. 53–60.

Chapter Six - Philosophical Leadership and Elite Patriotism

Late-antique political thought, as explored in Chapter Two, was profoundly invested in hierarchy and the rule of self-proclaimed virtuous elites. Redefining civic patriotism in spiritual terms therefore required a close and careful attention to the role of elite leaders. Yet these leaders performed diverse and distinctive roles – acting as local councillors, priestly specialists, ascetic teachers and imperial officials.[1] Religious leaders, for instance, were expected to be worthy, distinguished philosophers, attentive to the eternal truths and universal moral claims to which their *paideia* alerted them. Yet they were also expected to behave as civic patriots, advancing local candidates to friends at court and serving in mundane local offices. The realities of politics rarely allowed the philosopher or the ascetic to maintain an unblemished reputation, as men like Julian and Themistius understood all too well.[2] To complicate things even further, certain teachers like Gregory sought to minimise ties to their πατρίς in order to attach themselves to another, more prestigious city. Though less successful in his own lifetime, Gregory's efforts to detach himself from his πατρίς and emphasise his universal status would bear rich fruit in the Byzantine period.[3] Other religious reformers like Basil or Julian had to justify interfering in the affairs of cities to which they had few natural ties.

Basil, Julian and Gregory had thus to reckon with diverging political and religious imperatives, and to construct a compromise between local service and universal religious intervention that could satisfy both civic patriotic demands and universalising claims of contemporary philosophy. In part, this could be achieved by advancing a model of the civic patriotic priest-philosopher who served his πατρίς by honouring God, safeguarding public morals and preserving social order. The traditionalist model of pagan priesthood and his explicitly localist theology could have given Julian some edge in making the case for a patriotic priesthood – but his more systematic treatises do not portray priesthood in consciously localist terms. By contrast, Basil explicitly integrated priesthood into civic patriotism in many of his letters. Gregory followed him to a lesser extent, but also had cause to reject civic patriotism altogether while bishop of Constantinople. In all three, therefore, civic patriotism was treated as a political language – embraced, redefined or rejected according to contingent circumstances in ways sometimes at odds with their broader philosophical positions.

---

[1] On the local functions of bishops in Asia Minor, see Mitchell 1993, 73–84; Sterk 2004, 66–73; more generally, see Rapp 2005, 209–34, 260–89.

[2] See Julian, *Ad Them.* 262C–D, 265B–C; Themistius *Or*. 17, 31, 34 all addressed accusations that he had compromised his philosophical integrity by assuming office in 383/384: see Vanderspoel 1995, 208–16; Heather and Moncur 2001, 285–98; Watts 2015, 178–9, 192–4. More generally for these tensions, see Van der Berg 2005.

[3] Van Dam 2003a, 180–84; Ousterhout 2011, 147, 67.

Philosophers and priests were only one half of this question. Religious reformers also needed to find ways of justifying secular public service in order win over elites, persuading them to view their secular activities as an extension of their religious ones.[4] Yet they had to do so without contradicting their own ascetic ideals too blatantly. Moreover, an ancillary problem shared by Basil, Julian and Gregory was that of persuading less religiously committed men to view their civic patriotic commitments in explicitly religious terms. After all, civic patriotism was a convenient way of uniting elites across religious lines, and not all desired to give it a more confessional stripe. The reaction to Julian's measures against Christian teachers exemplifies the disapproval that deliberately divisive efforts could arouse.[5] The following chapter will thus examine how far religious leaders were imagined as civic patriots, and (conversely) the extent to which secular elites could combine their roles as local patron and pious man of *paideia*. It will suggest that both Christianity and Neoplatonic paganism could convincingly integrate civic patriotism and religious obligation into a new model of elite leadership. Nonetheless, it will suggest this model remained a competing political language rather than a strictly hegemonic one, and that both secular civic patriotism and ascetic philosophical universalism continued to exist as alternative, legitimate political languages.

Transforming Religious Leaders into Civic Patriots

How could ascetic priests and philosophers be recast in the terms of civic patriotism? What sort of service could they offer their locality? Perhaps the most important service was propitiating the divine, particularly through prayer and sacrifice. For Julian, prayer was part of what elevated priests above magistrates, and he suggested that priests ought to be held in esteem as men who 'sacrifice and pray on behalf of all [προθύουσι γὰρ πάντων καὶ ὑπερεύχονται]'.[6] Elsewhere, he remarked on how 'the gods have assigned to priests the duty to honour them by their nobility of character and by the practice of virtue and by serving them as is fitting', specifically with reference to the preservation of the city.[7] Sacrifices and prayers were strongly linked in late-antique thought, with offers such as prayer, incense and good conduct understood by many as purer, spiritual form of sacrifice compared to the physical

[4] On the utility of the secular as a category, see Introduction p. 20.
[5] Amm. Marc. 22.10.7 (Seyfarth, Jacob-Karau, Ulmann 1978, 275), 25.4.20 (364). The precise details of the proposals are uncertain, and have generated significant scholarly debate: see Downey 1957; Bowersock 1978, 83–5; Banchich 1993, 6 n. 3 with bibliography; Elm 2012b, 139–43 and n. 174 with bibliography; McLynn 2014; Watts 2015, 113–15; Hughes 2018, 128–70; Vössing 2020. Some scholars maintain that the "school law" was not specifically aimed against Christians, but rather included non-Christians like the Cynics, or aimed more generally at imperial regeneration than persecution – see, for instance, Goulet 2008, 192–4; Carmon Hardy 1968. The first position does not alter the point that his measures were controversial. The second simply posits a false dichotomy of motives.
[6] Julian, *Ad Sacer.* 296C, cf. 288D–89A. Compare Plut., *Max. cum princ.*, 778F (Hubert 1957, 9). The public character of sacrifice is stressed particularly in Stroumsa 2005, 147–58 who links its decline with the decline of the πόλις.
[7] Julian, *Misop.* 362D. Compare the need for clean hands at *Ep.* 20 380A (*Ep.* 84a Bidez-Cumont).

act of slaughter.[8] This interpretation was not shared by Julian, however, who sought to revive the practice by framing it in specifically patriotic terms in his *Misopogon*.[9] Trying to shame his Antiochene interlocutors, he remarked on how at Daphne he had 'expected to enjoy the sight of your wealth and public spirit [τοῦ πλούτου καὶ τῆς φιλοτιμίας]',[10] but 'on your own behalf and on behalf of the city's welfare [ὑπὲρ δὲ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς σωτηρίας τῆς πόλεως] not one of the citizens offers a private sacrifice, nor does the city offer a public sacrifice, but only this priest.'[11] For 'I think it right for the city to sacrifice both privately and publicly [ἰδίᾳ καὶ δημοσίᾳ]'.[12] Julian's invocation of σωτηρία ('welfare', even 'salvation') and φιλοτιμία ('public spirit', 'love of honour') chimed with a close identification of private and public interest, and conveyed the message that all were responsible for maintaining divine favour and public morals. Although priests were the first line of defence against divine displeasure and social breakdown, the sacred was a matter of broader patriotic concern.

Gregory also employed this notion of prayer as a form of patriotic sacrifice. When he praised the governor Hellenius for honouring Basil and other priests, Gregory noted how that governor had honoured 'clean sacrifices' (καθαρὰς θυσίας) – meaning prayers and good deeds – along with 'the beloved fatherland' (πάτρην... φίλην).[13] In general, however, neither he nor Basil invoked patriotic reasons for criticising blood sacrifice,[14] though they did emphasise the patriotic context of prayer. When Basil petitioned the governor Modestus for exemption for local priests from taxation, he presented himself as 'striving earnestly for my country as a whole [ὑπὲρ πατρίδος πάσης ἀγωνιῶντι]'.[15] The local role that Basil envisaged for the priest here was as a carer for the poor, arguing that tax exemptions would make this job easier. But he also invoked 'the provision of many prayers on behalf of the imperial house', suggesting a broader ecumenical context for sacerdotal prayer.[16] Even when

[8] Bradbury 1995; Strousma 2009; Ullucci 2011, 137–49. For Iamblichus' attack on Porphyry's anti-sacrificial stance, see Shaw 1995, 153–61; Rives 2011, 276–77.
[9] Compare Sallustius, *De Deis et Mundo* 16 (Rochefort 1960, 20–1). For comment, see Bradbury 1995; Belayche 2002; for developments in the theology of sacrifice leading to this stance, see Rives 2011. Symmachus forms an interesting exception to the general pattern, though unlike Julian he sought rather to legitimise blood-sacrifice as a private form of worship – see Salzman 2011. Note now Gassman 2020, 6–8, 50–4 who argues for a ban on grain and incense offerings under Constantius II as well as blood-sacrifice and thus for a more religiously controversial policy on the part of Constantine and his successors.
[10] Julian, *Misop.* 361D; compare *Contra Cyn.* 185B–D.
[11] Julian, *Misop.* 362D.
[12] Julian, *Misop.* 363A.
[13] Gregory Nazianzus, *Carmina* 2.2.1, ll. 298–300 (PG 37.1472A–73A). On the context of this poem, see McLynn 2012.
[14] The notion that Christ's death formed a sacrificial offering, explaining why Christians were not required to sacrifice, was significant for both Basil and Gregory – see Thomas 2019, 56. For the historical background to Christian attitudes towards sacrifice, see Ferguson 1980; Stroumsa 2005, 103–43; Ullucci 2011.
[15] Basil, *Ep.* 104 (Courtonne 2.5). On Basil and exemptions, see Vogler 1992, 460–1; Gascou 1997. Julian had revoked clerical exemptions from curial service. Valentinian and Valens restored them, but emphasised that curials could not become clerics without nominating another man to take over their property and curial liabilities (*CTh* 12.1.59, 16.2.17), though later allowing exemptions to those who had been priests for ten years (*CTh* 16.2.19) – see Lenski 2003, 276 n. 76.
[16] Basil, *Ep.* 104 (Courtonne 2.5).

he wrote to the imperial official Aburgius, lauding him as φιλόπολις, prayer was the first service Basil mentioned: 'you who invoke blessings for the whole city in common and for each individual citizen, and not praying only [κοινῇ τε πάσῃ τῇ πόλει καὶ ἰδίᾳ ἑκάστῳ τὰ ἀγαθὰ συνευχόμενος, καὶ οὐκ εὐχόμενος μόνον]'.[17] Although the prayer here was personal, the intended beneficiaries were collective: principally, the city of Caesarea and its population.[18] Even when uttered by a non-cleric, prayers could be defined as a form of civic service.

As well as prayer and (potentially) sacrifice, religious leaders were urged to aid their localities by teaching public morals. This vision was reflected in Julian's writings on the Cynics.[19] These, as Arnaldo Marcone has argued, formed part of a campaign to eliminate religiously unacceptable philosophical positions among pagan intellectuals.[20] Accordingly, they fit a broader agenda of ensuring 'pagan orthodoxy' amongst philosophers.[21] Julian outlined his vision of how the true Cynic ought to act by contrasting the Cynics of his own time with a Neoplatonic account of how Cynics had acted in the past. According to this account, Diogenes and the Cynics had performed a public role by correcting abuses as true philosophers. 'They comprehended that man is by nature a social and political animal [φύσει κοινωνικὸν καὶ πολιτικὸν ζῷον]. And so they aided their fellow-citizens, not only with their examples but with their speeches too [τοὺς συμπολιτευομένους ὠφέλησαν οὐ τοῖς παραδείγμασι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς λόγοις].'[22] The mention of 'fellow citizens' (from συμπολιτεύω, 'have citizenship with') suggested a specifically local dimension to their obligations, emphasising that the Cynic's role was a local one.

This sense of local responsibility fitted with Julian's other attacks on the Cynics at Constantinople as men who had fled their local obligations, ambitious for success at the capital. 'Like [monks] you have abandoned your fatherland, you wander about everywhere [καταλελοίπατε τὴν πατρίδα ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνοι, περιφοιτᾶτε πάντῃ].'[23] Rather than leaving their πατρίδες and spreading disorder over the world, Julian suggested that the Cynics should have behaved as proper patriotic philosophers by staying at home and inspiring their fellow citizens.[24] Instead, Julian alleged, they had irresponsibly trampled on social *mores* (including by insulting him) in a vain quest for publicity,

---

[17] Basil, *Ep.* 96 (Courtonne 1.208).
[18] Compare *Ep.* 97 (Courtonne 1.210–11) to the city council of Tyana which urged them not to undermine him, citing the fact that prayer was only effective if voiced collectively (closely paraphrasing Matthew 18:20); see also *Ep.* 229.2 (Courtonne 3.35) for prayer and collective social activity.
[19] Iamblichus was probably influential on Julian here – for civic patriotism in the *Vita Pythagorica*, see 5–6 (Deubner and Klein 1975, 13–18), 9 (25–8). See further O'Meara 2003, 20–21, 24, 87–105; Dillon 2005, 11–12.
[20] Marcone 2012.
[21] Liebeschuetz 2012. Compare Wright 1980, 60–62.
[22] Julian, *Contr. Cyn.* 201C–D. Compare Basil's reference to the Cynic philosopher Maximus' activities (Basil, *Ep.* 9.3 (Courtonne 1.40)); see above, ch. 3 p. 76.
[23] Julian, *Contr. Herac.* 224C. See ch. 4 p. 91.
[24] See Wright 1980, 65–6. Compare Julian's praise of other patriotic philosophers at *Ep.* 47 434A (*Ep.* 111 Bidez-Cumont), *Ep.* 16 (*Ep.* 30 Bidez-Cumont, 36).

rather than actually seeking to improve the condition of society. 'Haunting cities and camps [περινοστεῖν τὰς πόλεις καὶ τὰ στρατόπεδα], slandering the best, and flattering the basest.'[25] Just before this passage, he had provided an exegesis of Dionysius' activity in civilising mortals, detailing the myth in which he had led them 'from the nomadic to a more civilised manner of life'.[26] The portrayal of the Cynics as spreaders of disorder was thus compounded by the suggestion that their peripatetic activity reversed the course of the civilising process.[27] Such men ought to correct civic manners rather than undermine them,[28] and not to mock the social order.[29] In all, this local emphasis portrayed the Cynic in very different terms compared to the image of the wandering philosopher Julian had endorsed in a part of his oration *Against the Cynic Heraclius*.[30] The ideal Cynic could thus be appropriated by rival political languages, with very different implications for how philosophers ought to actually behave.

In parallel with Julian's comments on the Cynics, civic patriotic language was adopted for the activity of priests and bishops. This is particularly evident in Basil's corpus. One notable instance comes in an early letter to the Pontic city of Neocaesarea on the death of its bishop Musonius.[31] In it, he portrayed Musonius as the ideal fusion of spiritual leader and secular potentate. Musonius had been 'a bulwark of his native land, an ornament of the churches, a pillar and foundation of the truth, a firm support of the faith of Christ [ἔρεισμα πατρίδος, Ἐκκλησιῶν κόσμος, στῦλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας, στερέωμα τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως]'.[32] 'Bulwark' (ἔρεισμα), 'ornament' (κόσμος), 'pillar' (στῦλος) and 'foundation' (ἑδραίωμα) are all familiar terms of praise from civic patriotic vocabulary,[33] and convincingly characterised Musonius as both spiritual and worldly patron of his people. Basil lamented that 'the magistrates [lack] their chief, the populace their patron, those in need their provider [οἱ ἐν τέλει τὸν ἔξαρχον, ὁ δῆμος τὸν προστάτην, οἱ βίου δεόμενοι τὸν τροφέα]'.[34] Portrayed as the vital internal force which kept the city whole and healthy, Musonius featured as the ideal spiritualised civic patriot, a man who both led his community in orthodoxy and glorified his locality. Crucially for his purposes, Basil emphasised how Musonius had also combated heresy, a legacy he urged the Neocaesareans to follow.[35]

---

[25] Julian, *Contr. Herac.* 223D.
[26] Julian, *Contr. Herac.* 221A–B; see above, ch. 4 pp. 94–5. For animus against nomads, see ch. 4 n. 87.
[27] Though the connection is not explicit, it is significant that all these tropes occur within a relatively short space of text.
[28] Julian, *Contr. Cyn.* 200C–D.
[29] Julian, *Contr. Cyn.* 202B–C.
[30] See ch. 3 pp. 75–6.
[31] Rousseau 1994, 155. Cf. *Ep.* 138.2 (Courtonne 2.56).
[32] Basil, *Ep.* 28.1 (Courtonne 1.66).
[33] Compare the language of Gregory's epigrams discussed in ch. 1 pp. 39–41, ch. 2 pp. 49–51, and pp. 131–2 below.
[34] Basil, *Ep.* 28.2 (Courtonne 1.68).
[35] For heresy destroying cities see among others Ep. 34 (Courtonne 1.77), Ep. 47 (1.127).

This form of civic patriotic language could also be used to reinforce Basil's episcopal networks beyond Cappadocia[36] Given that Basil himself had been brought up in neighbouring Pontus this flexibility suited him well. Particularly paradigmatic were Basil's remarks to Amphilochius the Younger, who had been elevated to the bishopric of Iconium in neighbouring Lycaonia.[37] Rather than playing down the importance of the earthly fatherland in his letter to this mobile young bishop, Basil emphasised it. 'She who nursed you nurtured you [ἡ θρεψαμένη] and brought you up to such a height of virtue does not possess you, but beholds her neighbour priding herself upon her own ornament [ἀλλὰ τὴν γείτονα ὁρᾷ τῷ ἰδίῳ κόσμῳ σεμνυνομένην].'[38] Employing the now-familiar language of ornamentation, Basil invoked the traditional paradigm of rivalry between different regions, as well as the image of the πατρίς as a nursing woman to be credited with the greatness of her charges. In many ways, it was a highly conventional description.

As such, one might expect it to provoke Basil's disapproval. But rather than emphasise the irrelevance of patriotic considerations in the face of the new universal Christian dispensation, Basil suggested that they were complementary. 'But since all who have placed their hopes in Christ are one people [εἷς λαὸς πάντες] and the followers of Christ are now one Church [μία Ἐκκλησία], even though He is called upon from various places, your fatherland both rejoices and is made happy by the dispensations of the Lord [χαίρει καὶ ἡ πατρὶς καὶ εὐφραίνεται ταῖς τοῦ Κυρίου οἰκονομίαις]'.[39] For 'she does not believe that she has lost one man, but that through one man she has acquired whole churches [ἀλλὰ δι᾽ ἑνὸς ἐκκλησίας ὅλας προσειληφέναι]'.[40] Basil invoked the trope familiar from discussions of elite movement in Chapter One and applied it to bishops, claiming that the πατρίς was glorified by the service of its elite even when they departed for other regions. As with his use of patriotic language in his descriptions of martyr cult and civic euergetism, Basil effectively redefined civic terms to suit his purposes.

In another, quite different text, the *Homily on Gordius* described Gordius fleeing the disorder and corruption of the city for the mountain where, like Elijah, he was purified by prayer and meditation, before returning to the city below to lead his fellow-citizens to salvation by bearing witness.[41] This paradigm had an autobiographical tinge. According to Gregory's funeral oration for

---

[36] Compare Basil, *Ep.* 102 (Courtonne 2.2–4), 228 (Courtonne 3.32–3).
[37] See Pouchet 1992, 407–9.
[38] Basil, *Ep.* 161.1 (Courtonne 2.93).
[39] Basil, *Ep.* 161.1 (Courtonne 2.93).
[40] Basil, *Ep.* 161.1 (Courtonne 2.93).
[41] Basil, *Hom. in Gord* 2–4 (PG 31.492C–500C). The portrayal here is strongly reminiscent of Platonic ideas of leadership, involving retreat, purification and return – see O'Meara 2003; though note the existence of differing paradigms of Christian leadership in Antiquity pointed out in Rubenson 2000. Compare Gregory of Nyssa's *Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus*, which portrayed the holy bishop and pivotal figure in the Cappadocian Church in similarly civic terms by drawing heavily on Iamblichus' *Pythagorean Life* – see Meredith 1984.

Basil, the latter's family had fled to their estates during the persecutions of the early fourth century. Basil himself had had his own period in ascetic retreat early in his career.[42] Basil's image of the ideal spiritual patriotic leader fitted his own biography, and he used this image of himself as a spiritual local patriot to identify attacks on himself as attacks on Caesarea.[43] Indeed, Basil even encouraged Gregory to see giving him support as a civic patriotic act,[44] rhetoric which the latter fully understood and later cynically dismissed as being in reality a grab for 'revenues and taxes'.[45] Nonetheless, at the time Gregory fell in line, encouraging others to aid Basil and 'our mother church, that of Caesarea'.[46]

Gregory largely upheld this image after Basil's death. Claiming intimacy with the now-famous bishop,[47] in his funeral oration for Basil Gregory emphasised Basil's civic credentials.[48] 'The city of Caesarea held him as a second founder and protector [ὥς τινα δεύτερον οἰκιστήν τε καὶ πολιοῦχον, literally a 'guardian deity'].'[49] Emphasising here his status as a 'second founder' (δεύτερος οἰκιστής) of the city, Gregory went on later to describe the Basileiados as a 'new city', acclaiming Basil in the time-honoured language of benefactors as new founders.[50] Gregory nonetheless balanced this description by noting Basil's service to the οἰκουμένη – 'and through the single city of Caesarea [Divine Providence] lit up the entire world [καὶ διὰ μιᾶς τῆς Καισαρέων πόλεως τῇ οἰκουμένῃ πάσῃ πυρσεύουσα]'.[51] Gregory's cycle of eleven epigrams on the death of Basil portrayed him as both a local and a universal hero. At his death 'not merely the whole of the Cappadocian city [Caesarea] groaned, but the world lamented loudly [πᾶσα δὲ Καππαδοκῶν ἐστονάχησε πόλις · οὐκ οἶον, κόσμος δὲ μέγ' ἴαχεν]', again unifying universal and local achievement.[52] Basil had been the 'great glory of Pontus and Cappadocia [Πόντου Καππαδοκῶν τε μέγα κλέος]',[53] and the 'great vaunt of Caesarea [Καισαρέων μέγ' ἄεισμα]'.[54]

---

[42] Gregory, *Or.* 43.6 (Bernardi 1992, 126–8).
[43] Basil, *Ep.* 59.1 (Courtonne 1.148), 59.3 (149).
[44] Basil, *Ep.* 71.2 (Courtonne 1.168).
[45] Gregory, *Vit. Sua* l. 462 (White 44).
[46] Gregory, *Ep.* 44.4 (Gallay 1.57).
[47] For friendship, see White 2002; McLynn 2009b. Gregory emphasised his closeness when he likened their meeting in Athens to the reunification of 'a river split from the one fountain of our fatherland' (*Or.* 43.15 (Bernardi 1992, 148)) and he and Basil being like one mind in two bodies (43.20 (164)). As Konstan notes, Gregory consciously included these elements in contrast to the earlier oration of Basil's brother Gregory of Nyssa, which had sought to present Basil as a detached figure worthy of the most austere saints of Christian tradition; see Konstan 2000, 165–6.
[48] See in addition Gregory, *Or.* 43.59 (Bernardi 1992, 252). For Basil as defender of ancient custom, see *Or.* 43.58 (Bernardi 1992, 248–50).
[49] Gregory, *Or.* 43.25 (Bernardi 1992, 182). For discussion of Basil as a second founder, see Van Dam 2003a, 91–2, 95–7.
[50] Gregory, *Or.* 43.63 (Bernardi 1992, 262).
[51] Gregory, *Or.* 43.25 (Bernardi 1992, 184). See also *Or.* 43.70–78 (Bernardi 1992, 282–98), where Gregory compared Basil to the great figures of the Old and New Testaments, and frequently used Basil's imperial prominence to assert his worthiness compared to such exempla. See also Gregory, *Or.* 13.2 (PG 35.833C).
[52] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.3 (Beckby 448).
[53] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.5 (Beckby 450).
[54] Gregory, *Anth. Pal.* 8.9 (Beckby 452).

Gregory's praise of Basil as a civic ornament echoed his other praises of bishops. Eusebius of Samosata was thus a 'column and support of the Church [στῦλον καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας], or a light in the world… a gift of God, or the pillar of his fatherland [ἢ πατρίδος ἔρεισμα]'.[55] Another such was 'Eupraxius, high priest of his holy country: I the great land Arianza contains his body [χώρης τῆσδ' ἱερῆς Εὐπράξιον ἀρχιερῆα ἥδ' Ἀριανζαίη χθὼν μεγάλη κατέχω]'.[56] At times, he fitted himself to this model. In his autobiography he stressed how the united populace of Constantinople had called for his elevation to the bishopric. Rephrasing their acclamations, he wrote of how to them 'it would be the first and greatest honour for the city… if I were to be appointed to that city's throne'.[57] In another place he referred to the Constantinopolitans' preference for his oratory because he was 'their own', an identification he encouraged in his poetry, with its emphatically emotional stress on his attachment to the city and his sense of desolation at being relegated to Cappadocian obscurity.[58]

Julian's treatment of bishops interestingly confirms the view that their role was often seen in civic patriotic terms. In a general missive to the cities, but addressed specifically to the citizens of Bostra, he urged them to expel their bishop and clergy as fomenters of discord in their congregations and amongst the people of the city in general.[59] Such men 'by their effronteries incite the populace to disorder [συνταράττειν] and revolt [στασιάζειν], whereby they both act with impiety towards the gods and disobey my edicts'.[60] Julian appealed to their sense of loyalty to the reputation of the citizens as a collective, urging them to reject a group who supposedly had traduced their good name.[61] In both cases, Julian cast Christians as irresponsible leaders, and dangerous for the health of the city generally. This was his justification for refusing an Alexandrian petition for the return of Athanasius. 'A meddlesome man is unfit by nature to represent the people [ἀνεπιτήδειος γὰρ φύσει προστατεύειν δήμου πολυπράγμων ἀνήρ]', as such a type of person threatened to introduce disorder.[62] In an edict to

---

[55] Gregory, *Ep.* 44.1 (Gallay 1.56). Gregory appealed to Eustathius to aid his and his father's push for Basil's election to the see of Caesarea, and the bishop obliged – see McGuckin 2001, 174–5; see further, Rousseau 1994, 147 n. 55, and on Basil's subsequent relationship with him 254–8. Compare also his description of the festivities upon the return of Athansasius to Alexandria in 366: 'with such a celebration that wondrous man regained his own city' (*Or.* 21.29 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1980, 172)).

[56] Gregory, *Anth. Pal*. 8.155 (Beckby 524). It is possible that this is the same Eupraxius referred to in Gregory, *Ep.* 65 (Gallay 1.84–5) (see PG 37.79D n. 1).

[57] Gregory, *Vit. sua* ll. 1374–6 (White 110).

[58] Gregory, *Or.* 36.3 (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 246). This highly emotional language has led many scholars to emphasise Gregory's unstable temperament and lack of suitability for the disappointments and intrigues of episcopal office, and in turn prompted a revisionist critique which views it as part of a conscious rhetorical strategy. Thus 'une âme hypersensible' in Bernardi 1995, 9; McGuckin 2001, passim; contrast Elm 2000, 414; generally the approach in McLynn 2009a. See also ch. 1 n. 105

[59] Julian, *Ep.* 41 437C (*Ep.* 114 Bidez-Cumont).

[60] Julian, *Ep.* 41 436B.

[61] Julian also here characterised the Christians generally as men suffering from madness, in line with the rhetoric of his letter discussing Christian teachers – see *Ep.* 36 424A–B (*Ep.* 42 Bidez-Cumont); discussion n. 5 above.

[62] Julian, *Ep.* 47 435C (*Ep.* 111 Bidez-Cumont).

the citizens of Byzacium restoring city councillors, he made this clear by picking out Christian deserters specifically, which encouraged its citizens to see local leadership and Christianity as incompatible.[63]

Nonetheless, the use of civic patriotic language was by no means a dominant theme in Gregory and Julian's writings about religious leadership. Correct belief (and to some extent correct practice) were theoretically universal through time and space, even if they were instantiated in particular localities at particular times. As a result, treatises on priestly conduct frequently paid little or no heed to civic patriotic ideals.[64] Gregory's single most important treatment of priesthood was his second oration, or his *Defence of his Flight to Pontus*. This treatise, running to some 117 chapters in its modern editions, was clearly much extended and revised for publication after its initial delivery at Nazianzus in 362/363.[65] Gregory cast his initial refusal to be ordained and minister to Nazianzus with his father in the finest classical terms of the philosophical *recusatio*.[66] This entailed refusing office in preference for educated contemplation, a refusal of power which paradoxically showcased one's aptitude for it. Yet, notably, Gregory did not invoke πατρίς once in the entire oration, neither to dismiss an argument that he had deserted it nor to affirm that his return came from a sense of duty to serve his locality.[67] This is the more surprising because Gregory had playfully accused Basil of having disparaged their common πατρίς in the seclusion of his ascetic retreat in Pontus. It thus seems probable that such accusations were levelled against his own conduct.[68] There are hints in his autobiography that this was the case, where he claimed that he had returned from Athens because 'my fatherland pulled me back (ἀνθεῖλκεν πατρίς)',[69] while later referring to his desire to live 'a life without ties and effortlessly become a citizen of every place [πολίτης ῥᾷστα ὢν παντὸς τόπου]',

[63] Julian, *Ep.* 39 380D–81A (*Ep.* 54 Bidez-Cumont). This was despite the fact that it was priests, not Christians in general, who were exempted from curial service.
[64] Compare also John Chrysostom, *De Sacerdotio*, which likewise ignores πατρίς beyond an unrelated mention in the *proem* – *De Sacerdotio* 1.1 (Malingrey 1980, 62) – and Gregory the Great, *Regula Pastoralis* which ignores *patria* besides a solitary reference to the Christian's heavenly abode (3.26 (PL 77.99B)). An exception is Ambrose's *De Officiis*, perhaps influenced by its Ciceronian model – see eg. 1.27 (46–7), 1.30 (52).
[65] The conventional dating of this oration is to Easter 362 (thus Bernardi 1968, 29–37), though Mossay 1964 suggests any time between 361 and 365 is possible. McGuckin 2001, 106–7 argues for the Easter 362 date, though suggests extensive revision took place after 382. Elm suggests that Gregory's flight was contemporary with Julian's passage through Cappadocia in spring 362, and thus the 'flight' was from his duty to defend the faith against a pagan emperor, rather than from his father's arbitrary ordination of him, delaying the piece's delivery to 363 – Elm 2012b, 153–8.
[66] Mossay 1964, 177.
[67] This would amplify the suggestion of various scholars that the oration in present form was intended for ecumenical rather than local consumption: thus Elm 2012, 154; contrast Bernardi 1968, 30–5 for whom the local ascetic audiences were primary.
[68] Gregory, *Ep.* 2.2 (Gallay 1.2), *Ep.* 4.1 (Gallay 1.3). Moreover, he placed this exchange of letters at the forefront of his letter collection, asserting the significance of this theme in his relations with Basil.
[69] Gregory, *Vit. sua* ll. 259–61 (White 28).

which was frustrated when Basil 'forced me onto a bishop's throne'.[70] By implication, Gregory's model of the 'citizen of every place' was a man removed from concrete ties to a specific locale and duties, with the bishop (conversely) a more locally grounded creature – who might be expected to possess patriotic ties.[71] The second oration's indifference to the claims of πατρίς nonetheless stands in stark contrast to Basil's suggestion of his own patriotic credentials as a spiritual leader.

Intriguingly, Julian's own meditations on the role of the priest are similarly disinterested in πατρίς. That was not for want of emphasis elsewhere on the ancient character of traditional cult, the duty to obey the ritual prescriptions of the ancestors, or the view that priests were vital for the health of their cities.[72] Nonetheless, Julian's *Letter to a Priest* was consciously imperial in scope. Priests were members of a hierarchy at whose head Julian stood as *pontifex maximus*, whose sacrifices, prayers and charitable giving would guide the populace back to true religion and ensure divine favour.[73] Julian went further in recommending a semi-standardised set of beliefs and practices. Priests were to honour images, precincts and altars (296B), preach (299B), pray (and possibly 'sacrifice' though this may just refer to the sacrifice of prayer or incense)[74] at dawn and dusk (302A–B), read certain texts and avoid others (300C–301D), memorise 'the hymns in honour of the gods' (301D), avoid society, magistrates, and busy places in favour of remaining within the temple to practise philosophy when not performing ritual (300D), wear humble clothing when not officiating (303B–C), avoid theatres, games with women present and wild beast shows (304B–D), and perform charity to win converts (305B–C). High priests were to inspect their subordinates to make sure these duties were performed as prescribed (298C). Creating what some commentators have termed a 'pagan church' by reason of its organisation and prescriptions of doctrinal and liturgical uniformity was, if not an anti-local move, one which certain sought to impose a measure of uniformity across local contexts.[75] Priests were to be recruited from 'the best and most god-loving inhabitants of the cities, and then the most humane [τοὺς ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι βελτίστους καὶ μάλιστα μὲν φιλοθεωτάτους, ἔπειτα φιλανθρωποτάτους]', implying an expectation that men would serve in their local cities.[76] Nonetheless, in Julian's letter their role was to be nodes in a wider imperial network, rather than servants of their particular cities for their own sake.[77]

---

[70] Gregory, *Vit. sua* ll. 421–4 (White 40). Compare his forceful assertion that, 'I did not abandon the throne of my beloved father' but rather God wanted 'me to reveal the Word and the Spirit to others, to rugged, foreign and thorn-bearing lands' (Gregory, *Carm.* 2.1.19 ll. 51, 57–8 (White 158)).
[71] Cf. McGuckin 2001, 100–1.
[72] Hence the need to qualify Mitchell's otherwise perceptive observation that Julian's programme was relatively indifferent to civic patriotism – Mitchell 1993, 91.
[73] Julian, *Ad Sacer.* 298C.
[74] Though note Sallustius' affirmation that prayers without sacrifices are mere words (*De Deis et Mundo* 16 (Rochefort 1960, 21)).
[75] See discussion at ch. 5 n. 127.
[76] Julian, *Ad Sacer.* 305A.
[77] Compare the description of the ideal city in Julian, *Contr. Cyn.* 186D, which details how the priests expel all impurity and evil conduct.

In concentrating on the duties of the priest without reference to patriotic obligation, Julian like Gregory offered a more universally applicable model of hieratic function, despite the roots of his thought in a more locally focused theology. In this, Julian had more common with Gregory than either did with Basil, for whom priesthood was a more patriotic and locally grounded office. It was the priest's ascetic, philosophical character that set him apart from the locality for both Julian and Gregory. Even if both knew that priesthood was a local patriotic responsibility in practice, both believed that the first task of the priest was engagement with a divinity and philosophy that was not bound by the limits of place.[78]

Gregory's own career provides evidence that civic patriotic language, and its expectations that men respect their local ties, could be problematic for the ambitious philosopher. After all, he was forced from the see of Constantinople in 381 on the basis of his having been bishop both of Sasima and of Nazianzus, claims whose relevance he vigorously attempted to rebut in his autobiography.[79] Yet even while bishop of Constantinople, Gregory frequently distanced himself from patriotic ties to Nazianzus. Perhaps his most vigorous outburst came in his *Oration Against the Arians and on Himself*, given while bishop of Constantinople.[80] The Arians of Constantinople, Gregory claimed, accused him of being a provincial nobody.[81] '"Your city", they say, "is small, and not a city at all, but a dry, unpleasant, and sparsely populated country neighbourhood."'[82] In response, Gregory rejected the assumption of urban superiority behind the Constantinopolitans' attacks, defying rather than redefining civic patriotic terms.[83] Proclaiming that 'earthly fatherlands and these lineages are the play-acting of temporal life', Gregory mocked his interlocutors further, arguing that their esteem for the earthly city and its amenities was to honour a mere 'tent' (σκηνή).[84] Indeed, it was one which one that bordered on blasphemy.

> I have dared something on these matters, I have found God to be an advocate of my rusticity [Θεὸν εὗρον τῆς ἐμῆς ἀγροικίας συνήγορον]. I will pattern myself after Bethlehem, I will

[78] It is possible also that both assumed a readership interested in general meditations on priesthood might also regard patriotic considerations as secondary.
[79] See Introduction n. 84.
[80] Bernardi, in view of the oration's addresses to the Arians of Constantinople, suggests that it therefore would not have been delivered to Gregory's Nicene congregation, but was rather circulated solely in manuscript form: Bernardi 1968, 166. If Gregory's enemies' accusations were known to his congregation, however, it would have made perfect sense for Gregory to refute them in his own church.
[81] Bernardi 1968, 168–9; McLynn 2010a, 223. McGuckin 2001, 240 accuses the Constantinopolitans of 'inbuilt racist xenophobia'. Compare also Socr. 5.7 (Hansen 1995, 278). As Elm remarks, Gregory's self-presentation drew on a classical *topos* of a great man from a small town, used by Plutarch, Aristides and Galen – see Elm 2012b, 20–21 with bibliography. However, Gregory developed these tropes in a markedly more antagonistic way than in the examples Elm provides.
[82] Gregory, *Or*. 33.6 (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 168).
[83] Cf. his emphasis on his philosophical credentials at Gregory *Or*. 33.9 (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 175), 36.3 (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 246).
[84] Gregory, *Or*. 33.12 (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 182), cf. *Or*. 14.21 (PG 35.884C).

> dishonour myself with the manger, through which you dishonour God – how astonishing, if you despise the herald [Christ] for this same reason?[85]

Honouring men on the basis of their city, Gregory suggested, was to endorse a principle inimical to Christianity itself, given the choice of Bethlehem for the Incarnation, and the humble origins of many other religious luminaries.[86] 'Samuel's Arimathea also deceived me, the little fatherland of a great man, not dishonouring the prophet, for it became more honourable from him rather than him from it [ἡ μικρὰ τοῦ μεγάλου πατρὶς, οὐκ ἀτιμάσασα τὸν προφήτην, οὐδὲ παρ' ἑαυτῆς μᾶλλον, ἢ παρ' ἐκείνου γενομένη τιμιωτέρα].'[87] Samuel, critically, despite his humble origins 'anointed kings and priests, and judged those from famous cities [κρίνειν τοὺς ἐκ τῶν λαμπρῶν πόλεων]' – an unmistakable warning to his Constantinopolitan critics.[88] Inviting his audience to dismiss their patriotic assumptions, according to which a city might be glorious through physical amenities or great secular personages, Gregory rather affirmed the priority of true philosophy, after which honouring the πατρίς came a distant second. Nonetheless, it is striking that Gregory found a way to turn traditional civic patriotic rhetoric to his own advantage by presenting a pose of radical rejection. And while this pose, as the Cynics show, was not exclusively Christian in late Antiquity, many elements of Christian theology, morality and organisation made it particularly congenial.

Another, slightly earlier example of this layered engagement with patriotic rhetoric came in Gregory's engagement with Maximus the Cynic. Maximus, as outlined in Chapter Three, was a Christian Cynic philosopher from Alexandria who had initially been ally Gregory's ally at Constantinople – before Maximus had then sought to gain the episcopal throne of the city for himself.[89] Before this controversy, however, Gregory had cemented their (temporary) alliance by giving an oration on Maximus's behalf which praising him as a true philosopher.[90]

---

[85] Gregory, *Or*. 33.10 (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 178).
[86] Bethlehem was referred to in several places by Gregory as exemplifying God's glory in choosing a small insignificant place to serve as a key point in salvation history: see *Or*. 3.6 (Bernardi 1978, 248–50), 18.17 (PG 35.1005B), 38.17 (Moreschini and Gallay 1990, 142–4), *Anth. Pal.* 8.21 (Beckby 458). See further, Cerroni 2020.
[87] Gregory, *Or*. 33.10 (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 176). It is perhaps not coincidental that Gregory likened himself to Samuel in his poetry: Gregory *Carm.* 2.1.1 ll. 424–38 (PG 37.1061A–62A), *Vit. sua* ll. 68–80 (White 14–16). The Byzantine hagiographer Gregory the Presbyter in his *Life* of Gregory Nazianzus says much the same of Gregory Nazianzus' ennobling of his home town by his birth there: Efthymiadis 2006, 246.
[88] Gregory, *Or*. 33.10 (Moreschini and Gallay 1985, 176).
[89] See ch. 3 n. 11.
[90] As Daunton-Fear points out, it is interesting that Gregory did not choose to revise this oration with the addition of sarcastic comments despite his subsequent conflict with the Alexandrian, suggesting that its current text (and those of his other extant orations) may actually resemble what was delivered – Daunton-Fear 2017. Gregory also expresses more reservations about Cynicism's pagan heritage in this oration than elsewhere – see Snee 1981, 17–18.

Gregory opened by describing the philosophical vocation in general: in particular, true philosophy was 'through words to serve zealously the Word [διά λόγου πρὸς Λόγον σπεύδοντες]'.[91] Nonetheless, Gregory needed to justify the intrusion of Maximus and his Egyptian allies into Constantinople's internal ecclesiastical politics.[92] For this purpose, Gregory invoked the paradigm of the 'citizen of the world'. Maximus was 'a citizen, by wisdom, of the entire world (for the Cynic does not hold himself enclosed by petty borders) [πολίτης δὲ, σοφίᾳ μὲν, τῆς οἰκουμένης ἁπάσης (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀνέχεται μικροῖς ὅροις Κυνικὴ περιγράφεσθαι)]'. Going on, Gregory detailed his Alexandrian pedigree: 'but by body, [a citizen] of the city of Alexandria, which is numbered with you [Constantinople] or just after you [σώματι δὲ, τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων πόλεως, τῆς σὺν ὑμῖν, ἢ μεθ' ὑμᾶς εὐθέως ἀριθμουμένης]'.[93] Several elements recall Gregory's other statements on philosophical heavenly citizenship – refusing the claims of a πατρίς 'bound… by petty borders' (μικροῖς ὅροις… περιγράφεσθαι) and making universal citizenship dependant on 'wisdom' (σοφία) explicitly opposed to the 'body' (σῶμα). But Gregory nonetheless did praise Alexandria as 'numbered with you or just after you' (τῆς σὺν ὑμῖν, ἢ μεθ' ὑμᾶς εὐθέως ἀριθμουμένης), even after suggesting that such praise didn't matter to a Cynic. Elevating Alexandria meant implicitly rebutting any notion that Maximus' movement was due to ambition: he could have satisfied that in the noble city of his origin.

Yet Gregory also subverted these familiar ideas. Later in the same oration, Gregory praised Maximus for having left the confines of his πατρίς to teach others in need. Inverting the civic patriotic trope (employed by Julian of Heraclius) that wandering indicated insatiable ambition and personal instability, Gregory suggested that it rather showed Maximus' exceptional generosity and willingness to suffer for his faith.[94] 'You are exiled from your fatherland [τῆς πατρίδος ὑπερορίζῃ] … so that others might learn piety through you [ἵνα καὶ ἄλλοι παιδευθῶσι διὰ σοῦ τὴν εὐσέβειαν]'.[95] In a classically Skinnerian fashion, Gregory employed a number of different rationales in order to advance his case – a civic patriotic argument about the prestige of Maximus' home city of Alexandria, a more anti-localist Cynic and Christian criticism of the limited nature of the earthly πατρίς, and a more radical subversion of traditional tropes about wandering as indicative of personal instability. That these arguments were not necessarily consistent did not matter – rather, they provided Gregory with a variety of ways of appealing to the potentially varied preferences and outlooks of his audience. Indeed, Gregory would go

[91] Gregory *Or.* 25.1 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1981, 156).
[92] This was the probable reason for preaching homilies in praise of Athanasius (*Or.* 21), on the arrival of the Egyptians into the city in 380 (*Or.* 34, which used a similar rubric of praising the subjects' πατρίς in order to glorify them and justify their leaving of it), and his subsequent bitterness against them in his autobiography (*Vit. sua* ll. 575–8 (White 52–4), 887–97 (76–8)). McGuckin 2001, 312.
[93] Gregory, *Or.* 25.3 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1981, 162).
[94] See Snee 1981, 15
[95] Gregory, *Or.* 25.14 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1981, 188), cf. *Vit. sua* ll. 976–8 (White 82). Contrast Gregory's encomium of Athanasius, which attacked Bishop George the Cappadocian as man who 'exchanged one country and city for another like a fugitive, intent on evil for the entire Church in common he seized Alexandria like an Egyptian plague': *Or*. 21.16 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1980, 142).

on to use precisely these negative tropes about wandering to attack Maximus in his autobiography.[96] Civic patriotism was thus only one of a selection of political languages on offer, albeit a significant one.

As for Julian, so too for Gregory, the Cynic was an ambiguously patriotic figure. By the nature of their renunciation of the world, pursuit of higher truth and peripatetic habits, Cynics could be awkward to describe in civic patriotic terms. In this respect, they posed a similar problem to priests. Though both might offer benefits through guidance, prayer and sacrifice for their πατρίδες, their philosophical credentials required them to view civic patriotic ties as a worldly distraction. This common ambiguity underscores the fundamental similarities in how Gregory and Julian conceived of the philosopher's role, whether that philosopher was a private Cynic or a consecrated priest. Reconciling the patriotic expectations that priests would serve their locality with the contrasting expectation that they view these ties as ephemeral was a common problem, and required negotiating between and even trying to fuse two political languages. Both Julian and Gregory therefore alternately used civic patriotic and philosophical ascetic languages.

Perhaps surprisingly, Gregory and Julian's writings on philosophy and priesthood embody tensions between local and universal far more explicitly than do Basil's – who was often content to view the priest as a local leader. This chimes with his greater willingness to make martyrs into local spiritual patrons. Had Basil not become bishop in Cappadocia or Pontus, it possible he would have faced the same criticisms as had Gregory – and thus been moved to expound a more universalist, anti-local model of priesthood. Even in cases like Amphilochius', however, we have seen that he adapted civic patriotic language for extra-πατρίς priestly service. This consideration suggests that, although there were stronger theological pressures within Christianity against the use of civic patriotic language than in Julian's Neoplatonic pagan religion, they did not produce uniform outcomes. Christians and pagans alike felt the need to balance ascetic philosophical and civic patriotic languages when describing the roles of philosophers and priests, or could prefer one over the other entirely.

Justifying Traditional Patriotism in Religious Terms

Yet Basil, Julian and Gregory did not merely encourage religious officials to see their vocation in civic terms. Secular officials, both local and imperial, were also urged to view their civic patriotism as fulfilling their spiritual obligations. Julian, for instance, portrayed the monarch in his second panegyric on Constantius II as a divinely guided leader nonetheless deeply invested in the protection of his πατρίς. When discussing the ideal ruler in his second oration praising Constantius, Julian made clear the bond between leadership, religion, localism and family. The king 'looks upon the fatherland

[96] Gregory, *Vit. sua* ll. 773–7 (White 68–70), 807–8 (70–72), 999–1000 (84).

as the common hearth and mother of all [ὑπολαμβάνει γὰρ ἁπάντων εἶναι τὴν πατρίδα κοινὴν ἑστίαν καὶ μητέρα], older and more reverend than his parents and more precious than brothers or guest-friends or comrades'.[97] Proclaiming the pre-eminence of the πατρίς over other ties by virtue of its age and emotional bond, Julian detailed how obligation to it took on a sacral character. Indeed, the ruler 'regards it as a greater impiety [μεῖζον ἀσέβημα] to defraud or do violence to her laws than sacrilegious robbery of money that belongs to the gods'.[98] Though the πατρίς here was the Roman Empire, the conclusions were easily applicable to a local level. Indeed, the application of Homeric language and ideas throughout the oration gave imperial power itself a civic patriotic cast.[99] One might fairly ask how far references to the gods were explicitly pagan as opposed to merely conventional. Although the oration was addressed to Constantius, which might suggest a more consensual reading, scholars are divided over whether it was actually given.[100] Its thoroughly Homeric set of references and (probable) late date, moreover, suggest that Julian intended something more than a vague, consensual view that piety was necessary for a ruler. Instead, they suggest a more consciously pagan vision.

A more explicitly pagan version of this model of the royal patriot came in Julian's *Hymn to King Helios*. 'And further may [Helios] preserve for the whole city the eternity allowed to it, acting as a chorus leader in good faith [καὶ ἔτι κοινῇ μὲν τῇ πόλει τὴν ἐνδεχομένην ἀϊδιότητα μετ᾽ εὐνοίας χορηγῶν φυλάττοι].'[101] Julian's reference to 'leading the chorus' recalls the Platonic view (shared by Christians) of the heavens as a harmonious system of spheres that moved in accordance with the first principle, thus directly invoking Helios both as center of the cosmos and as preserver of Rome, the eternal, divinely-appointed center of empire.[102] Julian prayed to Helios to help him 'live and serve as a citizen in the state with my life [ἐμπολιτευέσθαι τῷ βιῷ], so long as it is pleasing to himself and well for me and beneficial for the affairs of the Romans [τοῖς κοινοῖς Ῥωμαίων συμφέρον πράγμασιν].'[103] Such a model of religious rule was civic patriotic at its core, and applied equally whether one's πατρίς was Rome or one's local city. Similarly, in his *Letter to the Athenians*, Julian invoked the gods as witnesses to his promises to aid the city, asking them to inspire him with devotion for Athens.[104] In both the cases of Athens and Rome, Julian presented himself as attached by patriotic sentiment to the

[97] Julian, *In Const. II* 89A. Some manuscripts give 'parents and loved ones.'
[98] Julian, *In Const. II* 89A. Drake highlights the oration's model of a pious pagan monarch, though warns that without the benefit of hindsight it would not have been obviously pagan to Julian's contemporaries: Drake 2012, 42.
[99] See ch. 2 p. 58–9.
[100] Given the mention of 'sacrilegious robbery' and impiety against the laws, however, there may be an ironic comment on the Constantinians' spoliation of temple treasures here. For the view that the oration was an allusive attack on Constantius, see Curta 1995; while Drake 2012, agrees that it was critical (and even parodic), he suggests that it might never have been published.
[101] Julian, *In Sol.* 157A–B.
[102] For a summary, see Heyning 2017, 38–71.
[103] Julian, *In Sol.* 157B.
[104] Julian, *Ep. ad Ath.* 287D.

cities' wellbeing, and blended that sentiment with his religious duties. As emperor, Julian sought to fashion a model of leadership which founded patriotic obligation 'to serve as a citizen [ἐμπολιτεύεσθαι]' on religious sentiment – a model which he expected his subordinates to emulate.

The appeal of this model of pious patriotic leadership is attested by Gregory's own adoption of it. As I argued in Chapter Three, it suited Gregory in some places to stress his family's philosophical credentials by refusing the 'law of encomium' that dictated that one should praise an individual's πατρίς, which in his sister Gorgonia's case widened into a broader attack on the very notion of earthly fatherland itself.[105] With his brother Caesarius, however, Gregory more straightforwardly embraced civic patriotic language, but attempted to redefine it so as to merge the political languages of ascetic philosophy and civic patriotism.[106] Complementing the portrayal in his epigrams,[107] Gregory's encomium further celebrated Caesrius as a local patriot, who recognised 'the need of his fatherland' [τῇ πατρίδι τὸ χρέος]', accepting the call of family and πατρίς despite the acclaim he received at court.[108]

Here, Gregory was walking an intellectual tightrope. On the one hand, Gregory was aware that men had criticised the fact that Caesarius had pursued a career at Constantinople and the imperial court at all, particularly during the reign of an apostate, as he related to his brother in a letter written under Julian.[109] 'Now [they say] the son of a bishop serves in the army, now he reaches for external power and glory [τῆς ἔξωθεν δυναστείας καὶ δόξης], now he is overcome by money, when conflagration consumes public affairs and men take flight for their souls.'[110] Caesarius, these critics alleged, had forgotten that Heavenly glory was the only sort worth having – as opposed to the 'outward' (ἔξωθεν) rewards of wealth and status. Yet one suspects that Gregory knew that there were voices within Cappadocia who would expect a more conventionally patriotic presentation of Caesarius' career, which would in turn reflect positively on his family.

Gregory thus attempted to combine both positions, suggesting that Caesarius was a model of secular Christian leadership. During his studies in Alexandria, Gregory proclaimed, Caesarius had been an ideal student and Cappadocian. 'Who more than he fled the crowd and the society of the wicked? Who indeed more than he joined himself instead to the company of the blessed, and to others of his country who were the best-reputed and most distinguished [ἄλλοις τε καὶ τῶν ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος

---

[105] On encomium, see ch. 3 n. 51; Gorgonia ch. 3 pp. 71–3. Cf. Gregory, *Or.* 8.3 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 250), Basil *Hom. in Gord.* 2 (PG 31.492C).
[106] Gregory however did not praise Caesarius' πατρίς, consistent with his other disavowals.
[107] See above, ch. 1 pp. 40–1. On the oration, see Van Dam 2003b, 62–3.
[108] Gregory, *Or.* 7.9 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 200).
[109] For the controversy this caused at Nazianzus, see Bernardi 1978, 30; McGuckin 2001, 115–16; Elm 2012b, 152. Caesarius seems to have made at least three trips between court and country, leaving the court for Nazianzus before rejoining it under both Constantius and Julian.
[110] Gregory, *Ep.* 7.3 (Gallay 1.9).

τοῖς εὐδοκιμωτάτοις καὶ γνωριμωτάτοις]?'[111] Going to Constantinople after completing his education, Caesarius had amply proved his worth, but had nonetheless returned to Cappadocia in answer to his mother's prayers, despite being offered a seat in the Senate.[112] This, Gregory suggested, also proved his patriotic concern: 'he was journeying to his own city, that he might share with others the goods of his education'.[113] Leaving one's πατρίς for the purposes of study was wholly compatible with patriotic duty – provided of course that one returned.[114] 'Even when Caesarius resumed his career at court, Gregory claimed, this was with patriotic motives in mind: 'desiring glory and to represent the city [δόξης ἐπιθυμία καὶ τοῦ προστατεῖν τῆς πόλεως], as he persuaded me'.[115] The claim that Caesarius went 'to represent the city [προστατεῖν τῆς πόλεως]' was an ideological figleaf for Caesarius' pursuit of an imperial career, but it complemented Gregory's portrayal of other prominent Cappadocians like Sophronius as imperial civic patriots.[116] Caesarius' ambition was thus anything but improper. Not only was it spurred by his love for his city, but it was mitigated by his love of philosophy, 'for to such a one philosophy was the greatest thing [φιλοσοφεῖν μὲν γὰρ ὅσῳ μέγιστον]'.[117] Philosophy, as Gregory later elaborated in his oration to Maximus, was identical with truth, and thus with Christianity.[118] Neither, Gregory related, had Caesarius compromised his faith under Julian, instead preferring to return when the emperor's policies became more intolerant.[119] In summary, therefore, Caesarius combined piety, learning, imperial glory and patriotism, in a manner perfectly befitting a civic patriot, a bishop's son and a successful member of the new aristocracy of service. It was a tour de force in blending the political languages of civic patriotism, imperial service and philosophical asceticism – albeit at the level of brilliantly realised rhetoric, rather than by completing integrating these conflicting ideas.

---

[111] Gregory, *Or.* 7.6 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 192).
[112] Gregory, *Or.* 7.8 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 198).
[113] Gregory, *Or.* 7.8 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 196). Compare Basil, *Ep.* 8.1 (Courtonne 1.23), assigned by Forlin Patrucco and other commentators to Evagrius Ponticus based on internal and manuscript evidence (Forlin Patrucco 1983, 296–7), but which opens by defending the writer's absence from his πατρίς on the basis of the theological education he is acquiring which can subsequently be used to assist the spiritual life of his homeland. Evagrius was himself a pupil of Gregory Nazianzus.
[114] Cf Gregory's account of his own education in Athens. For the paradigm as applied to Christian elites, see Rubenson 2000, who notes that it was sometimes controversial.
[115] Gregory, *Or.* 7.9 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 200). An alternative reading supported by two of the manuscripts is προστατεύειν ('to have authority over' or 'to guard') instead of προστατεῖν but the latter fits the context and the existing manuscript evidence better – Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 201 n. 4. One may compare Basil's Ep. 26.1 to Caesarius, which similarly complimented Caesarius as a benefactor (Courtonne 1.63).
[116] See ch. 1 pp. 38–41.
[117] Gregory, *Or.* 7.9 (Calvet-Sebasti 1995, 202).
[118] Gregory, *Or.* 25.1 (Mossay and Lafontaine 1981, 156). Compare ch. 4 p. 100.
[119] As detailed above, Caesarius stayed at court rather too long for the taste of some of Nazianzus' Christians. Elm suggests that Caesarius remained there perhaps through to late spring 363: Elm 2012, 337 n. 5. See McGuckin's view that Caesarius is one of the courtiers mentioned at *Or.* 4.85 (McGuckin 2001, 116), and the wider suggestion that it was Caesarius from whom Gregory acquired much of the information that went into the composition of his invectives (Elm 2012, 273).

Basil shared this view of the importance of piety for a prospective ruler, and evinced similar enthusiasm for the defining civic patriotic language of service to the πόλις with reference to religious obligations derived from Scripture. Indeed, Basil's integration of the language of civic patriotism with that of philosophical asceticism was rather more theorised than Gregory's. This was amply demonstrated in his appeal to Sophronius on behalf of an ex-governor of Cappadocia, Elias. Praising Elias' character, he remarked on how 'we are all (the entire people) dejected [πανδημεὶ πάντες σκυθρωπάζομεν] at having been deprived of a governor who alone is able to raise again our city [τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν ἀνορθῶσαι], which had lately been brought to its knees.'[120] Invoking the familiar trope of the city 'on its knees' (εἰς γόνυ κλιθεῖσαν), Basil gave a veritable shopping list of the governor's virtuous actions - and 'greatest of all, he was restoring the affairs of the Christians to their former honour'.[121] Favour to Christianity was complementary with ensuring peace, law and order and social peace, and thus dovetailed with the governor's other duties. It was conceived specifically in terms of Cappadocia's patriotic interest.[122] Urging Sophronius that, 'you should feel grateful to him as the benefactor of the land that bore you [εὐεργέτῃ τῆς ἐνεγκούσης]',[123] Basil asked him to view his petition as that of 'your whole country through our one voice [πᾶσαν οἵου τὴν πατρίδα διὰ μιᾶς τῆς ἡμετέρας φωνῆς]', and to recommend Elias to the emperor in consequence.[124] Again emphasising the unity with which his countrymen acted, Basil also positioned himself as their single representative, advancing his own authority. Elsewhere, Basil praised the Christian concern of other magistrates such as the local elite of Nicopolis,[125] and complimented the Beroeans on 'the concord of the whole people [τοῦ δήμου παντὸς τὴν συμφωνίαν], and the greatness of the customs of those who rule the city and administer its government, as well as their sincere piety toward God', which was a credit to the church there.[126]

Basil went further than merely redefining service to the πατρίς as pious behaviour by magistrates, or in suggesting that civic patriotic language's emphasis on concord meant an abhorrence of heresy. Rather, Basil at times grounded his use of civic patriotism in explicit theological reflection. In a letter to a tax assessor, Basil referred to his powers of patronage, asking him to help 'since God has called you to an office which affords opportunities of displaying kindness [ἐκάλεσέ σε ὁ Θεὸς εἰς

[120] Basil, *Ep.* 96 (Courtonne 1.209).
[121] Basil, *Ep.* 96 (Courtonne 1.209). This may be a reference to the restoration of privileges lost under Julian.
[122] Compare Basil's disingenuous remarks to the governor Demosthenes (PLRE 1.249 (Demosthenes 2)), whom Basil elsewhere dubbed a 'fat sea-monster' (*Ep.* 231 (Courtonne 3.37)), proclaiming his gladness that a Christian and a moral man had been entrusted with the administration of the πατρίς: Basil, *Ep.* 225 (Courtonne 3.21).
[123] Basil, *Ep.* 96 (Courtonne 1.209).
[124] Basil, *Ep.* 96 (Courtonne 1.209).
[125] Basil, *Ep.* 228 (Courtonne 3.32); compare *Ep.* 230 (Courtonne 3.35–6) to the same, emphasising that though the bishops administer the Church, they require lay support to be effective.
[126] Basil, *Ep.* 220 (Courtonne 3.3), compare *Ep.* 183 (Courtonne 2.117–18) to the magistrates of Samosata, more critically *Ep.* 210.3 (Courtonne 2.191–2) to 'the most learned' in Pontic Neocaesarea.

πρᾶγμα φιλανθρωπίας ἐπίδειξιν ἔχον], one through which it is possible to set upright again our fatherland now completely levelled with the earth [διορθωθῆναι ἡμῶν τὴν πατρίδα παντελῶς ἐδαφισθεῖσαν].'[127] Invoking both the need to raise 'our fatherland' (ἡμῶν τὴν πατρίδα) and claiming his correspondent had received his office as a result of God's favour, Basil made clear that the Christian's duty was to his πατρίς. Yet this appeal was indistinguishable in its objective from Basil's other secular patriotic invocations – the object of Basil's petition was another member of the elite, whose property he requested the *censitor* to oversee as if it were Basil's own. The contrast with the rejection of πατρίς as a distraction from God in his homilies and ascetic works is striking.

Yet it was in his letter to Sophronius where Basil fully fleshed out a Christian rationale for civic patriotic language. Basil appealed for his favour when asking for support for a slandered friend:

> And still more I have received from my God the commandment of love [καὶ ἔτι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ μου λαβεῖν τὴν ἐντολὴν τῆς ἀγάπης] in which I am your debtor, not only in accordance with human nature in general, but also because I recognise you in particular as a benefactor both of myself and of my country [οὐ μόνον κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων φύσιν, ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι καὶ ἰδίως εὐεργέτην σε γνωρίζω ἐμαυτοῦ τε καὶ τῆς πατρίδος].[128]

Basil invoked 'the commandment of love' (τὴν ἐντολὴν τῆς ἀγάπης) familiar from the Old and New Testaments in the form 'love your neighbour as yourself',[129] explicitly contrasting 'general' (κοινόν) and 'particular' (ἰδίως) obligations. Yet while Luke's Gospel had glossed 'neighbour' (πλησίον) as anyone in need through the parable of the Good Samaritan (a universalism reflected in Jesus' other pronouncements) Basil here used the Scriptural 'commandment of love' to justify a more restricted, reciprocal obligation to friends and countrymen.[130] Basil's hailing of Sophronius with the classic patriotic title 'benefactor' (εὐεργέτης) cemented the union of localist ideology and Christian obligation. In all, this marriage of πατρίς and ἀγάπη offered to Sophronius a way of behaving both as a patriotic worthy and a Christian aristocrat, and which justified essentially secular favours to elites and intervention for one's city in explicitly Christian terms.[131] Basil employed this logic of reciprocity in other comments on friendship. Writing to the philosopher Maximus, he somewhat playfully praised

---

[127] Basil, *Ep.* 83 (Courtonne 1.186), compare *Ep.* 65 (156), 75 (177), 76 (179) (cf. ch. 1 pp. 28–9).
[128] Basil, *Ep.* 272.3 (Courtonne 3.146).
[129] For examples of relevant biblical injunctions to loving one's neighbour, see Leviticus 19:18, Mark 12:29–31, Matthew 22:37–40, Matthew 19:18–19, Luke 10:25–37. See also ch. 4 pp. 88–92.
[130] For the importance of disinterested love (compared with natural affection) in the sayings of Jesus, see Montefiore 1962, 158–60; for the argument that this interpretation of Leviticus 19:18 was common by Jesus' time, see H. Kelly 2017. The universalist character of this commandment is essential to Brown's view (and those of earlier scholars) that Christianity dissolved the traditional ties of civic religion – see Introduction pp. 10–11, ch. 5 pp. 115–16.
[131] Compare the comment in *Reg. Brev.* 163: 'if a brother is a benefactor we owe him on grounds of humanity the love which even the gentiles cherish' citing Luke 4:32 (PG 31.1189A).

Maximus for displaying 'love towards both God and neighbour [τήν τε πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἀγάπην καὶ πρὸς τὸν πλησίον]', for 'we hold as a sign of [love of neighbour] your tenderness for me'.[132] Whilst not endorsing civic patriotism specifically here, Basil clearly used the same principle of reciprocity, deriving φιλία from ἀγάπη. Indeed, rather than adapting patriotic political language in the service of theological language in the manner we saw in Chapters Three and Four, Basil rather reinterpreted the universalising language of Christian Scripture in support of traditional civic patriotism.

This play between universal and particular claims was perhaps most elegantly expressed in a pair of short letters from Basil's correspondence whose literary character is readily apparent. Both probably date from the 370s like many of his intercessory letters, and both were epistolary intercessions on behalf of their bearer (the names of the bearers and the addressee are unknown). Basil's first letter brimmed with civic language, leaving little doubt that patronage of one's countrymen was a thoroughly moral act:

> Those who come from our fatherland are commended to you by the very claim of the fatherland [τοὺς ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος ἡμῶν ἀφικομένους συνίστησί σοι αὐτὸ τῆς πατρίδος δίκαιον], even though you, through the goodness of your character, bring under your fostering care all those who in any way need any succour. Therefore… receive [the bearer] as a fellow-countryman, as one who is in need of protection, and as one who is commended to you by us [δέξαι, καὶ ὡς πατριώτην καὶ ὡς δεόμενον ἀντιλήψεως καὶ ὡς παρ᾽ ἡμῶν συνιστάμενόν σοι].[133]

Basil deployed a range of recommendations – personal affection, individual need and patriotic feeling – as mutually reinforcing moral claims. The πατρίς required its children to aid each other, while good citizens freely give such aid out of love for their country. Implicit, too, was the suggestion that one would not recommend someone for the sake of one's fatherland if they were nonetheless unworthy of the favour. Concluding, Basil reminded his reader that God requited good deeds in order to further encourage his correspondent's generosity.

This letter is most interesting when read with that which follows.[134] This second letter begins: 'on the heels of your departure came this son, who gives this letter to you, who came to us in need (as a man living in a strange land) of all consolation due to strangers from Christians [χρείαν ἔχων, ὡς

---

[132] Basil, *Ep.* 9.1 (Courtonne 1.37); cf. *Ep.* 209 (2.189). On friendship in the Cappadocians, see further White 2002, 61–84. For the possible identity of this Maximus ch. 3 n. 73.
[133] Basil, *Ep.* 318 (Courtonne 3.191).
[134] The order is almost certainly original as the latter letter seems to refer to the former in its title and body, besides the complementary themes. The pair is extant in only three of the six codices studied by Courtonne for the preparation of his 1957–1964 edition, but is attested by witnesses from more than one manuscript family (Courtonne 3.191–2); the letters do not appear apart from one another.

ἀνὴρ ἐν ἀλλοδαπῇ διάγων, πασῆς τῆς παρὰ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ὀφειλομένοις τοῖς ξένοις παραμυθίας].'[135] Echoing Classical ideas of hospitality but grounding his appeal in Christian duty, Basil's second letter neatly complemented the first. Although aid to one's countrymen was expected by God and nature, so too was generosity to guests, whose position as strangers also merited compassion.[136] Although Basil's letters were collected and published somewhat haphazardly after his death, the placing of this pair suggests his compilers were aware of the literary potential of this apposition. *Progymnasata* exercises were important elements in late-antique rhetorical training, which often involved taking an unpromising or difficult topic and acted essentially as devil's advocate.[137] Such exercises could, moreover, take the form of successive *pro* and *contra* arguments for contrasting positions.[138] Basil's pair of epistles thus neatly showcased the bishop's virtuosity, able at a moment to argue both sides of a case in classic rhetorical style, and indeed to harmonise them as complementary.

Secular elites, then, could be effectively portrayed as religious patriots by those who wished them to view their identity and obligation in religious terms. As noted in Chapter One, mentions of the divine origins of one's patriotic duty could be fairly cursory.[139] For the less religiously committed, they might have seemed another minor element adduced in support of patriotic duty. Yet the more elaborate invocations discussed here suggest that we should nonetheless view those earlier examples as potentially ambiguous. Depending on the recipient's relationship with the sender, these seemingly cursory references to God's commands could have hinted at much more thoroughgoing theology of civic patriotism than is otherwise apparent. Certainly for some members of the elite, like Gregory's brother Caesarius and (I suggest) the Cappadocian magistrate Sophronius, the redefinition of Christian theology to support the language of patriotic duty would have been an eminently welcome way of accommodating their secular and religious responsibilities. Irrespective of how religious such men were, it suited them and the bishops who praised and petitioned them to fashion them into Christian patriots, and thus to bridge a potential gulf between the languages of Christian philosophical devotion and service to the locality. Likewise for Julian, though elite pagans were less vulnerable to charges of irreligion when they performed their civic duties, it was still important for him to emphasise the pagan character of these duties and to ensconce pagan identity at the core of civic patriotism.

---

[135] Basil, *Ep.* 319 (Courtonne 3.192).
[136] Gauthier 1973.
[137] For the influence of Libanius' *progymnasmata* on Basil and Gregory, see Webb 2010, 133, 149–52.
[138] Webb 2010, 136, 145–9, who discusses Lib. *Progymnasmata* 5 and 6 as examples of this technique (for Libanius' *progymnasmata*, see Foerster 1915, 121–54). *Pro* and *contra* arguments also discussed in C. Gibson, 2014, 133. For *pro* and *contra* exercises in philosophy, see Runia 1981, 116–18 with examples.
[139] See ch. 1 pp. 28–9.

* * * * *

This final chapter has suggested that religious reformers applied civic language in quite different ways to different sections of the elite. Priests and philosophers, like the reformers themselves, often needed to prove their patriotic credentials to other members of the elite, who doubted their sincerity or utility. Basil, Julian and Gregory could reach for civic ideas to justify their own conduct, or to denigrate their opponents – in particular, for Julian and Gregory, the Cynics. Yet there was ambiguity here too. Part of philosophical and priestly authority came from their detachment from the ordinary affairs of πόλις and πατρίς. As such, it was difficult for religious reformers like Julian and Gregory to embrace civic patriotic political language wholeheartedly when it came to the duty of the priest, with both men in their generalised reflections on priesthood offering accounts of priestly activity with little explicit appeal to the πατρίς. Interestingly, Basil was the least concerned by this ambiguity. Despite his strident rejections of patriotic affection in his ascetic writings, his descriptions of priestly activity (including his own) framed the priest as a local servant. This common ground between the Neoplatonic pagan emperor Julian and the Christian bishop and theologian Gregory suggests that the more important variable in deciding the application of patriotic language was the two men's position on the trans-imperial stage: unlike Basil, whose episcopal activity was more locally-grounded, and who never produced a systematic treatise on priesthood itself. Although the world-denying rhetoric of Christianity examined in Chapter Three did present more of a challenge to Christians than the pagan tradition did to Julian, common philosophical and ascetic tendencies seem to have produced a strikingly similar balance between the language of universal and ascetic philosophy on the one hand, and that of local patriotic duty on the other. The terms of civic language could be adopted and adapted by reformers, but within limits. Reconciling them with the universalist expectations of philosophy remained a challenging task.

Yet if civic language was redefined to describe the roles of priests and philosophers, the assumptions of theology were also redefined to serve the purposes of civic patriotism. Both in the theoretical meditation offered by Julian and the praises offered by Basil and Gregory, theological concepts were invoked to support the secular civic patriotism of the elite. Much of this thesis has discussed how patriotism was challenged or adapted in the interests of religious languages and rationales: but here is clear evidence of the reverse process. Redefining religious language to praise the secular patriotism of elite men was perhaps a compromise on the part of religious reformers. Such men would perhaps have preferred elites to have changed their conduct rather than having to adapt religious language in their interests. Yet one need not necessarily assume that this glorification of more secular roles in religious terms was unwilling or insincere. And even if an insincere accommodation, it was not without benefit. As religiously motivated reformers, it was surely beneficial for Basil, Julian and Gregory to encourage elites to view their roles in religious terms

whenever possible. In doing so, they could gradually shift the tone of the public sphere from a religiously neutral or inter-confessional space toward a more explicitly pagan or Christian one. Once that was achieved, yet further reform could become viable.

If this was the objective, however, both sets of reformers would ultimately be disappointed. Julian, most obviously, died prematurely, bringing an abortive end to his effort to make civic patriotic elite service coterminous with paganism. And while Christianity did become the public religion of the Roman Empire, local civic belonging continued to matter to Roman elites independently of religious identity.[140] The Constantinopolitan careers of men like John Lydus depended on their regional connections with powerful officials there, just as had the petitions of Basil, Gregory and a myriad others.[141] Such men continued to employ the rhetoric of πατρίς in their letters in deeply traditional terms – thus the rhetor Procopius of Gaza (465–528), who reflected on how 'one's fatherland is greatly desired among men [μέγα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς πόθον ἐστὶν ἡ πατρίς], as Odysseus' disregarding Circe that he might see Ithaca testifies.'[142] The early fifth century bishop Firmus of Caesarea praised the Classical Athenian statesman Aristides 'the Just' of Athens for 'zeal towards his πατρίς' and urged his correspondent to do likewise for the Church.[143] Though both men were prominent members of the Christian elite, both employed civic patriotic tropes of serving, glorifying and loving the πατρίς derived from Classical examples. Adapting the language of ascetic philosophy in the service of civic patriotism may thus have strengthened that language's more secular elements, in exchange for helping bring Christianity to prominence in the public sphere. Although religious reformers aimed to redefine elites' attachment to civic patriotism in religious terms, therefore, its continuing strength suggests that such efforts were only partially successful.

[140] And post-Roman: see now Jiménez 2020; Welton 2020. On the broader topic of the maintenance of the Classical aesthetic in urban building, see Jacobs 2014b, 652–4, 75–8 who dates the acceleration of urban change to the latter half of the sixth century and views it largely as a result of external factors.
[141] See discussion at ch. 1 n. 31, and examples in C. Kelly 2004, 44–5, 48–9, 173.
[142] Procopius of Gaza, *Ep.* 113 (Garzya and Loenertz 1963, 59). PLRE 2.921 (Procopius 8).
[143] Firmus of Caesarea, *Ep.* 13 (Calvet-Sebasti and Gatier 1989, 100).

Conclusion

Though this thesis has concentrated on three of the most important thinkers and writers of the mid/late fourth century, there were many others who shared their civic patriotic concerns. One such was the famous Antiochene rhetor Libanius. While born a generation earlier than Basil, Julian and Gregory, Libanius was in varying levels of contact with all three – Julian famously attending his lectures in secret while studying in Nicomedia.[1] Libanius is often classified as the archetypal fish out of water in late Antiquity. The Antiochene sophist, in this view, was a stranded Antonine creature, the flotsam of a more civilised time beached on the Dominate's strange shores.[2] Yet Libanius was very much a man of his age.[3] Despite self-consciously opening his autobiography by listing the advantages of Antioch, proclaiming how he was 'fortunate to be a citizen of a great and famous city [πόλεως πολίτην εἶναι μεγάλης τε καὶ ὀνομαστῆς]', Libanius was nonetheless an accomplished example of the new fourth century elite.[4] Taking advantage of the mobility afforded by his talents and education, he spent most of his early career outside Antioch, teaching at Athens, Nicomedia and Constantinople. At the last he even enjoyed an imperial salary, benefiting like many of his peers from the Roman state's expansion. When he returned to Antioch, Libanius' local influence depended on his trans-imperial network of friends and his willingness to employ it in the interests of his clients.[5] Some of these links were with cities themselves as well as with individual contacts. Thus Libanius's monody on Nicomedia, of which he wrote that, 'I mourn that city which I saw most gladly, left unwillingly, and yearned for',[6] while interceding for and with its citizens on a number of occasions.[7]

A flexible attitude on religious matters enabled Libanius to maintain this range of contacts. Libanius counted Christians, Neoplatonic pagans, Jews and the religiously indifferent among his addressees, though he himself remained committed to traditional cults.[8] This adaptability was particularly marked during the reign of his former pupil Julian. On the one hand, Libanius celebrated

[1] For Basil's (fake) correspondence with the sophist and its purpose, see Van Hoof 2016.
[2] Norman 2000 3–7, Liebeschuetz 1972, 10–13; Zuiderhoek 2009, 159. Other accounts tend to temper this characterisation, but it is notable that Libanius' professions of love for Antioch and use of civic language still tend to be seen as a result of emotional affection and not necessarily as a conscious rhetorical choice, or are viewed as part of his animus against imperial government – for example, Cribiore 2007, 24–30; Bradbury 2014, 226–32; Malosse 2014, 103.
[3] For this view of Libanius and his broader generational context, see Watts 2015, 76–9 in particular.
[4] Lib., *Autobiographia* 2 (trans. Norman 1992, 52–4).
[5] For the trans-imperial (mainly eastern) character of this network and Libanius' world more generally, see Cribiore 2007, esp. 83–110.
[6] Lib., *Ep.* 33 (Foerster 1.29–30); compare *Ep.* 1187 (2.272–3), *Autobiographia* 51–5 (trans. Norman 1992, 112–16), 75–8 (138–42).
[7] Examples in Lib., *Ep.* 35 (Foerster 1.31–3), 37 (1.34–6), 330 (1.309–10), 374 (1.361–3), 458 (1.443–4), 459 (1.444), 636 (1.576), 715 (1.643–4).
[8] Sandwell 2007, 91–119.

the emperor's restoration of temples and civic cult;[9] on the other, he interceded for friends and relatives who were faced with returning temple land that they had acquired.[10] On curial service, too, Libanius faced both ways. Despite lauding initiatives to enrol more *curiales*, he himself enjoyed immunity from curial responsibilities and sought the same for his son.[11] Libanius like many of his peers desired to serve his city and to be seen to do so, but through the exertion of influence and the provision of education rather than the burdens of tax collection, administration and civic liturgies.

If the facts of Libanius' career seem at odds with his conventional characterisation, that in large part is to do with the way scholars see his extensive use of patriotic language. If Libanius was an accomplished communicator, but nonetheless chose to use an outdated localist idiom, the conclusion naturally followed that his vocal civic patriotism was emotional rather than calculated – the anachronism of a quixotic don rather than the deliberate decision of an academic careerist. If we consider, however, the continuing significance of patriotic rhetoric in Basil, Julian and Gregory, Libanius makes much more sense as a fourth-century success story. Libanius worked hard to portray himself as a civic patriot precisely because so many aspects of his career spoke otherwise.[12] His exaggerated attachment to localism was not at odds with his success on the wider late Roman stage, but part and parcel of it.

At the other end of the historiographical spectrum sits Gregory of Nyssa, the younger brother of Basil of Caesarea and the third of the "Cappadocian Fathers". Gregory has also seemed a man out of time, but because he is felt to transcend it - viewed as a mystic *par excellence*, renowned for his philosophical curiosity and personal simplicity. Nyssa was famously characterised by Basil as unfit for court as being averse to servile flattery, while a combination of political mishaps and his opposition to slavery and coercive power in general have fed this image of the otherworldly contemplative idealist.[13] Yet this image is a distorting one, resulting in large part from the meagre corpus of letters that survives, but which almost certainly represents a minor fraction of his output.[14] Despite this loss, it is clear that Gregory of Nyssa was more interested in civic ideas than historians

[9] Amongst others, see *Ep.* 697 (Foerster 1.633), 712 (1.642), 727 (1.652–3), 757 (1.682–3), 770 (1.693–4).
[10] Lib., *Ep.* 724 (Foerster 1.649–50), 1364 (2.410–11).
[11] For the legal aspects of this episode, see Evans-Grubbs 2014, 38–40. Libanius' problem was how to make sure his illegitimate son Cimon inherited his property without Cimon thereby becoming liable for curial service. Compare intercessions aimed at getting others out of curial service in *Ep.* 293 (Foerster 1.276), 336 (1.316–17), 374 (1.361–3), 1224 (2.306–9).
[12] Compare the view of Bonamente 1983, 41 on the purpose of Themistius, *Or.* 23.
[13] Basil, *Ep.* 215 (Courtonne 2.207), compare *Ep.* 58 (1.145–7). For Gregory the 'Christian Anarchist', see Steenbuch 2017. Van Dam 2003a, 36 notes Gregory's excoriating social attacks on Aetius as evidence of a more typically late-antique mindset. Perhaps, as Moreschini observes, the tendency of modern theologians to see Gregory's philosophical positions as anticipating their own informs this somewhat complimentary approach: Moreschini 2017, 139.
[14] Silvas 2006. This paucity informed Kopecek's decision to discount Gregory of Nyssa from his article on civic patriotism in the Cappadocians – Kopecek 1974b.

have allowed. It is from Gregory, in fact, that we receive the most worked-out, consistent form of martyr-focused, spiritualised civic patriotism. Noting the obligation laid down by the Fifth Commandment ('honour your father and your mother'), Gregory of Nyssa inferred that one had a duty to honour one's native country: 'the fatherland of those who give me life also encompasses in itself the dignity of parents [ἥ γὰρ πατρὶς τῶν γεννησαμένων ἐν ἑαυτῇ περιέχει καὶ τὸ τῶν γεγεννηκότων ἀξίωμα]'.[15] This honouring took the form of praising the πατρίς, but only for things that were truly worth a Christian's admiration. Thankfully, Cappadocia was rich in praiseworthy products. 'For who does not see your fruit, for you have brought forth such a prolific crop of martyrs?'[16] This ideology, as I have discussed elsewhere, was aligned to Gregory's broader anthropology, and represents a more theologically worked-out view of the purpose and overall place of martyr piety than that provided by his brother Basil.[17] Likewise, his *Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus* borrowed heavily from the model of the civic patriotic philosopher embraced by Iamblichus' *On the Pythagorean Life* and his brother Basil alike, portraying the Thaumaturgus ('Wonder-worker') as an archetypal sage and bishop.[18] Elements in his epistolary corpus further hint at a familiarity with civic language.[19] If so, this would hardly be a surprise. Gregory of Nyssa was an accomplished ecclesiastical politician, who played an important role at the Council of Constantinople and was prominent at the capital during the 380s.[20] Despite his brother's doubts, such a man would have been well aware of the potential benefits civic language offered.

Civic patriotism was thus a standard element in elite rhetorical and intellectual arsenals, and its investigation can throw new light on seemingly familiar figures. Yet civic rhetoric does not simply survive in the literary evidence of gilded speeches and polished letters. Neither was it an exclusively Greek phenomenon, for Roman law is replete with patriotic injunctions.[21] 'If men who are *curiales*, in the event of the council being neglected, do not satisfy the debt owed their fatherland with their services [*debitas patriae reddiderint functiones*]', Theodosius's draftsmen fulminated, they were to be forced to do so 'for the public good [*pro publica utilitate*]'.[22] A notable constitution targeted monks, who were 'to be recalled to the duties of their fatherlands that they have evaded [*ad munia patriarum*

[15] Gregory of Nyssa, *In XL martyres Ia* (Cavernos, Heil and Lendle 1990, 138–9).
[16] Gregory of Nyssa, *In XL martyres Ia* (Cavernos, Heil and Lendle 1990, 141).
[17] Langley 2020.
[18] Meredith 1984; on Gregory Thaumaturgus, see also Van Dam 1982; Mitchell 1999. For Iamblichus, see ch. 6 n. 19.
[19] Gregory, *Ep.* 6 (Maraval 1990, 164–70), 9 (178–80), 17.14–18 (224–6).
[20] Gregory also preached at the funerals of Theodosius' daughter and wife, and many of his other homilies were products of his years in Constantinople. In this respect, he was certainly a more successful ecclesiastical politician than Gregory Nazianzus, and arguably than Basil as well.
[21] See Part I n. 14.
[22] *CTh* 12.1.91. Honoré assigns the law to Theodosius' *quaestor* 'E2', noted for his more literary language – Honoré 1998, 45 n. 136.

subeunda revocari]', as 'seekers of idleness deserting the obligations of the cities'.[23] Men like Symmachus, Ausonius and Ambrose in the Latin-speaking West were enthusiastic exponents of a rich patriotic tradition – though as suggested in the introduction, the rich vein of civic patriotic political thought in the Latin tradition is worth a study in itself.

In epigraphy, too, cities continued to commemorate their benefactors – albeit on a reduced scale when compared to the early imperial period.[24] On a statue preserved at Aphrodisias in Asia Minor, the former governor Flavius Eutolmius Tatianus was acclaimed the city's saviour, with an epigram that emphatically stressed his virtue and origin. 'Who? Whence? From Lycia, and the best upon the governor's seat, Tatianus who safeguarded the city with just decrees [θέσμοις τε δίκης πτολίεθρα σαώσας].'[25] The city of Scythopolis (now in northern Israel) adopted similar terms in a late fourth-century inscription, referring to 'Silvanus the most magnificent and greatly admired *comes* and governor of his own fatherland', who was even cast as an imitator of Hadrian.[26] Even in the late fifth century, the rhetoric of πατρίς remained significant. A mosaic inscription from 473 in Serjilla, in northwestern Syria, praised one Julianus for his generosity in building some baths. 'Though Julianus built it, the whole village is delighted, with his wife Domna, he has bestowed unspeakable joy gladdening his fatherland.'[27]

Such late-antique civic sentiment naturally prompts wider questions. How did ideas of πόλις and πατρίς developed in poetry (say) differ from those evinced in speeches, letters, tracts, laws, inscriptions and so on? How exceptional was Julian for using civic language so extensively? How did the Latin and Greek traditions of secular patriotic, spiritual patriotic and religious anti-patriotic thought interrelate? Did the dominance of Rome over the culture of the West, compared to the polycentrism of Greek urbanism, make a difference when it came to patriotism? Did cities and civic localism exert influence beyond Nicene Christianity and traditional Greco-Roman religion, and were the demands of the local thus more significant in the faiths of the 'Axial Age' than is sometimes allowed? Did such ideas wither with the collapse of the imperial government in the West and its (later) crisis in the East, or can one trace continuity further through the early Middle Ages?[28]

---

[23] *CTh* 12.1.63. See Lenski 2002 256–7. Contrast however the complete lack of any mention of *patria* in the legislation discussing Christian matters (including curial service) in Book 16.
[24] For bibliography on epigraphy and euergetism, see Part I n. 6–7; ch. 5 n. 73–81.
[25] Kaibel no. 919, cited in Robert 1948, 42. Tatianus' hometown of Sidyma recorded his many offices in an inscription, albeit with no mention of πατρίς or local glory.
[26] SEG 59 1718. Trajan and Hadrian had begun the renovation of Scythopolis in the early second century. It is worth noting that in earlier inscriptions, even when a formula like *patria sua* or ἡ αὐτοῦ πατρίς is used, the city in question may not actually be the governor's native land – see Erkelenz 2001. Governors were also not supposed to administer their own *patriae* (*CTh* 12.1.110) though some clearly did regardless.
[27] Butler and Prentice 1901; Robert 1948, 81.
[28] For recent arguments for the latter, see Martínez Jiménez 2020; Welton 2020; Langley 2022; Wallace-Hadrill 2022.

* * * * *

A close examination of Basil, Julian and Gregory has enabled a detailed focus on how civic patriotism affected both intellectual theorisation and practical change in religion and politics alike. It has shown that, by giving due attention to civic patriotic ideas and terms, the nature of fourth-century political and religious change can be more accurately understood. For one, it demonstrates significant continuity in the identity and ideological idiom of late Roman elites. Appeals to the city and fatherland retained social cachet and effectiveness in the personal, trans-imperial and patronage focused world of late Roman politics. These appeals blended with the languages of *paideia*, virtue and family to offer mutually complementary accounts of why elite rule was legitimate in both imperial and local government. Πατρίς belonging created ties between elites whose personal interests, religious divisions and institutional differences might threaten to set them at odds. Both pagans and Christians could be approached with appeals to the fatherland, defusing potential religious tensions and maintaining the religious détente of the mid fourth century.

Yet was the rhetoric of πόλις and πατρίς was not unchallenged in this imperial space. A focus on monarchy and order threatened the place of civic rhetoric. To focus too much on the language of politics, too, is to risk ignoring the influence of factors such as money and political expediency in fourth century politics. Nonetheless, civic language adapted to new challenges as its referents and assumptions shifted. As innovating ideologists, fourth-century users of civic language adapted what it meant to be a civic patriot, lauding imperial bureaucrats performing intercessions for their cities or emperors who gifted their birthplaces with honours, privileges and buildings.

Of course, imperial civic patriots were as old as the Empire itself – thus Augustus' freedman Zoilus who funded the reconstruction of his native Aphrodisias,[29] or that emperor's supposed boast that he found Rome a city of bricks and left it a city of marble.[30] The increasingly diverse regional origins of imperial administrators, however, provided a spur to this redefinition. Civic patriotism, moreover, was now celebrated in distinctly late-antique forms. Letter collections stand out as texts which could be more easily circulated and admired by the imperial literati when compared to the inscriptions and decrees of an earlier age. While exhibiting significant continuity with the imperial past, therefore, civic patriotic rhetoric was adapted to the political and intellectual realities of the fourth-century present, exhibiting its influence and flexibility.

[29] Reynolds 1982, 97–101, 156–64.
[30] Suetonius, *Vita divi Augusti* 28.3 (Carter 1982, 49); see Wardle 2014, 220–2.

This resilience of civic ideas thus suggests the need to rethink the late-antique Roman Empire. Rather than viewing imperial government and local allegiance as competitors in a zero-sum game for personal loyalty, viewing the expansion of the centre as bringing an eclipse of local affiliation, the enduring value of civic patriotic ideas suggests that local connections and loyalties were drawn on and amplified by those at the centre in order to strengthen imperial government.[31] And although the trans-imperial character of this ruling elite is often the focus of historiography,[32] this study has shown that these men needed local connections. Even emperors needed local loyalties for civic administration (and thus tax collection) to function at all. Power in the localities may not always have been the ignominious second place that modern treatments envisage, for there were still advantages of prestige, convenience and career security to be gained from a career outside the center.

To some extent, however, civic patriotism was the victim of its own success. Christians from Saint Paul onwards had sought to appropriate the language of πατρίς, πολιτεῦμα and πολιτεία to describe their own communities, a legacy of which both Basil and Gregory were faithful and sometimes creative custodians. The oppositional stance which these ideas of belonging had encouraged created a parallel rhetoric of πόλις and πατρίς which had little space for earthly belonging. The essentialising rhetoric of civic patriotism, which derived obligation to the locality from deep emotional attachment to one's origins, made it difficult to accommodate to Christian claims that humans' divine origins and entailed a radically different way of life and sense of personal identity. Contemporary trends in philosophy echoed these objections, for they emphasised personal asceticism, universal morality and ecumenical reach, and the cult of the highest divinity rather than its local manifestations or servants. Common between traditions, these ideas all had the potential to undermine civic identity as irrelevant or detrimental to the pursuit of truth. Christians tended to pursue all of these with a comparatively greater zeal than their pagan contemporaries, however, fostered by the oppositional stance springing from their patriotism for the 'Jerusalem Above'. This marked a clear difference between them and their pagan counterparts.

Nonetheless, the Christian appropriation of patriotic terminology also limited the change that could ensue. The citizenship of Heaven enshrined in practice the centrality of worldly cities in Christian thought, and while the city might be castigated as endemic with iniquity, framing this iniquity as an inevitable facet of urban living actually made its practical toleration more palatable.

This dichotomy, moreover, also meant recognising that believers' affections were divided between spiritual perfection and worldly belonging. This in turn encouraged religious reformers to

[31] Thus Weisweiler 2011.
[32] Most recently in Schmidt-Hofner 2020.

elaborate a kind of spiritual civic patriotic language, which redefined citizenship as a religious belonging and service to the city as a spiritual duty. Though Basil and Gregory often argued that any kind of worldly loyalty was unacceptable and that civilisation was superfluous and distracting from ascetic purity, they nonetheless appealed to civic patriotic sentiment when advocating for religious change. The developments in Christianity this rhetoric fostered were lasting and significant: the elevation of martyrs and their relics to a central place in popular piety, the establishing of bishop and clergy as quasi-civil offices, and the compromise with urban aristocratic norms of behaviour and governance. It is interesting that there is little explicit evidence of strong, principled oppositions to these changes in the Cappadocians' preaching. In part, this may represent the Cappadocians' endorsement of what was essentially a religious *fait accompli*, though it may also suggest that the anti-universal tendencies of much Christian preaching were only felt to be relevant to personal behaviour and support for new types of religious communities, rather than provoking serious social reorganisation.

Like the Cappadocians, Julian too had to re-sacralise civic religious life. Julian's embrace of spiritual civic patriotism was entirely in keeping with the traditional logic of Roman religious life, greatly aiding his religious reforms in this respect. It was more difficult, however, for him to find a balance between respect for local divergence in religious observation, which might entail (for instance) the riotous celebration of local festivals, and the advancement of a more rigorist ascetic programme in keeping with the emperor's moral views. The universal imperial aspirations of Julian's religious reforms were, ironically, in tension with the localism of his theology. From a practical standpoint, Julian was essentially trying to give new organisational form and dogmatic content to a fissiparous and geographically fractured religious group, whose members did not necessarily see themselves as such. Patriotic loyalties were thus as significant a hindrance to Julian as they were to his Christian contemporaries.

* * * * *

These surprising conclusions suggest the need to re-think broad paradigms of late Antiquity as an era where the universal (whether political or intellectual) became ever more prominent at the expense of the local. Whether conceived in terms of Axial Age, Empires of Faith, or the transformation from euergetism to charity, the retreat from localism is implicit in many paradigms. Sometimes, this is formulated more strongly in terms of the "Decline of the Ancient City" – a version of late Antiquity which preserves the virtue-politics belief that changes in political ideasand the decline of individual morality can account for the end of the ancient city, the fall of Rome, and any other late-ancient malaise. Yet as we have seen, local loyalties and sentiments remained significant elements in

religious culture and political organisation alike. Even the most otherworldly 'citizens of the universe', after all, lived in real places in particular moments.

The continuing significance of civic patriotic ideas in Rome and its successor polities also offers an intriguing window onto wider issues of comparative political organisation. The importance of autonomous cities in the Roman Empire, reflected and encouraged by the popularity of civic patriotic political ideas, is striking when compared to the contemporary imperial polity of Han China. This contrast is the sharper for the two regimes' relative similarities. In both cases, already urbanised territory was unified by an outsider state into an enduring imperial structure, certain regions of which were made up of 'city-state cultures'.[33] In the Mediterranean basin one city-state triumphed at the expense of others, frequently in collaboration with other civic elites. This preserved the *civitas*/πόλις as a fundamental organising principle of society, culture and thought, despite trends to monarchic and bureaucratic government.[34] Though Greek and Roman monarchs sometimes employed a language of universal dominion, *imperium sine fine* and quasi-divine rule,[35] their power always rested on mobilising and placating networks of cities, proud of their local traditions and jealous of their autonomy.[36] Even in the later Empire, when cities' formal autonomy was eroded and the public sphere increasingly constituted by the court and its officeholders, civic elites acting on behalf of the state remained fundamental to the empire's function and ideology.[37]

In northern China, however, political unity was achieved through the expansion of territorial, fiscal-military states at the expense of urban and aristocratic elites.[38] As a consequence, while cities in Han China were centres of imperial administration and hubs of economic activity, the localism and sense of autonomous community characteristic of Roman urban centres was noticeably less in evidence, with imperial officials deliberately dissociated from local ties.[39] Correspondingly, Chinese imperial ideology strongly condemned local sentiment as fundamentally separatist, ignorant and biased.[40] While this condemnation formed an element (as we have seen) of Classical and late-antique philosophy and religion, advocates of the local remained a substantial group into late Antiquity.

---

[33] Lewis 2000.
[34] *Pace* Runciman's view of the πόλις as an 'evolutionary dead end' – Runciman 1990. For the significance of citizenship viewed from a comparative perspective, see Burbank and Cooper 2010, 28–31, 35–43.
[35] The strand of Classical rhetoric characterised as quintessentially Byzantine in Dvornik 1966.
[36] Ma 2003; Boatwright 2002; Lenski 2016.
[37] Contrasting with the emphasis in many accounts on imperial systems' tendencies towards uniform governance and similarities in political structure, for example,. Eisenstadt 1963; Scheidel 2019, 224–7. See Burbank and Cooper 2010, 11–13.
[38] For the comparison, see Noreña 2015; cf. Rosenstein 2009, 25–9.
[39] Though some degree of localism existed, evidenced by the informal power of urban merchants, *You xia* leagues and the *de facto* influence of clerks and locally-recruited officials. See, for example, Zhao 2015, 82–7; Lewis 2015, 218–22; compare also Veyne 1976, 117.
[40] Lewis 2006, 189–212; Turner 2009, 54–61.

Despite similar pressures and rationales of empire, then, post-Roman polities were decisively influenced by the civic patriotism of the later Roman Empire. Indeed, in many respects the centuries following Basil, Julian and Gregory witnessed the ebb of more universalised, inter-connected imperial systems, at least within the post-Roman West and (later) Byzantium. And despite the general spread of Christianity throughout the Roman world, Christianity itself could be a powerful tool for reinforcing local and patriotic impulses.[41] Even to reject city and locality meant drawing on its vocabulary to describe belonging to the heavenly city, reproducing the patterns of patriotic discussions even as they transformed their content. Moreover, in early medieval Europe 'the poor' became (or remained) the local poor, while local ascetics, saints and bishops became the counsellors and guardians of post-Roman cities.[42] Ideas and institutions founded on charity did mark a significant difference from what came before,[43] but this new language was deeply indebted to prior modes of thought and did not replace them. Within Christianity, patriotic impulses, ideas and language continued to prove influential.[44] Likewise, Christian ideas, symbols and institutions could be adapted to the politically, ethnically and economically fragmented world of the early Middle Ages as well as to the universal empires of Constantine and Justinian. Though there remained a degree of unease about the forces of particularism within certain Christian circles, the dissemination of a locally focused, civic patriotic version of Christianity was thus one of late Antiquity's most significant ideological products.

Civic patriotism, and the localist models of imperial rule which it produced and reflected, was thus a characteristic and perhaps even fundamental element of Greco-Roman power, and a correspondingly deep influence on the empires, kingdoms and city-states which emerged from the Roman world.[45] Greek and Roman languages of citizenship, patriotic virtue and urban civilisation were recurrently influential in later ages, both as a continuing late-antique legacy in post-Roman societies and a rich resource on which political reformers would draw to produce fresh visions of civic participation.[46] Far from a dated anachronism, Julian was a vital part of this scene, debating and adapting these ideas with his Cappadocian contemporaries. Through their efforts, the new, 'Byzantine' city of this world was influenced by the same fundamentally civic elements which had made up the old one. Through encounter with their works (and those of many others), the elites of succeeding centuries received the principles of local attachment and the investment in civic living which had actuated their predecessors. Even the most distinctive innovations of this new civic

[41] For this role in the independent communities of the Caucasus, see Whittow 1996, 205–6. More generally on Christianity and ethnic/national formation, see Hastings 1997; De Jong 2009.
[42] Particularly true of early medieval Italy where urbanism remained significant, but see also Spain, Gaul – Fasoli 1973; Ward-Perkins 1984; Loseby 2006; Barbier 2014; Maskarinec 2018; Jiménez 2020.
[43] Daley 1999; Gray 2013.
[44] For a good example in the western context, see Salzman 2017a.
[45] See however Scheidel 2019, 345, who argues that the legacy of Classical urban autonomy was less significant in the re-emergence of autonomous urban communities than the political fragmentation of the Middle Ages.
[46] Recently on these themes, see Oldfield 2019; Hankins 2019.

consensus (episcopal power, church-building, relief for the poor, widows and orphans, the cult of martyrs) were theorised by Basil, Julian and Gregory within age-old assumptions about the duties of local service.

Ultimately, men like Basil, Julian and Gregory embraced civic patriotism alongside philosophical universalism because it continued to reflect the realities of urban and imperial life in the later Roman world. Local sentiment still mattered in the new Imperial οἰκουμένη, even as it needed to be set in a more universal image of the cosmos. In this, late Antiquity was not unique. Civic patriotism and local loyalties had been similarly adapted and debated during the momentous transitions from the Classical to the Hellenistic world or from the kingdoms of Alexander's successors to the *imperium* of Rome.[47] Basil, Julian and Gregory were effective custodians of this legacy. In adapting, defending and contesting civic patriotism, they effectively fitted it for the late-antique centuries and beyond. Through their lives and works, the impulse toward the local – in tandem with the exhortation of the universal – became one of late Antiquity's enduring legacies.

[47] For civic politics during these transitions, see in particular the volumes edited by Alston and Van Nijf; Alston and Van Nijf 2008; 2011; Alston, Van Nijf and Williamson, 2013.

Abbreviations

I follow for abbreviations first S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth & E. Eidinow eds., *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th edition, Oxford, 2012; then A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602: A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey*, 3 volumes, Oxford, 1964; then finally abbreviations of my own based on the Latin names of texts.

Amm. Marc.	Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res gestae*
Anth. Pal.	*Anthologia Palatina*
Arist.	Aristotle
Eth. Nic.	*Ethica Nicomachea*
Pol.	*Politica*
Ath.	Athanasius
August.	Augustine
De civ. D.	*De civitate Dei*
Basil, *Ep.*	Basil, *Epistulae*
In Ps.	*Homilia in Psalmum [with Psalm number]*
Hex.	*Homilia in Hexaemeron [with number]*
Hom.	*Homilia*
de humil.	*De humilitate*
ex. ad bapt.	*Exhortatoria ad sanctam baptismum*
in ebr.	*In ebriosos*
in evang. Luc.	*In illud dictum evangelii secundum Lucam: 'Destruam horream meum, et maiora aedficabo'*
in Gord.	*In Gordium martyrem*
in illud.	*In illud: 'Attende tibi ipsi'*
in Jul.	*In Julittam martyrem*
in Lac.	*Homilia dicta in Lacizis*

in Mam.	*In Mamam martyrem*
in XL mart.	*In XL martyres*
quod reb. mund.	*Quod rebus mundanis non adhaerendum sit, et de incendio extra ecclesiam facto*
Reg. Brev.	*Regula brevius tractate*
Reg. Fus	*Regula fusius tractate*
Budé	Collection Budé/Collection des Universités de France
Cic.	Cicero
Rep.	*De Re Publica*
Leg.	*De Legibus*
Clem., *Strom.*	Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromateis*
CSLA	The Cult of the Saints in Late Antiquity database
CTh	*Codex Theodosianus*
Dio Chrys., *Or.*	Dio Chrysostomus, *Orationes*
DNP	*Der Neue Pauly*
Ep.	*Epistulae*
Eunap., VS	Eunapius, *Vitae sophistarum*
Eus.	Eusebius
Hist. eccl.	*Historia ecclesiastica*
VC	*Vita Constantini*
Gregory	Gregory of Nazianzus
Ep.	*Epistulae*
Or.	*Orationes*
Vit. Sua	*De vita sua*

Carm.	*Carmina*
Poem. arcana	*Poemata arcana*
Greg. Nyss.	Gregory of Nyssa
Ep.	*Epistulae*
Hom. in XL mart. Ia	*Homilia in XL martyres Ia*
Vit. Greg. Thaum.	*Vita Gregorii Thaumaturgii*
GVI	W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften,* I (Berlin, 1955)
Himer., *Or*.	Himerius, *Orationes*
Hom.	*Homiliae*
I.Metr.	B. Dreyer, H. Engelmann, *Die Inschriften von Metropolis*, I (Bonn, 2003)
Iambl., *VP*	Iamblichus, *Vita Pythagorae*
Joh. Chrys.,	John Chrysostom,
De sac.	*De sacerdotio*
Hom. in Ep. 1 ad Cor.	*Homiliae in Epistulam Primam ad Corinthios*
Hom. de inani gloria	*Homilia de inani gloria et de educandis liberis*
Jerome, *Contr. Vig*	Jerome, *Liber contra Vigilantium*
Julian	Julianus imperator
Ad Ath.	*Epistula ad Athenienses*
Ad Sacer.	Bidez-Cumont *Ep*. 89b/Wright *Letter to a Priest*
Caes.	*Caesares*
Consol. Sall.	*Consolatio pro abitione Sallustii*
Contr. Cyn.	*Oratio contra cynicos ineruditos*
Contr. Gal.	*Contra Galilaeos*

Contr. Herac.	*Oratio contra Heraclium cynicum*
Ep.	*Epistulae* (ps.-Julian.= Ep. wrongly attributed to Julian)
Ep. ad Them.	*Ad Themistium epistula*
In Const. I	*In Constantii laudem oratio*
In Const. II	*De rebus gestis Constantii sive de monarchia oratio*
In Euseb.	*In Eusebiae laudem oratio*
In Matr. D.	*Oratio in Matrem Deorum*
In Sol.	*Orato in Solem*
Misop.	*Misopogon*
Kaibel	G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*, Berlin, 1878.
Lib.	Libanius
Ep.	*Epistulae*
Or.	*Orationes*
Loeb	Loeb Classical Library
LXX	Septuagint (ed. Rahlfs-Hanhart 2006)
Macrob., *In Somn.*	Macrobius, *Commentarius ex Cicerone in Somnium Scipionis*
Men. Rhet.	Menander Rhetor
MGH	*Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (1877–1919; repr. 1961)
M.	Migne
PG	Migne, *Patrologiae cursus, series Graeca*
PL	Idem, *Patrologiae cursus, series Latina*
NPNF	Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers
SEG	Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum (1923–)
Or.	*Orationes*

Origen, *Contr. Cels.*	Origen, *Contra Celsum*
Pan. Lat.	*XII Panegyrici Latini*
Pl.	Plato
Leg.	*Leges*
Rep.	*Respublica*
Ti.	*Timaeus*
PLRE	*Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, 3 vols., ed. A. H. M. Jones and others (1970–92)
Plut.	Plutarch
Mor.	*Moralia*
An seni	*An seni respublica gerenda sit*
De exil.	*De exilio*
De tranq. anim.	*De tranquillitate animi*
Max. cum princ.	*Maxime cum principibus philosopho esse disserendum*
Porph.	Porphyry
praef.	*Praefatio*
Socr.	Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica*
Soz.	Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica*
Symm.	Symmachus
Teubner	Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (1849–)
Them., *Or*.	Themistius, *Orationes*
Zos.	Zosimus, *Historia Nova*

Bibliography

Primary Editions Used for the Principal Authors

Basil of Caesarea, *Homilien zu Hexaemeron*, ed. Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta and Stig Y. Rudberg, Berlin, 1997.

———, *Le Lettere*, 1 vol., ed. & trans. M. Forlin Patrucco, Turin, 1983.

———, *Lettres*, 3 vols., ed & trans. Yves Courtonne, Paris, 1957–66.

———, *Opera Omnia*, 4 vols., ed. Jean-Paul Migne, Paris, 1857.

———, *Sur la Baptême*, ed. & trans. Jeanne Ducatillon, Paris, 1989.

———, *Sur le Saint-Esprit*, ed. & trans. Benoît Pruche, 1968.

Gregory Nazianzus, *Correspondance*, 2 vols., ed. & trans. Paul Gallay, Paris, 1964–7.

———, *Discours 1–3*, ed. & trans. Jean Bernardi, Paris, 1985.

———, *Discours 4–5*, ed. & trans. Jean Bernardi, Paris, 1983.

———, *Discours 6–12*, ed. & trans. Marie-Ange Calvet-Sebasti, Paris, 1995.

———, *Discours 20–23*, ed. & trans. Justin Mossay, Guy Lafontaine, Paris, 1980.

———, *Discours 24–26*, ed. & trans, Justin Mossay, Guy Lafontaine, Paris, 1981.

———, *Discours 27–31*, ed. & trans. Paul Gallay & Maurice Jourjon, Paris, 1978.

———, *Discours 32–37*, ed.& trans. Claudio Moreschini, intro. Paul Gallay, Paris, 1985.

———, *Discours 38–41*, ed. & trans. Claudio Moreschini, intro. Paul Gallay, Paris, 1990.

———, *Discours 42–43*, ed. & trans. Jean Bernardi, Paris, 1992.

———, *Epigrammata*, in *Anthologia Graeca Buch VII–VIII*, ed. H. Beckby, Munich, 1957.

———, *Lettres théologiques*, ed. & trans. Paul Gallay & Maurice Jourjon, Paris, 1974.

———, *St Gregory of Nazianzus Poemata Arcana*, ed. C. Moreschini, trans. D. A. Sykes, Oxford, 1997.

———, *Opera Omnia*, 4 vols., ed. Jean-Paul Migne, Paris, 1857–62.

———, *Selected Poems of Gregory of Nazianzus: I.2.17, II.1.10, 19, 32: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Commentary*, ed. Christos Simelidis, Göttingen, 2010.

Julian, *Alla Madre degli Dei e altri discorsi*, intro Jacques Fontaine, ed. Carlo Prato, trans. & comm. Arnaldo Marcone, Milan, 1987.

———, *A Salustio: Autoconsolazione per la Partenza dell' Ottimo Salustio*, ed. & trans. Marco Ugenti, Rome, 2014.

———, *Contra Galilaeos*, ed. and trans. Emanuela Masaracchia, Rome, 1990.

———, *Die Beiden Satiren des Kaisers Julianus Apostata*, ed. & trans. Friedhelm L. Müller, Stuttgart, 1998.

———, *Epistulae, Leges, Poematia, Fragmenta Varia*, ed. Joseph Bidez & Franz Cumont, Paris, 1922.

———, *La Prima Orazione di Giuliano a Costanzo*, ed. & trans. Ignazio Tantillo, Rome, 1997.

———, *Opera*, ed. Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, Berlin, 2015.

Other Editions and Translations of Principal Authors

Basil, *Ascetical Works*, trans. Agnes Clare Way, Washington, DC, 1950.

———, *Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah*, [*dubia*] trans. Nikolai Lipatov-Chicherin, Hamburg, 2001.

———, *Exegetical Homilies*, trans. Agnes Clare Way, Washington, DC, 1963.

———, *Letters*, 4 vols., trans. Paul J. Deferrari, Cambridge, Mass., 1926–34.

———, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2nd Series Vol. VIII: Basil: Letters and Select Works*, trans. Rev. Blomfield Jackson, 1894.

———, *The Asketikon of Saint Basil the Great*, trans. Anna M. Silvas, Oxford, 2005.

Gregory Nazianzus, *Autobiographical Poems*, trans. Carolinne N. White, Cambridge, 1996.

———, *Epigrammata* in *Greek Anthology: Books VII–VIII*, ed. Jeffrey Henderson, trans. William R. Paton, Cambridge, Mass., 1917.

———, *Gregory of Nazianzus' Letter Collection: the Complete Translation*, trans. Bradley Storin, Oakland, CA, 2019.

———, *Select Orations*, trans. Martha Vinson, Baltimore, MA, 2003.

———, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2nd Series Vol. VII: Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzus*, trans. Charles Gordon Brown & James Edward Swallow, Edinburgh, 1893.

Julian, *Œuvres complètes*, 4 vols., ed. Joseph Bidez, Gabriel Rochefort, Christian Lacombrade, Paris, 1924–65.

———, *Works*, 3 vols., trans. Wilmer C. Wright, Cambridge, Mass., 1913–23.

Primary Sources

Ambrose, *De officiis ministrorum*, ed. M. Testard, Turnhout, 2001.

Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*, ed. W. Seyfarth, L. Jacob-Karau, I. Ulmann, Berlin, 1978.

Aristotle, *Ethica Nichomachea*, ed. I. Bywater, Oxford, 1894, repr. 1957.

———, *Politique*, Vol. 1, ed. & trans. J. Aubonnet, Paris, 1960.

Athanasius, *Epistula Encyclica* in *Athanasius Werke Band II: Die „Apologien", Lieferung 5: Apologia secunda 80,3 – Historia Arianorum 32,2,*, ed. H. G. Opitz, Berlin, 1940.

———, *Historia Arianorum* in *Athansius Werke. Band II: Die „Apologien". Lieferung 5: Apologia secunda 80,3 – Historia Arianorum 32,2,*, ed. H. G. Opitz, Berlin, 1935.

———, *Vie d'Antoine*, ed. & trans. G. J. M. Bartelink, Paris, 1994.

Augustine, *De civitate dei libri I–XIII*, ed. B. Dombart, A. Kalb, add. J. Divjak, 5th edition, Turnhout, 1993.

———, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini opera. Pars III, 3, Epistulae CI–CXXXIX*, ed. Klaus D. Daur, Turnhout, 2009.

———, *The City of God Against the Pagans*, ed. & trans. R. W. Dyson, Cambridge, 1998.

Cicero, *De republica librorum sex quae manserunt*, ed. K. Ziegler, Leipzig, 1969.

———, *On the Commonwealth and On the Laws*, 2nd edition, ed. & trans. James E. G. Zetzel, Cambridge, 2017.

———, *Traité des Lois*, ed. & trans. Georges de Plinval, Paris, 1959.

Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata libri I–IV*, in *Opera Omnia Vol. I*, ed. Jean-Paul Migne, Paris, 1857.

Dio Chrysostom, *Opera omnia*, 2 vols., ed. J. De Arnim, Berlin, 1962.

Epictetus, *Entretiens Livre II*, ed & trans. J. Souilhé, Paris, 1949.

Epistula ad Diognetum, in *The Apostolic Fathers Vol. II, 2nd Edition*, ed. & trans. Bart D. Ehrman, Cambridge, Mass., 2003.

Eunapius, *Vies de philosophes et de sophistes*, 2 vols., ed. & trans. R. Goulet, Paris, 2014.

Eusebius, *Histoire Eccléstiastique*, Vol. 1, ed. & trans. G. Bardy, Paris,1952, revd. 1986.

———, *Vita Constantini*, in *Eusebius Werke, Band 1.1: Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin*, ed. F. Winkelmann Berlin, 1975.

Firmus of Caesarea, *Lettres*, ed. and trans. M.-A. Calvet-Sebasti and P.-L. Gatier, Paris, 1989.

Gregory the Great, *Regula Pastoralis*, in *Opera omnia tomus III*, repr. J.-P. Migne, Paris, 1849.

Gregory of Nyssa, *De tridua inter mortem et resurrectionem Domini nostri Iesu Christi*, in *Gregorii Nysseni sermones Pars I* ed. G. Heil, A. Van Heck, E. Gebhardt & A. Spira, Leiden, 1967.

———, *De vita Gregori Thaumaturgi* in *Gregorii Nysseni sermones Pars II*, ed. J. P. Cavernos, G. Heil, & O. Lendle, Leiden, 1990.

———, *Gregory of Nyssa: the Letters: Introduction, Translation and Commentary,* ed. & trans. Anna M. Silvas, Leiden, 2006.

———, *In Basilium fratrem*, in *Gregorii Nysseni sermones Pars II*, ed. J. P. Cavernos, G. Heil, & O. Lendle, Leiden, 1990.

———, *In inscriptiones Psalmorum*, in *Gregorii Nysseni In inscriptiones psalmorum: In sextum psalmum; In Ecclesiasten homiliae,* ed. S.J. McDonough and A. Jacobus, Leiden, 1962.

———, *In XL martyres*, in *Gregorii Nysseni sermones Pars II*, ed. J. P. Cavernos, G. Heil, & O. Lendle, Leiden, 1990.

———, *Lettres*, ed. & trans. Pierre Maraval, Paris, 1990.

———, *Oratio catechetica, opera dogmatica minora pars IV*, ed. E. Mühlberg, Leiden, 1996.

Herodotus, *Books I–II*, trans. Godley, Cambridge, Mass., 1920.

Himerius, *Declamationes et orations cum deperditarum fragmentis*, ed. A. Colonna, Rome, 1951.

———, *Man and Word: the Orations of Himerius*, trans. Robert J. Penella, Berkeley, CA, 2007.

Iamblichus, *De vita Pythagorica liber*, ed. L. Duebner & U. Klein, Teubner, 1975.

———, *On the Pythagorean Life*, trans. Gillian Clark, Liverpool, 1989.

———, *Réponse à Porphyre (De mysteriis)*, ed. & trans. Henri Domique Saffrey & Alain-Philippe Segonds with Adrien Lecerf, Paris, 2013.

Jerome, *Adversus Vigilantium*, ed. J. L. Feiertag, Turnhout, 2005.

———, *Epistulae*, 3 vols., ed. I. Hilberg, Vienna, 1910–18.

John Chrysostom, *Discours sur Babylas*, ed. & trans. Margaret A. Schatkin with Cécile Blanc and Bernard Grillet, Paris, 1990.

———, *Homilia in Epistulam 1 ad Corinthos* in *Opera omnia quae exstant, tomus X.*, repr. Jean-Paul Migne, Paris, 1862.

———, *Sur la vaine gloire et l'éducation des enfants*, ed. & trans. A.-M. Malingrey, Paris, 1972.

———, *Sur le sacerdoce*, ed. & trans. A.-M. Malingrey, Paris, 1980.

Libanius, *Antioch as a Centre of Hellenic Culture according to Libanius*, trans. Norman, Liverpool, 2000.

———, *Autobiography and Selected Letters*, 2 vols, trans. A. F. Norman, Cambridge, Mass, 1993.

———, *Libanii sophistae epistolae Graece et Latine*, ed. & trans. J. C. Wolfe, Amsterdam, 1738.

———, *Opera Vol. VIII: progymnasmata*, ed. Richard Foerster, Leipzig, 1915.

———, *Opera Vol. X: epistulae 1–839*, ed. Richard Foerster, Leipzig, 1921, repr. Hildesheim, 1963 (= Foerster 1).

———, *Opera Vol. XI: epistulae 840–1544, etc*, ed. Richard Foerster, Leipzig, 1922, repr. Hildesheim, 1963 (= Foerster 2).

———, *Selected Letters of Libanius, from the Age of Constantius and Julian*, trans. Scott Bradbury, Liverpool, 2004.

———, *Selected Orations*, 2 vols. trans. A. F. Norman, Cambridge, Mass., 1969–77.

Macarius, *Apocriticus*, trans. Jeremy M. Schott & Mark Edwards, Liverpool, 2015.

———, *Apokritikos: kritische Ausgabe mit deutscher Übersetzung*, ed. & trans. Ulrich Volp, Berlin, 2013.

Macrobius, *Commentarii in somnivm Scipionis*, ed. J. Willis, 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1970, repr. 1994.

Menander Rhetor, *Menander Rhetor*, ed. and trans. D. A. Russell & N. G. Wilson, Oxford, 1981.

Musonius Rufus, *That Exile is not an Evil*, in *Lectures*, trans. Cora E. Lutz, *Yale Classical Studies* 10 (1947), 3–150.

Novum Testamentum Graece (Nestle-Aland), 27th edition, ed. Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini & Bruce M. Metzger, Stuttgart, 1993, corr. 2006.

Origen, *Contre Celse: Tome III (Livres V et VI)*, ed. & trans. Marcel Borret, Paris, 1969.

———, *The Philocalia of Origen*, ed. J. A. Robinson, Cambridge, 1893.

———, *The Philocalia of Origen*, trans. George Lewis, Edinburgh, 1911.

———, *Traité des principes, Vol. IV*, ed. & trans. Henri Crouzel, Manlio Simonetti, Paris, 1980.

Philo, *De Opificio Mundi*, in *Opera quae supersunt Vol. I*, ed. L. Cohn, Leipzig, 1896.

———, *De Abrahamo*, in *Opera quae supersunt Vol. 4*, ed. L. Cohn, Leipzig, 1902.

Philostorgius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* in *Philostorgius. Kirchengeschichte, 3rd edn*., ed. F. Winkelmann, J. Bidez, Berlin, 1981.

Plato, *The Laws of Plato*, ed. & trans. E. B. England, Manchester, 1921.

———, *Rempublicam*, ed. S. R. Slings, Oxford, 2003.

———, *Timaeus*, in *Opera Vol. 4*, ed. J. Burnet, Oxford, 1902 repr. 1968.

Plutarch, *An seni respublica gerenda sit*, in *Moralia Vol. V.1*, ed. C. Hubert, Leipzig, 1957.

———, *De exilio*, in *Moralia Volume III*, ed. W. R. Paton, M. Pohlenz & W. Sieveking, Leipzig, 1957.

———, *De tranquillitate animi*, in *Moralia Volume III*, ed. W. R. Paton, M. Pohlenz & W. Sieveking, Leipzig, 1957.

———, *Maxime cum principibus philosopho esse disserendum*, in *Moralia Vol. V.1*, ed. C. Hubert, Leipzig, 1957.

Porphyry, *Against the Christians*, ed. & trans. Robert Berchman, Leiden, 2005.

Procopius of Gaza, *Procopii Gazaei epistolae et declamations*, ed. A. Garzya & R.-J. Loenertz, Ettal, 1963.

Rufinus, trans., *Regula Basilii*, in *The Rule of St Basil in Latin and English*, ed. & trans. Anna M. Silvas, Collegeville, Minnesota, 2013.

Sallustius, *Des dieux et du monde*, ed & trans. Gabriel Rochefort, Paris, 1960.

Salvian, *De gubernatione Dei* in *Salvien de Marseille: Oeuvres Vol. 2*, ed. G. Lagarrigue, Paris, 1975.

Septuaginta: id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes, ed. Alfred Rahlfs, rev. Robert Hanhart, Stuttgart, 2006.

Socrates, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G. C. Hansen, Berlin, 1995.

Sozomen, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. J. Bidez & G. C. Hansen, *Berlin*, 1960 (2nd ed. 1995).

Suetonius, *Vita divi Augusti*, ed. John M. Carter, Bristol, 1982.

———, *Life of Augustus*, trans. & comm. D. Wardle, Oxford, 2014.

Symmachus, *The Letters of Symmachus: Book I*, trans. M. R. Salzman & M. Roberts, Atlanta, 2011.

Themistius, *Themistii orationes quae supersunt*, 3 vols., ed. G. Downey & H. Schenkel, Leipzig, 1965–74.

Theodoret, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Leon Parmentier, Berlin, 2009.

Theodosiani libri XVI cum Constitutionibus Sirmondianis et Leges Novellae ad Theodosianum Pertinentes, ed. Theodore Mommsen & Paul M. Meyer, 2nd ed., Berlin, 1954.

Zosimus, *Zosimus: comitiis et exadvocati fisci historia nova*, ed. Mendelssohn, Leipzig, 1887.

Secondary Works Cited

Note that, within individual authors, works are cited in alphabetical order rather than by date.

Adams, Sean A., 'Paul the Roman citizen: Roman citizenship in the ancient world and its importance for understanding Acts 22:22–29', in Stanley E. Porter, ed., *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman*, Leiden, 2009, pp. 309–326.

Addey, Crystal, 'The role of Divine Providence, will and love in Iamblichus' theory of theurgic prayer and religious invocation', in Eugene Afonasin, John Dillon, and John Finamore, eds., *Iamblichus and the Foundations of Late Platonism*, Leiden, 2012, pp. 133–50.

Agosti, Gianfranco, 'Greek metrical inscriptions, classical *paideia* and identity', in María-Paz de Hoz and Luiz Arturo Guichard, eds., *Greek paideia and local traditions in the Graeco-Roman East*, 2020, pp. 217–31.

———, 'Literariness and levels of style in epigraphical poetry of late antiquity', *Ramus*, 37 (2008), pp. 191–213.

Aliquot, Julien, 'Cultes des saints et rivalités civiques en Phénicie à l'époque protobyzantine', in Jean-Pierre Caillet, Sylvain Destephen, Bruno Dumézil, and Hervé Ingelbert, eds., *Des dieux civiques aux saints patrons (IVe–VIIe siècle)*, Paris, 2015, pp. 117–39.

Allen, Pauline and Bronwen Neil, *Greek and Latin Letters in Late Antiquity: the Christianisation of a Literary Form*, Cambridge, 2020.

Alston, Richard, and Onno Van Nijf, eds., *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age*,

Alston, Richard, Onno Van Nijf and Christina Williamson, eds., *Cults, Creeds and Identities in the Greek City after the Classical Age*, Leuven, 2013.

Alt, Karin, 'Man and daimones: do the daimones influence a man's life?', in Andrew Smith, ed., *The Philosopher and Society in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Peter Brown*, Swansea, 2005, pp. 73–90.

Amand de Mendieta, Emmanuel, 'La préparation et la composition des neuf Homélies sur l'Hexaéméron de Basile de Césarée. Le probléme des sources littéraires immédiates', in Elizabeth A. Livingstone, *Studia patristica, XVI: Papers presented to the Seventh International Conference on Patristica Studies held in Oxford 1975, II : Monastica et*

ascetica, Orientalia e saeculo secundo, Origen, Athanasius, Cappadocian Fathers, Chrysostom, Augustine, Berlin, 1985, pp. 349–67.

———, ‘Le système cénobitique basilien comparé au système cénobitique pachômien’, *Revue de l’histoire des religions*, 152 (1957), pp. 31–80.

———, ‘Les neufs homélies de Basile de Césarée sur l’Hexaéméron: recherches sur la genre littéraire, le but et l’élaboration de ces homélies’, *Byzantion*, 48 (1978), pp. 337–68.

Anderson, Perry, *Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism*, London, 1974.

Ando, Clifford, ‘Imperial identities’, in Tim Whitmarsh, ed., *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek world*, Cambridge, 2017, pp. 17–45.

———, *The Matter of the Gods*, Berkeley, CA, 2008.

———, ‘Was Rome a *polis*?’, *Classical Antiquity*, 18 (1999), pp. 5–34.

Armstrong, A. Hilary, ‘Man in the cosmos: a study of some differences between pagan Neoplatonism and Christianity’, in W. den Boer, J. H. Waszinck, P. G. van der Nat, and C. M. J. Sicking, eds., *Romanitas et Christianitas; studia Iano Henrico Waszink a. d. VI Kal. Nov. a. MCMLXXIII XIII lustra complenti oblata*, Amsterdam, 1973, pp. 5–14.

———, ‘Salvation, Plotinian and Christian’, *The Downside Review*, 75 (1957), pp. 126–139.

Athanassiadi, Polymnia, *Julian and Hellenism*, Oxford, 1981.

Athanassiadi, Polymnia and Michael Frede, eds., *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, 2002.

Baker-Brian, Nicholas, ‘The politics of virtue in Julian’s *Misopogon*’, in Nicholas Baker-Brian and Shaun Tougher, eds., *Emperor and Author: the Writings of Julian the Apostate*, Swansea, 2012, pp. 263–280.

Banaji, Jairus, *Agrarian Change in Late Antiquity: Gold, Labour, and Aristocratic Dominance*, 2007.

———, ‘State and aristocracy in the economic evolution of the late empire’, in Idem, *Exploring the Economy of Late Antiquity: Selected Essays*, Cambridge, 2016, pp. 52–60.

Banchich, Thomas, ‘The Emperor Julian’s school laws: Cod. Theod. 13.5.5 and *Ep.* 42’, *Ancient World*, 24 (1993), pp. 5–14.

Barbier, Josiane, *Archives oubliées du haut Moyen âge – les gesta municipalia en Gaule franque, VI–IXe siècle*, Paris, 2014.

Barnes, Timothy D., ‘Angel of light or mystic initiate? The problem of the “Life of Antony”’, *The Journal of Theological Studies,* 37 (1986), pp. 353–368.

———, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge, Mass., 1993.

———, *Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambridge, Mass., 1989.

———, *Constantine: Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire*, Chichester, 2011.

Barnes, Timothy D. and John Vanderspoel, ‘Julian and Themistius’, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 22 (1980), pp. 187–89.

Barnish, Sam, ‘The transformation of Classical cities and the Pirenne Debate’, *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 2 (1989), pp. 385–400.

Bartelink, G. J. M., ‘L’empereur Julien et le vocabulaire chrétienne’, *Vigiliae Christianae*, 11 (1955), pp. 37–48.

Baumeister, Theofried, *Die Anfänge der Theologie des Martyriums*, Münster, 1980.

Beard, Mary, John North, and Simon Price, *Religions of Rome: Volume 1, A History*, Cambridge, 1998.

Beck, Hans, *Localism and the Ancient Greek City-State,* Chicago, Ill., 2020.

Begass, Christoph, ‘Φιλοκτίστης: ein Beitrag zur spätantiker Euergetismus’, *Chiron : Mitteilungen der Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, 44 (2014), pp. 165–189.

Belayche, Nicole, ‘Sacrifice and theory of sacrifice during the “pagan reaction”: Julian the emperor’, in Albert I. Baumgartner, ed., *Sacrifice in Religious Experience*, Leiden, 2002, pp. 101–126.

Beltrán Lloris, Francisco, ‘The “epigraphic habit” in the Roman World’, in Christer Bruun and Jonathan Edmondson, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy*, Oxford, 2014, pp. 131–48.

Bernardi, Jean, ‘La composition et la publication du *Discours 42* de Grégoire de Nazianze’, in *Mémorial Dom Jean Gribomont*, Rome, 1988, pp. 132–43.

———, *La Prédication des Pères Cappadociens*, Paris, 1968.

———, *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze: Le Théologien et son Temps (330–390)*, Paris, 1995.

Bernier-Farella, Hélène, 'Retour sur les rapports entre héros grecs et martyrs chrétiennes', in Jean-Pierre Caillet, Sylvain Destephen, Bruno Dumézil, and Hervé Ingelbert, eds., *Des dieux civiques aux saints patrons (IVe–VIIe siècle)*, Paris, 2015, pp. 39–58.

Berns, Christof, ed., *« Patris » und « Imperium »: kulturelle und politische Identität in den Städten der römischen Provinzen Kleinasiens in der frühen Kaiserzeit : Kolloquium Köln, November 1998*, Peeters, 2002.

Biddle, Martin, 'Towns', in D. M. Wilson, ed., *The Archaeology of Anglo-Saxon England*, Cambridge, 1976, pp. 99–150.

Boatwright, Mary T., *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire*, Princeton, NJ, 2002.

Bodnaruk, Mariana, 'Administering the empire: the unmaking of an equestrian elite in the 4th century CE', in Rada Varga and Viorca Rusu-Bolindeț, eds., *Official Power and Local Elites in the Roman Provinces*, London, 2017, pp. 145–67.

Boedeker, Carol, 'Hero cult and politics in Herodotus: the bones of Orestes', in Carol Dougherty, ed., *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*, Oxford, 1998, pp. 164–177.

Boin, Douglas, 'The Maccabees, "apostasy", and Julian's appropriation of *Hellenismos* as a reclaimed epithet in Christian conversations of the fourth century CE', in Morwenna Ludlow and Richard Flower, eds., *Rhetoric and Religious Identity in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, 2020, pp. 48–64.

Bolle, Katharina, Carlos Machado, and Christian Witschel, 'Introduction: defining the field', in Christian Witschel, Carlos Machado, and Katharina Bolle, eds., *The Epigraphic Cultures of Late Antiquity*, 2017, pp. 15–30.

Bonamente, Giorgio, 'La città nella politica di Giuliano l'Apostata', *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Macerata*, 16 (1983), pp. 33–96.

Booth, Alan D., 'The chronology of Jerome's early years', *Phoenix*, 35 (1981), pp. 237–259.

Borelli, Daniella, 'Identità e funzioni dello hiereus nel "religious revival" di Massimino Daia e di Giuliano Imperatore', in Davide Dainese and Viola Gheller, eds., *Beyond Intolerance: the Milan Meeting in AD 313 and the Evolution of Imperial Religious Policy from the Age of the Tetrarchs to Julian the Apostate*, Turnhout, 2018, pp. 67–104.

Bouffartigue, Jean, 'L'authenticité de la Lettre 84 de l'empereur Julien', *Revue de philologie, de litterature et d'histoire anciennes*, 79 (2005), pp. 231–242.

Bowden, W. and Luke Lavan, eds., *Theory and Practice in Late Antique Archaeology*, Leiden, 2003.

Bowder, Diana, *The Age of Constantine and Julian*, London, 1978.

Bowersock, Glen Warren, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, Oxford, 1969.

———, '"The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire" by Michael Ivanovitch Rostovtzeff', *Daedalus*, 103 (1974), pp. 15–23.

———, *Julian the Apostate*, Cambridge, Mass., 1978.

Bowman, A. K., *The Town Councils of Roman Egypt*, Toronto, 1971.

Bradbury, Scott, 'Constantine and the problem of anti-pagan legislation in the fourth century', *Classical Philology*, 89 (1994), pp. 120–139.

———, 'Julian's pagan revival and the decline of blood sacrifice', *Phoenix*, 49 (1995), pp. 331–56.

———, 'Libanius' networks', in Lieve Van Hoof, ed., *Libanius: A Critical Introduction*, Cambridge, 2014, pp. 220–40.

Bradshaw, David, 'Plato in the Cappadocian Fathers', in Ryan C. Fowler, ed., *Plato in the Third Sophistic*, Berlin, Boston, 2014, pp. 193–210.

Brakke, David, *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity*, Cambridge, Mass, 2006.

Branham, Robert B., 'Exile on main street: Citizen Diogenes', in Jan Felix Gaertner, ed., *Writing Exile: the Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, Leiden, 2007, pp. 71–86.

Bransbourg, Giles, 'Imperial taxation and municipal finances in the 4th century', *Antiquité Tardive*, 16 (2008), pp. 255–96.

———, 'Julien, l'*immunitas christi*, les dieux et les cités', *L'Antiquité Tardive*, 17 (2009), pp. 151–158.

Bremen, Riet Van, *The Limits of Participation: Women & the Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic & Roman Periods*, Amsterdam, 1996.

Brewer, Raymond R., 'The meaning of *politeuesthe* in Philippians 1:27', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 73 (1954), pp. 76–83.

Brock, Roger, ‘Sickness in the body politic: medical imagery in the Greek *polis’*, in Valerie Hope and Eireann Marshall, eds., *Death and Disease in the Ancient City*, London; 2000, pp. 24–34.

———, ‘The body as a political organism in Greek thought’, in Francis Prost and Jérôme Wilgaux, eds., *Penser et représenter le corps dans l’Antiquité: actes du colloque international de Rennes, 1–4 septembre 2004*, Rennes, 2006, pp. 351–9.

Brogiolo, Gian Pietro, Nancy Gauthier, and Neil Christie, eds., *Towns and Their Territories Between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, Leiden, 2000.

Brogiolo, Gian Pietro and Bryan Ward-Perkins, eds., *The Idea and Ideal of the Town Between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, Leiden, 1999.

Brown, Peter, ‘Concluding remarks’, in Jean-Pierre Caillet, Sylvain Destephen, Bruno Dumézil, and Hervé Ingelbert, eds., *Des dieux civiques aux saints patrons (IVe–VIIe siècle)*, Paris, 2015, pp. 375–84.

———, ‘From civic euergetism to Christian charity: the parameters of a change’, in Peter Eich and Eike Faber, eds., *Religiöser Alltag in der Spätantike*, Stuttgart, 2013, pp. 23–30.

———, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*, Hanover, New England, 2002.

———, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*, Madison, 1992.

———, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*, New York, NY, 1988.

———, *The Cult of the Saints: its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity*, Chicago, 1982.

———, ‘The rise and function of the holy man in late antiquity’, *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 61 (1971), pp. 80–101.

———, ‘The saint as exemplar in late antiquity’, *Representations*, 2 (1983), pp. 1–25.

———, *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350–550 AD*, Princeton, NJ, 2012.

Browning, Robert, ‘Education in the Roman Empire’, in Averil Cameron, Michael Whitby, and Bryan Ward-Perkins, eds., *The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume 14: Empire and Successors, AD 425–600*, Cambridge, 2001, pp. 855–83.

———, *The Emperor Julian*, London, 1975.

Burbank, Jane and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton, NJ, 2010.

Burgess, R. W., 'The summer of blood: the "Great Massacre" of 337 and the promotion of the sons of Constantine', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 62 (2008), pp. 5–51.

Burrus, Virginia, *The Making of a Heretic: Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy*, Berkeley, 1996.

Burton, G. P., 'The *curator rei publicae*. Towards a reappraisal', *Chiron : Mitteilungen der Kommission für alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, 9 (1979), pp. 465–487.

Busine, Aude, 'Basil of Caesarea and the praise of the city', *Studia Patristica Volume XCV. Papers Presented at the Seventeenth International Conference on Patristics Studies Held at Oxford 2015*, 95 (2017), pp. 209–15.

———, 'Les représentations chrétiennes de l'histoire des cités dans l'orient romain', in Jean-Pierre Caillet, Sylvain Destephen, Bruno Dumézil, and Hervé Ingelbert, eds., *Des dieux civiques aux saints patrons (IVe–VIIe siècle)*, Paris, 2015, pp. 235–48.

———, 'The conquest of the past: pagan and Christian attitudes towards civic history', in Peter Van Nuffelen and David Engels, eds., *Religion and Competition in the Ancient World*, Brussels, 2014.

Caillet, Jean-Pierre, 'L'évolution de la notion d'évergétisme dans l'antiquité chrétienne', in Elizabeth Yota and Jean-Michel Spieser, eds., *Donation et Donateurs dans le Monde Byzantin*, Paris, 2012, pp. 11–24.

Callu, Jean-Pierre, 'Cités et provinces: des confusions toponymiques', in Claude Lepelley, ed., *La fin de la cité antique et le début de la cité médiévale: De la fin du IIIe siècle à l'avènement de Charlemagne*, Bari, 1996, pp. 15–23.

Cameron, Alan, 'The Epigrams of Sophronius', *Classical Quarterly* 33 (1983), 284–92.

———, *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*, Oxford, 1993.

———, *The Last Pagans of Rome*, Oxford, 2011.

Caner, Daniel, 'Bishops and the politics of lithomania in early Byzantium', in Marc Domingo Gygax and Arjan Zuiderhoeck, eds., *Benefactors and the* Polis: *the Public Gift in the Greek Cities from the Homeric World to Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, 2020, 267–96.

———, *The Rich and the Pure: Philanthropy and the Making of Christian Society in Early Byzantium*, Berkeley, CA, 2021.

Carlson, Rachel D., 'The Honey Bee and Apian Imagery in Classical Literature' (PhD Diss., University of Washington, 2015).

Carmon Hardy, B., 'The Emperor Julian and his school law', *Church History*, 37 (1968), pp. 131–43.

Cecconi, G. A., '*Honorati, possessores, curiales*: competenze istituzionali e gerarchie de rango nella città tardonantica', in Rita Lizzi Testa, ed., *Le trasformazioni delle élites in età tardoantica: atti del convegno internazionale, Perugia, 15–16 marzo 2004*, Rome, 2006, pp. 41–64.

Cerroni, Enrico, 'A commentary on Gregory of Nazianzus, AP 8.21', *Graeco-Latina Brunensia*, 25 (2020), pp. 61–70.

Chaniotis, Angelos, *Age of Conquests: the Greek World from Alexander to Hadrian*, London, 2018.

———, 'Public subscriptions and loans as social capital in the Hellenistic city: reciprocity, performance, commemoration', in P. Martzavou and N. Papazarkadas, *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis: 4th Century BC to 2nd Century AD*, Oxford, 2012, pp. 89–106.

Chastagnol, André, *L'album municipal de Timgad*, Bonn, 1979.

Chin, Tamara T., 'What is imperial cosmopolitanism? Revisiting *kosmopolitēs* and *mundanus*', in Richard E. Payne, Myles Lavan, and John Weisweiler, eds., *Cosmopolitanism and Empire: Universal Rulers, Local Elites, and Cultural Integration in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean*, Oxford, 2016, pp. 129–52.

Chiriatti, Mattia C., 'A Reviewed ἔκφρασις of the spectacle in Basil's *Homilia in Gordium martyrem*', *Studia Patristica*, 95 (2017), pp. 189–99.

Chitty, Derwas J., *The Desert a City: Introduction to the Study of Egyptian and Palestinian Monasticism Under the Christian Empire*, Oxford, 1966.

Clark, Elizabeth A., 'The Life of Olympias', in Eadem, *Jerome, Chrysostom and Friends. Essays and Translations*, New York, 1979, pp. 107–57.

Clark, Gillian, 'Philosophical lives and the philosophical life: Porphyry and Iamblichus', in Philip Rousseau, Thomas Hägg, and Christian Høgel, eds., *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, CA, 2000, pp. 29–51.

———, *Women in Late Antiquity: Pagan and Christian Lifestyles*, Oxford, 1993.

Cloke, Gillian, *'This Female Man of God': Women and Spiritual Power in the Patristic Age, AD 350–450*, London, 1995.

Cobb, L. Stephanie, *Dying to Be Men: Gender and Language in Early Christian Martyr Texts*, New York, NY, 2008.

Cochrane, Charles Norris, *Christianity and Classical Culture: a Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine*, Oxford, 1940.

Consolino, Franca Ela, 'Macrobius' *Saturnalia* and the *Carmen contra paganos*', in Rita Lizzi Testa, ed., *The strange death of Pagan Rome: Reflections on a Historiographical Controversy*, Turnhout, 2014, pp. 85–108.

———, 'Σοφίης ἀμφοτέρης πρύτανιν: gli epigrammi funerari di Gregorio di Nazianzo (AP VIII)', *Athenaeum*, 65 (1987), pp. 405–27.

Cooper, John M., 'Political animals and civic friendship', in Günther Patzig, ed., *Aristoteles 'Politik': Akten des XI. Symposium Aristotelicum, Friedrichshafen/Bodensee, 25.8.–3.9.1987*, Göttingen, 1990, pp. 220–41.

Cooper, Kate, *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, Mass., 1996.

Cribiore, Rafaella, *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch*, Princeton, NJ, 2007.

Crislip, Andrew T., *From Monastery to Hospital: Christian Monasticism and the Transformation of Health Care in Late Antiquity*, Ann Arbor, MI, 2005.

Cross, Richard, 'Divine monarchy in Gregory of Nazianzus', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 14 (2006), pp. 105–116.

Cunningham, Mary, 'Introduction', in Mary Cunningham, Pauline Allen, and Pauline Allen, eds., *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*, Leiden, 1998, pp. 21–32.

Cunningham, Mary and Pauline Allen, eds., *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*, Leiden, 1998.

Curchin, Leonard A., 'The end of local magistrates in the Roman Empire/El fin de los magistrados locales en el Imperio romano', *Gerión*, 32 (2014), pp. 271–287.

Curran, J., *Pagan City and Christian Capital: Rome in the Fourth Century*, Oxford, 2002.

Curta, Florin, ‘Atticism, Homer, Neoplatonism, and Fürstenspiegel: Julian’s second panegyric on Constantius’, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 36 (1995), pp. 177–211.

Dagron, Gilbert, *Emperor and Priest: the Imperial Office in Byzantium*, trans. Jean Birrell, Cambridge, 2003.

———, ‘Entre village et cité: la bougade rurale des IVe–VIIe siècles en Oriente’, *Κοινωνία*, 3 (1979), pp. 29–52.

———, *La romanité chrétienne en Orient: héritages et mutations*, London, 1984.

———, ‘Le christianisme dans la ville byzantine’, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 31 (1977), pp. 1–25.

———, *Naissance d' une capitale: Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Paris, 1974.

Dal Santo, Matthew, Peter Sarris, and Phil Booth, eds., *An Age of Saints? Power, Conflict and Dissent in Early Medieval Christianity*, Leiden, 2013.

Daley, Brian, ‘Building a new city. The Cappadocian Fathers and the rhetoric of philantropy’, *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 7 (1999), pp. 431–461.

Daunton-Fear, Andrew, ‘Can we hear the spoken words of Gregory of Nazianzus?’, *Scrinium*, 13 (2017), pp. 72–83.

De Jong, Mayke, ‘The state of the Church: *ecclesia* and early medieval state formation’, in Walter Pohl and V. Wieser, eds., *Der frühmittelalterliche Staat: Europäische Perspektive Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, Vienna, 2009, pp. 241–55.

Delehaye, Hippolyte, *Les origines du culte des martyrs*, Brussels, 1933.

Delmaire, Roland, ‘Cités et fiscalité au bas-empire à propos du rôle des *curiales* dans la levée des impôts’, in Claude Lepelley, ed., *La fin de la cité antique et le début de la cité médiévale: De la fin du IIIe siècle à l’avènement de Charlemagne*, Bari, 1996, pp. 59–70.

———, *Largesses sacrées et res private: L’*aerarium *impériale et l’administration du IVe au VIe siécle*, Rome, 1989.

Demoen, Kristoffel, ‘Gifts of friendship that will remain forever: personae, addressed characters and the intended audience of Gregory Nazianzen’s epistolary poems’, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, 47 (1997), pp. 1–11.

Destephen, Sylvain, ‘Martyrs locaux et cultes civiques en Asie Mineure’, in Jean-Pierre Caillet, Sylvain Destephen, Bruno Dumézil, and Hervé Ingelbert, eds., *Des dieux civiques aux saints patrons (IVe–VIIe siècle)*, Paris, 2015, pp. 59–116.

Dey, Hendrik, *The Afterlife of the Roman City: Architecture and Ceremony in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, Cambridge, 2015.

———, ‘Privileged cities: provincial, regional and imperial capitals’, *Antiquité Tardive*, 26 (2018), pp. 163–95.

Dillon, John, ‘Philosophy as a profession in late antiquity’, in Andrew Smith, ed., *The Philosopher and Society in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Peter Brown*, Swansea, 2005, pp. 1–17.

Downey, Glanville, ‘Julian and Justinian and the unity of faith and culture’, *Church History*, 28 (1959), pp. 339–349.

———, ‘Julian the Apostate at Antioch’, *Church History*, 8 (1939), pp. 303–315.

———, ‘Philanthropia in religion and statecraft in the fourth century after Christ’, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 4 (1955), pp. 199–208.

———, ‘The Emperor Julian and the schools’, *The Classical Journal*, 53 (1957), pp. 97–103.

Drake, Harold Allen, ‘“But I digress...”: rhetoric and propaganda in Julian’s second oration to Constantius’, in Shaun Tougher and Nicholas Baker-Brian, eds., *Emperor and Author: the Writings of Julian the Apostate*, Swansea, 2012, pp. 35–46.

———, *Constantine and the Bishops: the Politics of Intolerance*, Baltimore, Md, 2000.

———, ed., *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Practices*, New York, NY, 2009.

Dreyer, B., and H. Engelmann, *Die Inschriften von Metropolis*, Vol. 1 (Bonn, 2003)

Driver, Lisa D. Maugans, ‘The cult of martyrs in Asterius of Amaseia’s vision of the Christian city’, *Church History*, 74 (2005), pp. 236–254.

den Dulk, Matthijs, ‘Origen of Alexandria and the history of racism as a theological problem’, *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 71 (2020), pp. 164–195.

Dunning, Benjamin H., *Aliens and Sojourners: Self As Other in Early Christianity*, Philadelphia, Penn., 2009.

Dvornik, Francis, *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy: Origins and Background*, 1966.

———, ‘The Emperor Julian’s reactionary ideas on kingship’, in Kurt Weitzman, S. Nersessian, G. H. Forsyth, Jr., E. H. Kantorwicz, and Th. E. Mommsen, eds., *Late Classical and Medieval Studies in Honour of Albert Matthias Friend, Junior*, Princeton, NJ, 1955, pp. 71–81.

Edwards, Mike, ‘Oratory: practice and theory’, in Martin Hose and David Schenker, eds., *A Companion to Greek Literature*, Chichester, 2016, pp. 205–16.

Efthymiadis, Stephanos, ‘Two Gregories and three genres: autobiography, autohagiography and hagiography’, in Tomas Hägg and Jostein Børtnes, eds., *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*, Copenhagen, 2006, pp. 239–56.

Eisenstadt, Shmuel N., ‘The axial age : the emergence of transcendental visions and the rise of clerics’, *European Journal of Sociology*, 23 (1982), pp. 294–314.

———, *The Political Systems of Empires*, New York, NY, 1963.

Ellis-Evans, Aneurin, ‘The ideology of public subscriptions’, in P. Martzavou and N. Papazarkadas, *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis: 4th Century BC to 2nd Century AD*, Oxford, 2012, pp. 107–21.

Elm, Eva and Nicole Hartman, eds., *Demons in Late Antiquity: Their Perception and Transformation in Different Literary Genres*, Berlin, 2020.

Elm, Susanna, ‘A programmatic life: Gregory of Nazianzus’ Orations 42 and 43 and the Constantinopolitan elites’, *Arethusa*, 33 (2000), pp. 411–27.

———, ‘Apollinarius of Laodicea and Gregory of Nazianz: the early years’, in Silke-Petra Bergjan, Benjamin Gleede, and Martin Heimgartner, eds., *Apollinarius und seine Folgen*, Tübingen, 2015, pp. 3–18.

———, ‘Church – festival – temple: reimagining civic topography in late antiquity’, in Claudia Rapp and Harold Allen Drake, eds., *The City in the Classical and Post-Classical World: Changing Concepts of Power and Identity*, Cambridge, 2014, pp. 167–182.

———, ‘Gregory’s women: creating a philosopher’s family’, in Tomas Hägg and Jostein Børtnes, eds., *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*, Copenhagen, 2006, pp. 171–91.

———, ‘Inventing the “Father of the Church”: Gregory of Nazianzus’ “Farewell to the Bishops” in its historical context’, in Franz J. Felten and Nikolas Jaspert, eds., *Vita Religiosa im Mittelalter: Festschrift für Kaspar Elm zum 70. Geburtstag*, Berlin, 1999, pp. 3–20.

———, ‘Julian the writer and his audience’, in Shaun Tougher and Nicholas Baker-Brian, eds., *Emperor and Author: the Writings of Julian the Apostate*, Swansea, 2012, pp. 1–18 (= Elm 2012a).

———, *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: the Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome*, Berkeley, CA, 2012 (= Elm 2012b).

———, ‘The letter collection of the Emperor Julian’, in Christina Sogno, Edward J. Watts, and Bradley K. Storin, eds., *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide*, Berkeley, CA, 2017, pp. 54–68.

———, *Virgins of God: the Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, 1994.

———, ‘Waiting for Theodosius, or the ascetic and the city: Gregory of Nazianzus on Maximus the Philosopher’, in Blake Leyerle and Robert Darling Young, eds., *Ascetic Culture: Essays in Honor of Philip Rousseau*, Notre Dame, Ind., 2013, pp. 183–197.

Erkelenz, Dirk, ‘“*Patria*, *civis*, *condecurio*”: zur Identifizierung der Herkunft von Rittern und Senatoren in der Römischen Kaiserzeit’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 137 (2001), pp. 271–279.

Esmonde Clearly, Simon, *The Roman West AD 200–500*, Cambridge, 2013.

Evans-Grubbs, Judith, ‘Illegitimacy and inheritance disputes in the late Roman Empire’, in Sabine R. Huebner and Béatrice Caseau, eds., *Inheritance, Law and Religions in the Ancient and Mediaeval Worlds*, Paris, 2014, pp. 25–50.

Falcasantos, Rebecca Stephens, *Constantinople: Ritual, Violence and Memory in the Making of a Christian Capital*, Oakland, CA, 2020.

Fasoli, Gina, ‘La coscienza civica nelle *Laudes Civitatum*’, in *La coscienza cittadina nei comuni italiani del Duecento*, Todi, 1973, pp. 11–44.

Fedwick, Paul J., *Bibliotheca Basiliana universalis*, 5 vols, Toronto, 1993–2004.

———, *The Church and the Charisma of Leadership in Basil of Caesarea*, Toronto, 1978.

Feissel, Denis, ‘Trois fonctions muncipales dans l’épigraphie protobyzantine (*curator*, *defensor*, *pater civitatis*)’, in Christian Witschel, Carlos Machado, and Katharina Bolle, eds., *The Epigraphic Cultures of Late Antiquity*, 2017, pp. 473–500.

Femia, Joseph V., ‘An historicist critique of “revisionist” methods for studying the history of ideas’, *History and Theory*, 20 (1981), pp. 112–34.

Ferguson, Everett, ‘Spiritual sacrifice in early Christianity and its environment’, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt,* 22 (1980), pp. 1151–1189.

Finley, M. I., ‘The ancient city: from Fustel de Coulanges to Max Weber and beyond’, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 19 (1977), pp. 305–327.

Finn, Richard, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire: Christian Promotion and Practice 313–450*, Oxford, 2006.

Flierman, Robert and Els Rose, ‘Banished from the company of the good. Christians and aliens in fifth-century Rome’, *Al-Masāq*, 32 (2020), pp. 64–86.

Floridi, L., ‘The epigrams of Gregory Nazianzen against tomb desecrators and their epigraphic background’, *Mnemosyne,* 66 (2013), pp. 55–81.

Focanti, Lorenzo, ‘The Fragments of Late Antique *Patria*’ (PhD Diss., Universities of Ghent & Groningen, 2018).

Ford, Coleman M., ‘“Striving for glory with God”: humility as the good life in Basil of Caesarea’s homily 20’, *Themelios,* 44 (2019), pp. 278–90.

Forlin Patrucco, Marcella, ‘Basilio προστάτης e ἔξαρχος della communità cittadina’, in *Basilio di Cesarea : la sua età, la sua opera e il basilianesimo in Sicilia : atti del congresso internazionale, Messina, 3–6 XII 1979.*, Messina, 1983, pp. 125–36.

———, ‘Forme della tradizione nella grecità tarda: la citazione classica come linguaggio politico’, in Mario Mazza and Giuffrida Claudia, eds., *Le trasformazioni della cultura nella tarda antichità*, Rome, 1985, pp. 185–203.

———, ‘Social patronage and political mediation in Basil of Caesarea’, *Studia Patristica*, 17 (1982), pp. 1102–1107.

Fortin, Ernest L., ‘Christianity and Hellenism in Basil the Great’s address *Ad Adulescentes*’, in Robert A. Markus and H. J. Blumenthal, eds., *Neoplatonism and Early Christian Thought: Essays in Honour of A. H. Armstrong*, London, 1981, pp. 189–211.

Foucault, Michel, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France 1977–1978*, ed. Michel Senellart, trans. Graham Burchell, New York, NY, 2009.

Fowden, Garth, *Empire to Commonwealth: Consequences of Monotheism in Late Antiquity*, Princeton, NJ, 1993.

———, ‘Late polytheism: public religion’, in Averil Cameron, Peter Garnsey, and Alan K. Bowman, eds., *The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume 12: the Crisis of Empire, AD 193–337,* Cambridge, 2005, pp. 553–572.

———, ‘Polytheist religion and philosophy’, in Averil Cameron and Peter Garnsey, eds., *The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume 13: the Late Empire, AD 337–425,* Cambridge, 1997, pp. 538–560.

———, ‘The pagan holy man in late antique society’, *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 102 (1982), pp. 33–59.

Frakes, Robert M., ‘The *defensor civitas* and the late Roman city’, *Antiquité Tardive*, 26 (2018), pp. 127–47.

François, Louis, ‘Julien et Dion Chrysostome. Les Περὶ Βασιλείας et le second panégyrique de Constance’, *Revue des Études Grecques,* 28 (1915), pp. 417–439.

Fustel de Coulanges, Numa Denis, *La cité antique*, 2nd ed., Paris, 1866.

———, *The Ancient City: a Study on the Religion, Laws and Institutions of Greece and Rome*, trans. A. Momigliano and S. C. Humphreys, London, 1980.

Gaddis, Michael, *There is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ: Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire*, Berkeley, CA, 2005.

Garnsey, P., ‘Roman citizenship and Roman law in the late Empire', in M. Edwards and S. Swain, eds., *Approaching Late Antiquity: the Transformation from Early to Late Empire*, Oxford, 2006, pp. 133–55.

Garrison, Roman, *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity*, Sheffield, 1993.

Gascou, Jean, ‘Les privilèges du clergé d’après la Lettre 104 de S. Basile’, *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, 71 (1997), pp. 189–204.

Gassman, Mattias P., *Worshippers of the Gods: Debating Paganism in the Fourth-Century Roman West*, Oxford, 2020.

Gauthier, Philippe, *Les cités grécques et leuers bienfaiteurs*, Paris, 1985.

———, ‘Notes sur l’étranger et l’hospitalité en Grèce et à Rome’, *Ancient Society*, 4 (1973), pp. 1–21.

Gerson, Lloyd, ‘General introduction’, in Lloyd P. Gerson, ed., *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, Vol. 1, Cambridge, 2000, pp. 1–10.

Gibbon, Edward, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. 1, London, 1776.

———, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. 3, London, 1781.

———, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. 1, ed. David Womersley, London, 1996.

Gibson, Craig, ‘Libanius' *progymnasmata*’, in Lieve Van Hoof, ed., *Libanius: a Critical Introduction*, Cambridge, 2014, pp. 128–43.

Gibson, Roy, ‘On the nature of ancient letter collections’, *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 102 (2012), pp. 56–78.

Giet, Stanislas, *Les idées et l’action sociales de saint Basile*, Paris, 1941.

Girardi, Mario, *Basilio de Cesarea e il culto dei martiri nel IV secolo: Scrittura e tradizione*, Bari, 1990.

Gleason, Maud W., ‘Festive satire: Julian’s *Misopogon* and the new year at Antioch’, *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 76 (1986), pp. 106–119.

Goddard, Christophe J., 'Euergetism, Christianity and municipal culture in late antiquity, from Aquileia to Gerasa (fourth to sixth centuries CE)', in Marc Domingo Gygax and Arjan Zuiderhoeck, eds., *Benefactors and the* Polis: *the Public Gift in the Greek Cities from the Homeric World to Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, 2020, pp. 297–329.

Goldhill, Simon and Emma Greensmith, ‘Gregory of Nazianzus in the *Palatine Anthology*: the poetics of Christian death’, *The Cambridge Classical Journal*, 66 (2020), pp. 29–69.

Goulet, Richard, ‘Réfexions sur la loi scolaire de l’empereur Julian’, in H. Hugonnand-Roche, ed., *L’Enseignement supérieur dans les mondes antiques et médiévaux. Aspects institutionnels, juridiques et pédagogiques*, Paris, 2008, pp. 175–200.

Gray, A. R., ‘Reflections on the meaning(s) of “city” in the Hebrew Bible’, in J. K. Aitken and H. F. Marlowe, eds., *The City in the Hebrew Bible: Critical, Literary and Exegetical Approaches*, London, 2018, pp. 17–34.

Gray, Benjamin, ‘Exile, refuge and the Greek *polis*: between justice and humanity’, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 30 (2017), pp. 190–219.

———, ‘The *polis* becomes humane? *Philanthropia* as a cardinal civic virtue in later Hellenistic honorific epigraphy and historiography’, *Studi Ellenistici*, 27 (2013), pp. 137–162.

Greenwood, David Neal, ‘Constantinian influence upon Julian’s pagan church’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 68 (2017), pp. 1–21.

———, *Julian and Christianity*, Ithaca, NY, 2021.

Greer, Rowan A., ‘Alien citizens: a marvellous paradox’, in Peter S. Hawkins, ed., *Civitas: Religious Interpretations of the City*, Atlanta, GA, 1986, pp. 39–56.

Gribomont, Jean, ‘Eustathe le Philosophe et les voyages du jeune Basile de Césarée’, *Revue d’Histoire Ecclésiastique*, 54 (1959), pp. 115–24.

———, *Histoire du texte des Ascétiques de S. Basile*, Löwen, 1957 (= Gribomont 1957a).

———, ‘Le monachisme au IVe siècle en Asie Mineure: De Gangres au Messalianisme’, *Studia Patristica*, 2 (1957), pp. 400–415 (= Gribomont 1957b).

———, ‘Le monachisme au sein de l’église en Syrie et en Cappadoce’, *Studia Monastica*, 7 (1965), pp. 7–24.

———, ‘L’ origénisme de saint Basile’, in *L’Homme devant Dieu – Mélanges offerts au pere Henri de Lubac*, Vol. 1, Paris, 1963, pp. 281–294.

———, ‘Un aristocrate révolutionaire, évêque et moine: saint Basile’, *Augustianianum*, 17 (1977), pp. 179–91.

Grig, Lucy, ‘Cities in the “long” late antiquity, 2000–2012 – a survey essay’, *Urban History*, 40 (2013), pp. 554–566.

———, ‘Competing capitals, competing representations: late antique cityscapes in words and pictures’, in Lucy Grig and Gavin Kelly, eds., *Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*, New York, NY, 2012, pp. 31–52.

Grig, Lucy and Gavin Kelly, eds., *Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, 2012.

Haarer, Fiona, ‘Developments in the governance of late antique cities’, in Laura Mecella and Umberto Roberto, eds., *Governare e riformare l’impero al momento della sua divisione : Oriente, Occidente, Illirico*, Rome, 2015.

Haensch, Rudolf, ‘Le financement de la construction des églises pendant l’Antiquité tardive et l’évergétisme antique’, *Antiquité Tardive*, 14 (2006), pp. 47–58.

Hägg, Tomas and Jostein Børtnes, eds., *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*, Copenhagen, 2006.

Haldon, John, ‘The idea of the town in the Byzantine Empire’, in Gian Pietro Brogiolo and Bryan Ward-Perkins, eds., *The Idea and Ideal of the Town Between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, Leiden, 1999, pp. 1–23.

Hankins, James, *Virtue Politics: Soulcraft and Statecraft in Renaissance Italy*, Cambridge, Mass., 2019.

Hanson, Richard Patrick Crosland, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: the Arian Controversy 318–381 AD*, London, 1988.

Harper, R. P., ‘Podandus and the *Via Tauri*’, *Anatolian Studies*, 20 (1970), pp. 149–53.

Hartman, Joshua, ‘Invective oration and Julian’s *Misopogon’*, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 57 (2017), pp. 1032–1057.

Hastings, Adrian, *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism*, Cambridge, 1997.

Heather, Peter, ‘New men for new Constantines’, in Paul Magdalino, ed., *New Constantines: the rhythm of imperial renewal in Byzantium, 4th–13th centuries : papers from the twenty-sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, St. Andrews, March 1992*, Aldershot, 1994, pp. 11–33.

Heather, Peter and Robert Moncur, *Politics, Philosophy and Empire in the Fourth Century*, Liverpool, 2001.

Heine Nielsen, Thomas, ‘The concept of « *patris* » in archaic and classical sources’, in Idem, ed., *Once Again: Studies in the Ancient Greek «* Polis *»*, Stuttgart, 2004, pp. 49–76.

Helleman, Wendy E., ‘Basil’s *Ad adolescentes*: guidelines for reading the classics’, in Wendy E. Helleman, ed., *Christianity and the Classics: the Acceptance of a Heritage*, London, 1990, pp. 31–51.

Hemelrijk, Emily A., ‘City patronesses in the Roman Empire’, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 53 (2004), pp. 209–245.

Henck, ‘Constantius II and the cities’, in B. Salway and John Drinkwater, eds., *Wolf Liebeschuetz Reflected: Essays Presented by Colleagues, Friends, & Pupils*, London, 2007, pp. 147–56.

Heyning, E., ‘Star Music: the Ancient Idea of Cosmic Music as a Philosophical Paradox’ (PhD Diss., University of Canterbury Christ Church, 2017).

Hildebrand, Stephen M., *The Trinitarian Theology of Basil of Caesarea: A Synthesis of Greek Thought and Biblical Truth*, Washington, DC, 2007.

Hodges-Kluck, Stefan Vernon, ‘Philosophical Self-Presentation in Late Antique Cappadocia’ (PhD Diss., University of Tennessee, 2017).

Holland, Tom, *Dominion: the Making of the Western Mind*, London, 2020.

Holman, Susan R., ‘Healing the social leper in Gregory of Nyssa’s and Gregory of Nazianzus’s “περί φιλοπτωχίας”’, *Historical Theology Review*, 92 (1999), pp. 283–309.

———, ‘Taxing Nazianzus: Gregory Nazianzus and the other Julian’, *Studia Patristica*, 37 (2001), pp. 103–9 (= Holman 2001a).

———, ‘The entitled poor: human rights language in the Cappadocians’, *Pro Ecclesia: A Journal of Catholic and Evangelical Theology*, 9 (2000), pp. 476–89.

———, *The Hungry Are Dying: Beggars and Bishops in Roman Cappadocia*, Oxford, 2001 (= Holman 2001b).

Holum, Kenneth G., ‘The classical city in the sixth century: survival and transformation’, in Michael Maas, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian*, Cambridge, 2005, pp. 87–112.

Honoré, Tony, *Law in the Crisis of Empire 379–455 AD: the Theodosian Dynasty and its Quaestors*, Oxford, 1998.

Horden, Peregrine, ‘Poverty, charity, and the invention of the hospital’, in Scott Fitzgerald Johnson, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity*, Oxford, 2012, pp. 715–43.

———, ‘The Christian hospital in late antiquity: break or bridge?’, in F. Steger and K. P. Jankrift, eds., *Gesundheit, Krankheit : Kulturtransfer medizinischen Wissens von der Spätantike bis in die Frühe Neuzeit*, Cologne, 2004, pp. 76–99.

Howard, Nathan D., ‘Gifts bearing Greekness: epistles as cultural capital in fourth-century Cappadocia’, *Journal of Late Antiquity*, 6 (2013), pp. 37–59.

Huber-Rebenich, Gerlinde and Stefan Rebenich, eds., *Interreligiöse Konflikte im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert: Julian „*Contra Galilaeos*" – Kyrill „*Contra Iulianum*"*, Berlin, 2019.

Hughes, Victoria Elizabeth, 'The Culture and Political World of the Fourth Century AD: Julian, *Paideia* and Education' (PhD Diss., University of Newcastle, 2018).

Humfress, Caroline, 'Citizens and heretics: late Roman lawyers on Christian heresy', in Eduard Iricinschi and Holger M. Zellentin, eds., *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity*, Tübingen, 2008, pp. 128–42.

Humphreys, S. C., ed., *The Family, Women and Death: Comparative Studies*, Ann Arbor, MI, 1993.

Humphries, Mark, 'Cities and the meanings of late antiquity', *Brill Research Perspectives in Ancient History*, 2 (2019), pp. 1–112.

Humphries, Mike, 'The tyrant's mask? Images of good and bad rule in Julian's *Letter to Themistius*', in Shaun Tougher and Nicholas Baker-Brian, eds., *Emperor and Author: the Writings of Julian the Apostate*, Swansea, 2012, pp. 75–90.

Hunt, David, 'Julian', in Averil Cameron and Peter Garnsey, eds., *The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume 13: the Late Empire, AD 337–425*, Cambridge, 1997, pp. 44–77.

Jacobs, Ine, 'A time for prayer and a time for pleasure. Christianity's struggle with the secular world', in David Engels and Peter Van Nuffelen, eds., *Religion and Competition in Antiquity*, Brussels, 2014, pp. 192–219 (= Jacobs 2014a).

———, *Aesthetic Maintenance of Civic Space: the 'Classical' City from the 4th to the 7th c. AD*, Leuven, 2014 (= Jacobs 2014b).

James, L., 'Is there an Empress in this text? Julian's speech of thanks to Eusebia', in Shaun Tougher and Nicholas Baker-Brian, eds., *Emperor and Author: the Writings of Julian the Apostate*, Swansea, 2012, pp. 47–60.

Janka, Markus, 'Quae philosophia fuit, satura facta est. Julians "Mispogon" zwischen Gattungskonvention und Sitz im Leben',' in Christian Schäfer, ed., *Kaiser Julian 'Apostata' und die philosophische Reaktion gegen das Christentum*, Berlin, 2008, pp. 177–206.

Johnsén, Henrik Rydell, 'The virtue of being uneducated: attitudes towards classical paideia in early monasticism and ancient philosophy', in Lillian I. Larsen and Samuel Rubenson, eds., *Monastic Education in Late Antiquity: the Transformation of Classical Paideia*, Cambridge, 2018, pp. 219–35.

Johnson, Aaron P., *Religion and Identity in Porphyry of Tyre: the Limits of Hellenism in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, 2013.

Jones, A. H. M., *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford, 1971.

———, *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*, Oxford, 1940.

———, *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602: A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1964.

Jones, A. H. M. & J. R. Martindale, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1971–1992.

Jones, Christopher P., 'Greek letter collections before late antiquity', in Christina Sogno, Edward J. Watts, and Bradley K. Storin, eds., *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide*, Berkeley, CA, 2017, pp. 38–53.

———, *New Heroes in Antiquity: From Achilles to Antinoos*, London, 2010.

Mayer, Wendy, 'Purity and the rewriting of memory: revisiting Julian's disgust for the Christian worship of corpses and its consequences', in Bronwen Neil and Kosta Simic, eds., *Memories of Utopia: The Revision of Histories and Landscapes in Late Antiquity*, London, 2020, pp. 75–91.

Kaegi, Walter Emil, 'Research on Julian the Apostate 1945–1964', *The Classical World*, 58 (1965), pp. 229–238.

———, 'The Emperor Julian's assessment of the significance and function of history', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 108 (1964), pp. 29–38.

Kaibel, G. *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*, Berlin, 1878.

Kaldellis, Anthony, *Hellenism in Byzantium: the Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*, Cambridge, 2007.

———, 'How was a "New Rome" even thinkable? Premonitions of Constantinople and the portability of Rome', in Y. R. Kim and A. E. T. McLaughlin, eds., *Leadership and Community in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Raymond Van Dam*, Turnhout, 2020, pp. 221–247.

———, *The Byzantine Republic: People and Power in New Rome*, Camb. Mass., 2015.

———, ‘Political freedom in Byzantium: the rhetoric of liberty and the periodization of Roman history’, *History of European Ideas,* 44 (2018), pp. 795–811.

Kalleres, Dayna S., *City of Demons: Violence, Ritual, and Christian Power in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, CA, 2015.

———, ‘Demons and divine illumination: a consideration of eight prayers by Gregory of Nazianzus’, *Vigiliae Christianae,* 61 (2007), pp. 157–188.

Kapust, Daniel, ‘Roman patriotism’, in Mitja Sardoč, ed., *Handbook of Patriotism*, Cham, 2020, pp. 47–67.

Kaster, Robert A., *Guardians of Language: the Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, CA, 1988.

Kelly, Christopher, *Ruling the Later Roman Empire*, Cambridge, Mass., 2004.

Kelly, Henry A., ‘Love of neighbor as Great Commandment in the time of Jesus: grasping at straws in the Hebrew Scriptures’, *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society,* 60 (2017), pp. 265–81.

Kelly, J. N. D., *Early Christian Doctrines*, London, 1977.

Kennedy, G., ‘Oratory’, in P. E. Easterling and Bernard M. W. Knox, eds., *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: Volume 1, Greek Literature*, Cambridge, 1985, pp. 498–526.

Kennedy, Hugh, ‘From *polis* to *madina*: urban change in late antique and early Islamic Syria’, *Past & Present,* 106 (1985), pp. 3–27.

Kislinger, E., ‘Kaiser Julian und die (Christlichen) *Xenodocheia’,* in W. Hörandner, ed., *Byzantios : Festschrift für Herbert Hunger zum 70. Geburtstag : dargebracht von Schülern und Mitarbeitern*, Vienna, 1984, pp. 171–184.

Kobusch, Theo, ‘Philosophische Streitsachen. Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen christlicher und griechischer Philosophie’’, in Christian Schäfer, ed., *Kaiser Julian ‘Apostata’ und die philosophische Reaktion gegen das Christentum*, Berlin, 2008, pp. 17–49.

Koch, W., ‘Comment l’empereur Julien tacha de fonder un église païen’, *Revue belge de philologie et d’histoire,* 6–7 (1927), pp. 123–46; 49–82, 511–50, 1363–85.

Konstan, David, ‘How to praise a friend: St Gregory of Nazianzus’s funeral oration for St Basil the Great’, in Philip Rousseau, Thomas Hägg, and Christian Høgel, eds., *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, CA, 2000, pp. 160–179.

Kopecek, Thomas A., ‘Curial displacements and flight in later fourth century Cappadocia’, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 23 (1974), pp. 319–42 (= Kopecek 1974a).

———, ‘The Cappadocian Fathers and civic patriotism’, *Church History*, 43 (1974), pp. 293–303 (= Kopecek 1974b).

———, ‘The social class of the Cappadocian Fathers’, *Church History*, 42 (1973), pp. 453–466.

Krause, Jens-Uwe, *Spätantike Patronatsformen im Westen des Römischen Reich*, Munich, 1987.

Krause, Jens-Uwe and Christian Witschel, eds., *Die Stadt in der Spatantike – Niedergang oder Wandel?: Akten des internationalen Kolloquiums in Muenchen am 30. und 31. Mai 2003*, Stuttgart, 2006.

Krentz, Edgar M., ‘Military language and metaphors in Philippians’, in Bradley H. McLean, ed., *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Honour of John C. Hurd*, London, 1993, pp. 105–27.

Krevans, Nita, ‘The arrangement of epigrams in collections’, in Peter Bing and Jon Bruss, eds., *Brill’s Companion to Hellenistic Epigram Down to Philip*, Leiden, 2007, pp. 131–46.

Kustas, George L., ‘Basil and the rhetorical tradition’, in Paul J. Fedwick, ed., *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic. A Sixteen-Hundreth Anniversay Symposium*, Toronto, 1979, pp. 221–79.

Lalli, Marco, ‘Urban-related identity: theory, measurement and empirical findings’, *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 12 (1992), pp. 285–303.

Langley, Thomas R., ‘*A fundamentis noviter*: the idea of the ancient city, the ninth century *Liber Pontificalis*, and civic thought in early Medieval Italy’, in Javier Martínez Jiménez and Sam Ottewill-Soulsby, eds., *Remembering and Forgetting the Ancient City*, Oxford, 2022, pp. 45–69.

———, ‘Local and universal citizenship in the works of the Cappadocian Fathers’, *Al-Masāq*, 32 (2020), pp. 34–53.

Laniado, Avshalom, *Recherches sur les notables municipaux dans l’Empire protobyzantin*, Paris, 2002.

Larsen, Jakob A. O., ‘The position of provincial assemblies in the government and society of the late Roman Empire’, *Classical Philology*, 29 (1934), pp. 209–220.

Larsen, Lillian I. and Samuel Rubenson, eds., *Monastic Education in Late Antiquity: the Transformation of Classical Paideia*, Cambridge, 2018.

Lauxtermann, Marc D., *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres: Texts and Contexts*, Vol. 1, Vienna, 2003.

Lavan, Luke, 'A.H.M. Jones and "the cities" 1964–2004', in D.M. Gwynn, ed., *A.H.M. Jones and the Later Roman Empire*, Leiden, 2007, pp. 167–192 (= L. Lavan 2007a).

———, 'Christianity, the city, and the end of Antiquity', *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 16 (2003), pp. 705–10.

———, 'The *agorai* of Antioch and Constantinople as seen by John Chrysostom', in B. Salway and John Drinkwater, eds., *Wolf Liebeschuetz Reflected: Essays Presented by Colleagues, Friends, & Pupils*, London, 2007, pp. 157–67 (= L. Lavan 2007b).

———, 'The late-antique city: a bibliographic essay', in Luke Lavan, W. Bowden, Averil Cameron, N. J. Christie, Sean A. Kingsley, O. Karagiorgou, et al., eds., *Recent Research in Late-Antique Urbanism*, Portsmouth, R.I, 2001, pp. 9–26.

Lavan, Luke et al., eds., *Recent Research in Late-Antique Urbanism*, Portsmouth, R.I., 2001.

Lavan, Myles, *Slaves to Rome: Paradigms of Empire in Roman Culture*, Cambridge, 2013.

Laven, Mary, 'Encountering the Counter-Reformation', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 59 (2006), pp. 706–20.

Le Roux, Patrick, 'L'*amor patriae* dans les cites sous l'empire romain', in Hervé Ingelbert, ed., *Ideologies et valeurs civique dans l'empire romain. Hommage à Claude Lepelley*, Nanterre, 2002, pp. 143–61.

Leemans, Johan, Pauline Allen, Wendy Mayer, and Boudewijn Dehandschutter, eds., *Let Us Die That We May Live: Greek Homilies on Christian Martyrs from Asia Minor and Palestine, AD c. 350–c. 450*, London, 2003.

Lendon, John, *Empire of Honour*, Oxford, 1997.

Lenski, Noel, *Constantine and the Cities: Imperial Authority and Civic Politics*, Philadelphia, Penn., 2016.

———, *Failure of Empire: Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century A.D.*, Berkeley, CA, 2003.

Lenski, Noel, and Lars Ramskold, ‘Constantine's dedication medallions and the maintenance of civic traditions’, *Numismatische Zeitschrift*, 119 (2012), pp. 31–58.

Lepelley, Claude, ‘La survie de l’idée de cité républicane en Italie au début du VIe siècle, dans un édit d’Athalaric rédigé par Cassiodore (*Variae*, IX, 2)’, in Claude Lepelley, ed., *La fin de la cité antique et le début de la cité médiévale: De la fin du IIIe siècle à l’avènement de Charlemagne*, Bari, 1996, pp. 71–83.

———, *Les Cités de l’Afrique romaine au Bas-Empire*, 1979.

———, ‘The survival and fall of the classical city in late Roman Africa’, in John Rich, ed., *The City in Late Antiquity*, London, 1996, pp. 50–76.

Lewin, Ariel S., ‘Urban public building from Constantine to Julian’, in Luke Lavan, W. Bowden, Averil Cameron, N. J. Christie, Sean A. Kingsley, O. Karagiorgou, et al., eds., *Recent Research in Late-Antique Urbanism*, Portsmouth, R.I, 2001, pp. 27–37.

Lewis, C. S., *The Discarded Image: an Introduction to Medieval and Renaissance Literature*, Cambridge, 1964.

Lewis, Mark Edward, ‘Public spaces in cities in the Roman and Han Empires’, in Walter Scheidel, ed., *State Power in Ancient China and Rome*, Oxford, 2015, pp. 204–29.

———, ‘The city-state in Sping-and-Autumn China’, in Mogens Herman Hansen, ed., *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures: An Investigation Conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre*, Copenhagen, 2000, pp. 359–74.

———, *The Construction of Space in Early China*, New York, 2006.

Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G., ‘Administration and politics in the cities of the 5th and 6th centuries with special reference to the circus factions’, in Claude Lepelley, ed., *La fin de la cité antique et le début de la cité médiévale: De la fin du IIIe siècle à l’avènement de Charlemagne*, Bari, 1996, pp. 161–82 (= Liebeschuetz 1996a).

———, *Antioch: City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire*, Oxford, 1972.

———, ‘Julian’s *Hymn to the Mother of the Gods*: the revival and justification of traditional Roman religion’, in Shaun Tougher and Nicholas Baker-Brian, eds., *Emperor and Author: the Writings of Julian the Apostate*, Swansea, 2012, pp. 213–227.

———, ‘Oligarchies in the cities of the Byzantine East’, in Walter Pohl and Maximilian Diesenberger, eds., *Integration und Herrschaft: ethnische Identitäten und soziale Organisation im Frühmittelalter*, Vienna, 2002, pp. 17–24.

———, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman City*, Oxford, 2001.

———, ‘The end of the ancient city’, in John Rich, *The City in Late Antiquity*, London, 1996, pp. 1–49 (= Liebeschuetz 1996b).

Lim, Richard, ‘Christianization, secularization, and the transformation of public life’, in Philip Rousseau, ed., *A Companion to Late Antiquity*, Chichester, 2009, pp. 497–511.

———, *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, CA, 1995 (= Lim 1995a).

———, ‘Religious disputation and social disorder in late antiquity’, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 44 (1995), pp. 204–231 (= Lim 1995b).

———, ‘The politics of interpretation in Basil of Caesarea’s “Hexaemeron”’, *Vigiliae Christianae*, 44 (1990), pp. 351–370.

Limberis, Vasiliki, *Architects of Piety: the Cappadocian Fathers and the Cult of the Martyrs*, Oxford, 2011.

———, ‘“Religion” as the cipher for identity: the cases of Emperor Julian, Libanius, and Gregory Nazianzus’, *Harvard Theological Review*, 93 (2000), pp. 373–400.

Lipatov-Chicherin, Nikolai, ‘The problem of the authorship of the commentary on the Prophet Isaiah attributed to St. Basil the Great’, *Studia Patristica*, 27 (1993), pp. 42–8.

Lo Nero, C., ‘*Christiana dignitas*: new Christian criteria for citizenship in the late Roman Empire’, *Medieval Encounters*, 7 (2001), pp. 146–64.

Lomas, Kathryn, ‘The idea of a city: élite ideology and the evolution of urban form in Italy, 200 BC–AD 100’, in Helen Parkins, ed., *Roman Urbanism: Beyond the Consumer City*, London, 1997, pp. 21–41.

Long, Jacqueline, ‘Structures of irony in Julian’s *Misopogon*’, *Ancient World*, 24 (1993), pp. 15–23.

Loseby, Simon, ‘Decline and change in the cities of late antique Gaul’, in Jens-Uwe Krause and Christian Witschel, eds., *Die Stadt in der Spätantike: Niedergang oder Wandel? : Akten des internationalen Kolloquiums in München am 30. und 31. Mai 2003*, Berlin, 2006, pp. 67–104.

Lowther Clarke, William K., *St Basil the Great: A Study in Monasticism*, Cambridge, 1913.

Ludlow, Morwenna, 'Demons, evil and liminality in Cappadocian theology', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 20 (2012), pp. 179–211.

Ma, John, 'Peer polity Interaction in the Hellenistic age', *Past & Present* 180 (2003), pp. 9–40.

MacCormack, Sabine, 'Sin, citizenship, and the salvation of souls: the impact of Christian priorities on Late-Roman and Post-Roman society', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 39 (1997), pp. 644–73.

MacDougall, Byron, 'Spectatorship in city and church in late antiquity: *theoria* returns to the festival', in Nicholas S. M. Matheou, Theofili Kampaniki and Lorenzo M. Bondioli, eds., *From Constantinople to the Frontier: the City and the Cities*, Leiden, 2016, pp. 127–141.

MacMullen, Ramsay, *Christianizing the Roman Empire: A.D. 100–400*, New Haven, Conn., 1984.

———, 'The epigraphic habit in the Roman Empire', *The American Journal of Philology*, 103 (1982), pp. 233–246.

———, 'The preacher's audience', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 40 (1989), pp. 503–511.

Magdalino, Paul, 'Byzantium=Constantinople', in Liz James, ed., *A Companion to Byzantium*, Chichester, 2011, pp. 43–54.

Malosse, P. L., 'Libanius' orations', in Lieve Van Hoof, ed., *Libanius: A Critical Introduction*, Cambridge, 2014, pp. 81–106.

Mango, Cyril, 'L'Euripe de l'Hippodrome de Constantinople. Essai d'identification', *Revue des études byzantines*, 7 (1938), pp. 180–193.

Maraval, Pierre, 'La date de la mort de Basile de Césarée', *Revue des Études Augustiniennes*, 34 (1988), pp. 25–38.

———, 'Les premiers développements du culte des XL Martyrs de Sébastée dans l'Orient byzantin et en Occident', *Vetera Christianorum*, 36 (1999), pp. 193–211.

Marcone, Arnaldo, 'Giuliano e lo stilo dell'imperatore tardoantico', *Rudiae: ricerche sul mondo classico*, 10 (1998), pp. 43–58.

———, 'The Forging of an Hellenic orthodoxy: Julian's speeches against the Cynics', in Shaun Tougher and Nicholas Baker-Brian, eds., *Emperor and Author: the Writings of Julian the Apostate*, Swansea, 2012, pp. 239–250.

———, ‘Un panegirico rovesciato: Pluralità di modelli e contaminazione letteraria nel “ Misopogon ” giulianeo’, *Revue d’Etudes Augustiniennes et Patristiques*, 30 (1984), pp. 226–239.

Markus, Robert A., ‘How on Earth could places become holy?’, *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 2 (1994), pp. 257–271.

———, *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine*, Cambridge, 1970 (repr. 2007).

———, *The End of Ancient Christianity*, Cambridge, 1990.

Martin, Dale B., *Inventing Superstition: From the Hippocratics to the Christians*, Cambridge, Mass., 2007.

Martínez Jiménez, Javier, ‘Local citizenship and the Visigothic kingdom’, in Sabine Panzram and P. Pacha, eds., *The Visigothic Kingdom: the Negotiation of Power in Post-Roman Iberia*, Amsterdam, 2020, pp. 195–212.

Maskarinec, Maya, *City of Saints: Rebuilding Rome in the Early Middle Ages*, Philadelphia, Penn., 2018.

Mathisen, Ralph, ‘*Natio, gens, provincialis* and *civis*: geographical terminology and personal identity in late antiquity’, in Geoffrey Greatrex, Elton, and McMahon, eds., *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity*, Farnham, 2015, pp. 277–86.

Matthews, John, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*, London, 1989.

———, *Western Aristocracies and the Imperial Court AD 364–425*, Oxford, 1975.

Maxwell, J., ‘Sermons’, in Scott McGill and Edward J. Watts, eds., *A Companion to Late Antique Literature*, Hoboken, 2018, pp. 343–57.

Mazza, Mario, ‘Giuliano dell’utopia religiosa: il tentativo di fondare una chiesa pagana?’, *Rudiae: ricerche sul mondo classico*, 10 (1998), pp. 17–42.

McCarty, V. K., ‘“The pure eye of her soul”: the asceticism of the Deaconess Olympias as reflected in the writings of the Fathers’, in John Anthony McGuckin, ed., *Orthodox Monasticism: Past & Present*, New York, 2014, pp. 131–45.

McDonald, James Joseph, ‘*Paideia* in the Poetry of Gregory Nazianzen’ (PhD Diss., University of Glasgow, 2020).

McGuckin, John, ‘Embodying the new society: the Byzantine Christian instinct of philanthropy’, in M. Pereira, ed., *Philanthropy and Social Compassion in Eastern Orthodox Tradition (Papers of the Sophia Institute Academic Conference Dec. 2009)*, New York, NY, 2010, pp. 50–71.

———, *Saint Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography*, Crestwood, NY, 2001.

McLynn, Neil B., ‘A self-made holy man: the case of Gregory Nazianzen’, *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 6 (1998), pp. 463–483.

———, *Christian Politics and Religious Culture in Late Antiquity*, Farnham, 2009 (= McLynn 2009a).

———, ‘*Curiales* into churchmen: the case of Gregory Nazianzen’, in Rita Lizzi Testa, ed., *Le trasformazioni delle élites in età tardoantica: atti del convegno internazionale, Perugia, 15–16 marzo 2004*, Rome, 2006.

———, ‘Gregory Nazianzen’s Basil: the literary construction of a Christian friendship’, in *Studia Patristica*, 37 (2001), pp. 178–93.

———, ‘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*, Leiden, 2014, pp. 48–67.

———, ‘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, 2014, 120–36.

———, ‘Moments of truth: Gregory Nazianzus and Theodosius I’, in Scott McGill, Cristiana Sogno, and Edward Watts, eds., *From the Tetrarchs to the Theodosians: Late Roman History and Culture, 284–450 CE*, Cambridge, 2010, pp. 216–39 (= McLynn 2010a).

———, ‘Pagans in a Christian Empire’, in Philip Rousseau, ed., *A Companion to Late Antiquity*, Chichester, 2009, pp. 572–587 (=McLynn 2009b).

———, ‘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 I: Alternatives to the Classical Past in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, 2010, pp. 106–118 (= McLynn 2010b).

———, ‘The tax man and the theologian: Gregory, Hellenius, and the monks of Nazianzus’, in Christopher A. Beeley, ed., *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus*, Washington, D.C, 2012, pp. 178–99.

———, ‘What was the “Philocalia of Origen”?’, in Idem, *Christian Politics and Religious Culture in Late Antiquity,* Farnham, 2009, pp. 32–43 (= McLynn 2009c).

Meeks, Wayne A., ‘St. Paul of the cities’, in Peter S. Hawkins, ed., *Civitas: Religious Interpretations of the City,* Atlanta, GA, 1986, pp. 15–24.

Meister, Jan Bernhard, *Der Korper des Princeps: Zur Problematik eines monarchischen Korpers ohne Monarchie,* Stuttgart, 2012.

Meredith, Anthony, ‘A comparison between the *Vita S. Macrinae* of Gregory of Nyssa, the *Vita Plotini* of Porphyry and the *De Vita Pythagorica* of Iamblichus’, in Andreas Spira, ed., *The Biographical Works of Gregory of Nyssa*, Philadelphia, Penn., 1984, pp. 181–195.

———, ‘Asceticism: Christian and Greek’, *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 27 (1976), pp. 313–332.

———, ‘The three Cappadocians on beneficence: a key to their audiences’, in Mary Cunningham and Pauline Allen, eds., *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*, Leiden, 1998, pp. 89–104.

Meseguer, Antonio José, ‘La desaparición de la epigrafía evergética en el municipium Florentinum Iliberitanum y el cambio de mentalidad en las élites urbanas’, *Florentia Iliberritana*, 29 (2018), pp. 151–93.

Meyer, Elizabeth A., ‘Explaining the epigraphic habit in the Roman Empire: the evidence of epitaphs’, *The Journal of Roman Studies,* 80 (1990), pp. 74–96.

Migeotte, Léopold, *Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités grécques*, Genève, 1992.

Miller, Timothy S., *The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire*, Baltimore, Md, 1997.

Mitchell, Stephen, *Anatolia: Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor*, Oxford, 1993.

———, ‘The life and lives of Gregory Thaumaturgus’, in Jan Willem Drijvers and John W. Watt, eds., *Portraits of Spiritual Authority: Religious Power in Early Christianity, Byzantium, and the Christian Orient*, 1999, pp. 99–138.

Mitchell, Stephen and Peter Van Nuffelen, *Monotheism Between Pagans and Christians in Late Antiquity*, Leuven, 2010 (= Mitchell and Van Nuffelen 2010a).

———, *One God: Pagan Monotheism in the Roman Empire*, Leuven, 2010 (= Mitchell and Van Nuffelen 2010b).

Momigliano, Arnaldo, ‘Pagan and Christian historiography in the fourth century A.D.’, in idem, ed., *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, Oxford, 1963, pp. 79–99.

———, ‘The disadvantages of monotheism for a universal state’, *Classical Philology*, 81 (1986), pp. 285–297.

Montefiore, Hugh, ‘Thou shalt love the neighbour as thyself’, *Novum Testamentum*, 5 (1962), pp. 157–170.

Moreschini, Claudio, ‘Is it possible to speak of “Cappadocian Theology” as a system?’, *Studia Patristica*, 95 (2017), pp. 139–63.

Mossay, Justin, ‘Le date de l’ *Oratio II* de Grégoire de Nazianze et celle de son ordination’, *Museon*, 77 (1964), pp. 175–86.

———, ‘Nazianze. Nenezi. Bekâlar.’, *Byzantion*, 71 (2001), pp. 438–450.

Muccioli, Federicomaria, ‘*Philopatris* e il concetto di patria in età ellenistica’, *Studi Ellenistici*, 19 (2006), pp. 367–398.

Müller, Gernot Michael, *Zwischen Alltagskommunikation und literarischer Identitätsbildung: Studien zur lateinischen Epistolographie in Spätantike und Frühmittelalter*, Stuttgart, 2018.

Muraille, Philippe, ‘L’ Église, peuple de l’Oikouménè d’après saint Grégoire de Nazianze: notes sur l’unité et l’universalité’, *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 44 (1968), pp. 154–178.

Naldini, Mario, ‘*Paideia* origeniana nella “Oratio ad adolescentes” di Basilio Magno’, *Vetera Christianorum*, 13 (1976), pp. 297–318.

———, ‘Sulla “Oratio ad adolescentes” di Basilio Magno’, *Prometheus*, 4 (1978), pp. 36–44.

Nasrallah, Laura S., ‘The formation of a Pauline letter collection in light of Roman epigraphic evidence’, in Cilliers Breytenbach and Julien M. Ogereau, eds., *Authority and Identity in Emerging Christianities in Asia Minor and Greece* (2018), pp. 281–302.

Neil, Bronwen, ‘Continuities and changes in the practice of letter-collecting from Cicero to late antiquity’, in Bronwen Neil and Pauline Allen, eds., *Collecting Early Christian Letters: from the Apostle Paul to Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, 2015, pp. 3–17.

Neil, Bronwen and Pauline Allen, eds., *Collecting Early Christian Letters: from the Apostle Paul to Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, 2015.

Nesselrath, Heinz-Günther, ‘Later Greek voices on the predicament of exile: from Teles to Plutarch and Favorinus’, in Jan Felix Gaertner, ed., *Writing Exile: the Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, Leiden, 2007, pp. 87–108.

———, ‘Mit “Waffen” Platons gegen ein christiliches Imperium. Der Mythos in Julians Schrift *Gegen den Kyniker Herakleios*’, in Christian Schäfer, ed., *Kaiser Julian ‘Apostata’ und die philosophische Reaktion gegen das Christentum*, Berlin, 2008, pp. 207–19.

Niccolai, Lea, ‘Age of Philosophy: the Self-Representation of Power in the Post-Constantinian Empire’ (PhD Diss., University of Cambridge, 2020).

Nicholson, Oliver, ‘The “Pagan Churches” of Julian the Apostate and Maximus Daia’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 45 (1994), pp. 1–10.

Nicols, John, *Civic Patronage in the Roman Empire*, Leiden, 2013.

Nikolaou, Th., ‘Der Mensch als politisches Lebewesen bei Basileios dem Grossen’, *Vigilae Christianae*, 35 (1981), pp. 24–31.

Noreña, Carlos F., ‘Urban systems in the Han and Roman Empires’, in Walter Scheidel, ed., *State Power in Ancient China and Rome*, Oxford, 2015, pp. 181–203.

Nutton, V., ‘*Archiatri* and the medical profession in Antiquity’, *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 45 (1977), pp. 191–226.

Oakes, Peter, ‘The Christians and their *politeuma* in Heaven: Philippians 3:20 and the Herakleopolis Papyri’, in Katell Berthelot and Jonathan Price, eds., *In the Crucible of Empire: the Impact of Roman Citizenship upon Greeks, Jews and Christians*, Leuven, 2019, pp. 141–63.

Oldfield, Paul, *Urban Panegyric and the Transformation of the Medieval City, 1100–1300*, Oxford, 2019.

Olivar, A., ‘Reflections on the problems raised by early Christian preaching’, in Mary Cunningham and Pauline Allen, eds., *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*, Leiden, 1998, pp. 21–32.

O’Meara, Dominic J., *Platonopolis: Platonic Political Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, 2003.

Omissi, Adrastos, *Emperors and Usurpers in the Later Roman Empire*, Oxford, 2018.

Omissi, Adrastos and Alan J. Ross, eds., *Imperial Panegyric from Diocletian to Honorius*, Liverpool, 2020.

Opsomer, Jan, ‘Weshalb nach Julian die mosaisch-christliche Schöpfungslehre der platonischen Demiurgie unterlegen ist’, in Christian Schäfer, ed., *Kaiser Julian ‘Apostata’ und die philosophische Reaktion gegen das Christentum*, Berlin, 2008, pp. 127–56.

Ousterhout, Robert, ‘Messages in the landscape: searching for Gregory Nazianzus in Cappadocia (with two excursions to the Çanlı Kilise)’, in Angeliki Lymberopoulou, ed., *Images of the Byzantine World: Visions, Messages and Meanings. Studies Presented to Leslie Brubaker*, Ashgate, 2011, pp. 147–69.

Pack, Roger, ‘Notes on the *Caesars* of Julian’, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association,* 77 (1946), pp. 151–157.

Pagliara, Alessandro, ‘Giuliano ad Atene (355 d.C.): ἀληθινὴ πατρίς di un « princeps philosophiae »’, *Mediterraneo Antico,* 17 (2014), pp. 183–99.

Patlagean, Evelyne, *Pauvreté économique et pauvreté sociale à Byzance: 4e–7e siècles*, Paris, 1977.

Perkins, Alexander D., ‘The grave politics of Gregory Nazianzen’s eulogy for Gorgonia’, *Studia Patristica,* 95 (2017), pp. 269–79.

Pietri, Charles F., ‘Les origines du culte des martyres (d’après un ouvrage récent)’, *Rivista di archeologia cristiana,* 3–4 (1984), pp. 293–319.

Pocock, J. G. A., ‘Between Machiavelli and Hume: Gibbon as civic humanist and philosophical historian’, *Daedalus*, 105 (1976), pp. 153–169.

———, ‘Political ideas as historical events: political philosophers as historical actors’, in idem, *Political Thought and History: Essays on Theory and Methods*, Cambridge, 2009, pp. 51–66 (= Pocock 2009a).

———, ‘The concept of a language and the métier d’historian: some considerations on practice’, in idem, *Political Thought and History: Essays on Theory and Methods*, Cambridge, 2009, pp. 67–86 (Pocock 2009b).

———, ‘The history of political thought: a methodological enquiry’, in idem, *Political Thought and History: Essays on Theory and Methods*, Cambridge, 2009, pp. 1–19 (= Pocock 2009c).

———, ‘The reconstruction of discourse: towards the historiography of political thought’, in idem, *Political Thought and History: Essays on Theory and Methods*, Cambridge, 2009, pp. 67–86 (= Pocock 2009d).

Pouchet, Robert, *Basile le Grand et son univers d'amis d'après sa correspondance: une stratégie de communion*, Rome, 1992.

Poulsen, Birte, 'City personifications in late antiquity', in Stine Birk, Troels Myrup Kristensen, and Birte Poulsen, eds., *Using Images in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, 2014, pp. 209–26.

Quiroga, M., 'Julian's *Misopogon* and the subversion of rhetoric', *Antiquité Tardive*, 17 (2009), pp. 127–35.

Radde-Gallwitz, Andrew, *Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and the Transformation of Divine Simplicity*, Oxford, 2009.

———, 'The letter collection of Basil of Caesarea', in Christina Sogno, Edward J. Watts, and Bradley K. Storin, eds., *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide*, Berkeley, CA, 2017, pp. 61–80.

Ramage, Edwin S., *Urbanitas: Ancient Sophistication and Refinement*, Norman, Okl., 1973.

Rapp, Claudia, 'City and citizenship as Christian concepts of community in late antiquity', in Claudia Rapp and Harold Allen Drake, eds., *The City in the Classical and Post-Classical World: Changing Concepts of Power and Identity*, Cambridge, 2014, pp. 153–166.

———, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity*, CA, 2005.

———, 'Monastic jargon and citizenship language in late antiquity', *Al-Masāq*, 32 (2019), pp. 54–63.

———, 'Saints and holy men', in Augustine Casiday and Frederik Norris, eds., *The Cambridge History of Christianity: From Constantine to c. 600*, II, Cambridge, 2007, pp. 458–566.

Rapp, Claudia and Harold Allen Drake, eds., *The City in the Classical and Post-Classical World: Changing Concepts of Power and Identity*, Cambridge, 2014.

Rebillard, Éric, 'Approaching "religious identity" in late antiquity', in Morwenna Ludlow and Richard Flower, eds., *Rhetoric and Religious Identity in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, 2020, pp. 15–27.

———, *Christians and their Many Identities in Late Antiquity, North Africa, 200 CE– 450 CE*, Ithaca, NY, 2012.

———, *The Care of the Dead in Late Antiquity*, trans. E. T. Rawlings and Jeanine Routier-Pucci, Ithaca, NY, 2009.

Rebillard, Éric and Claire Sotinel, eds., *Les frontières du profane dans l'antiquité tardive*, Rome, 2010.

Reed, J., 'The letter', in Stanley E. Porter, ed., *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.– A.D. 400*, Leiden, 1997, pp. 171–93.

Reinhard, Wolfgang, 'Reformation, Counter-Reformation, and the Early Modern state: a reassessment', *Catholic Historical Review*, 75 (1989), pp. 383–404.

Remijsen, Sofie, *The End of Greek Athletics in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, 2015.

Revell, Louise, *Roman Imperialism and Local Identities*, Cambridge, 2009.

Reynolds, Joyce M., *Aphrodisias and Rome*, London, 1982.

Reynolds, Joyce M., and Charlotte Roueché, *Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity: the Late Roman and Byzantine Inscriptions Including Texts from the Excavations at Aphrodisias Conducted by Kenan T. Erim*, London, 1989.

Rich, John, ed., *The City in Late Antiquity*, London, 1996.

Richter, Daniel S., 'Cosmopolitanism', in Daniel S. Richter and William A. Johnson, eds., *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic*, Oxford, 2017, pp. 81–98.

Riedweg, Christoph, 'Anti-Christian polemics and pagan onto-theology: Julian's *Against the Galilaeans*', in Hans-Ulrich Wiemer and Stefan Rebenich, eds., *A Companion to Julian the Apostate*, Leiden, 2020, pp. 245–66.

Riehl, Alexander, ed., *A Companion to Byzantine Epistolography*, Leiden, 2020.

Rist, John M., 'Basil's "Neoplatonism": its background and Nature', in Paul J. Fedwick, ed., *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic. A Sixteen-Hundreth Anniversay Symposium*, Toronto, 1979, pp. 137–220.

Rivas, Andrades, 'La transformación de la ciudadanía romana en el fin del imperio', *Revista de Estudios Histórico-Jurídicos*, 39 (2017), pp. 61–83.

Rives, James Boykin, 'The theology of animal sacrifice in the ancient Greek world: origins and developments', in Jennifer Wright Knust and Zsuzsanna Varhelyi, eds., *Ancient Mediterranean sacrifice*, Oxford, 2011, pp. 187–202.

Rizos, Efthymios, ed., *New Cities in Late Antiquity: Documents and Archaeology*, Turnhout, 2017.

Robert, Fabrice, ‘La rhétorique au service de la critique du christianisme dans le *Contre les Galiléens* de l’empereur Julien’, *Revue d ’études augustiniennes et patristiques*, 54 (2008), pp. 221–256.

Robert, Louis, ‘Épigrammes du Bas-Empire’, *Hellenica: Recueil d’épigraphie de numismastique et d’antiquités grecques*, 4 (1948).

Rochefort, Gabriel, ‘Le περι θεων και κοσμου de Saloustios et l’influence de l’Empereur Julien’, *Revue des Études Grecques*, 69 (1956), pp. 50–66.

Rosen, Klaus, *Julian. Kaiser, Gott und Christenhasser*, Stuttgart, 2006.

Rosenstein, Nathan, ‘War, state formation, and military institutions’, in Walter Scheidel, ed., *Rome and China: Comparative Perspectives on Ancient World Empires*, Oxford, 2009, pp. 24–51.

Roskam, Geert, ‘John Chrysostom on pagan euergetism: a reading of the first part of *De inani gloria et de educandis liberis*’, *Sacris Erudiri*, 53 (2014), pp. 147–169.

Rostovtzeff, Michael, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, Oxford, 1926.

Roueché, Charlotte, ‘Floreat Perge’, in Mary Margaret Mackenzie and Charlotte Roueché, eds., *Images of Authority: Papers Presented to Joyce Reynolds on the Occasion of her 70th Birthday*, Cambridge, 1989, pp. 206–228.

Rousse, J., ‘Les anges et leur ministère selon saint Grégoire de Nazianze’, *Mélanges de science religieuse*, 62 (1965), pp. 133–52.

Rousseau, Philip, ‘Antony as teacher in the Greek Life’, in Philip Rousseau and T. Hägg, eds., *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, CA, 2000, pp. 89–105.

———, ‘Ascetics as mediators and as teachers’, in James Howard-Johnston and Paul Antony Hayward, eds., *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages: Essays on the Contribution of Peter Brown*, Oxford, 2002, pp. 45–59.

———, *Basil of Caesarea*, Berkeley, CA, 1994.

———, ‘The preacher’s audience: a more optimistic view’, in T. W. Hillard, R. A. Kearsley, C. E. V. Nixon, and Alanna Nobbs, *Ancient History in a Modern University, Volume II: Early Christianity, Late Antiquity, and Beyond*, Grand Rapids, MI, 1998, pp. 391–400.

Rubenson, Samuel, ‘Apologetics of asceticism: the *Life of Antony* and its political context’, in Blake Leyerle and Robert Darling Young, eds., *Ascetic Culture: Essays in Honor of Philip Rousseau*, Notre Dame, Ind., 2013, pp. 75–96.

———, ‘Philosophy and simplicity: the problem of education in early Christian biography’, in Philip Rousseau, Thomas Hägg, and Christian Høgel, eds., *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, CA, 2000, pp. 110–139.

———, ‘The Cappadocians on the Areopagus’, in Jostein Børtnes and Tomas Hägg, eds., *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflection*, Copenhagen, 2006, pp. 113–132.

Runciman, W. G., ‘Doomed to extinction: the *polis* as an evolutionary dead-end’, in Oswyn Murray and Simon Price, eds., *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*, Oxford, 1990, pp. 347–67.

Runia, David T., *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*, Minneapolis, MN, 1993.

———, ‘Philo’s “De aeternitate mundi”: the problem of its interpretation’, *Vigiliae Christianae*, 35 (1981), pp. 105–151.

———, ‘The idea and the reality of the city in the thought of Philo of Alexandria’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 61 (2000), pp. 361–379.

Ryan, Garrett, ‘The authority of tradition: governors and their capitals in late antique Asia Minor’, in Y. R. Kim and A. E. T. McLaughlin, eds., *Leadership and Community in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Raymond Van Dam*, Turnhout, 2020, pp. 115–40.

Salvatore, Antonio, *Tradizione e originalità negli epigrammi dei Gregorio Nazianzeno*, Naples, 1960.

Salzman, Michele Renee, ‘Latin letter collections before late antiquity’, in Christina Sogno, Edward J. Watts, and Bradley K. Storin, eds., *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide*, Berkeley, CA, 2017, pp. 13–37 (= Salzman 2017a).

———, ‘The end of public sacrifice: changing definitions of sacrifice in post-Constantinian Rome and Italy’, in Jennifer Wright Knust and Zsuzsanna Várhelyi, eds., *Animal Sacrifice in the Ancient World*, Oxford, 2011, pp. 167–83.

———, ‘From a classical to a Christian city: civic euergetism and charity in late antique Rome’, *Studies in Late Antiquity*, 1 (2017), pp. 65–85 (= Salzman 2017b).

Sandwell, Isabella, *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews and Christians in Antioch*, Cambridge, 2007.

Saradi, Helen G., *The Byzantine City: Literary Images and Historical Reality*, Athens, 2006.

Sardiello, Rosanna, ‘Medici e medicina in Giuliano’, *Rudiae: ricerche sul mondo classico*, 10 (1998), pp. 185–223.

Sarris, Peter, *Empires of Faith: the Fall of Rome to the Rise of Islam, 500–700,* Oxford, 2011.

———, ‘New insights into the origins of the manorial economy’, *English Historical Review*, 119 (2004), pp. 279–311.

Schäfer, Christian, *Kaiser Julian ‘Apostata’ und die philosophische Reaktion gegen das Christentum*, Berlin, 2008.

Scheidel, Walter, *Escape from Rome: the Failure of Empire and the Road to Prosperity*, Princeton, NJ, 2019.

Schmidt-Hofner, Sebastian, ‘An empire of the best: Zosimus, the monarchy, and the Eastern administrative elite in the fifth century CE’, *Chiron : Mitteilungen der Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Institut*, 50 (2020), pp. 217–52.

———, ‘Der *Defensor civitatis* und die Entstehung des städtschen Notabelnregiments in der Spätantike’, in Stefan Patzold and Mischa Meier, eds., *Chlodwigs Welt. Organisation von Herrschaft um 500*, Stuttgart, 2014, pp. 487–522.

———, ‘Die städtische Finanzautonomie im spätrömischen Reich’, in Hans-Ulrich Wiemer, ed., *Staatlichkeit und politisches Handeln in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Berlin, 2006, pp. 209–48.

———, ‘Reform, routine, and propaganda: Julian the lawgiver’, in Hans-Ulrich Wiemer and Stefan Rebenich, eds., *A Companion to Julian the Apostate*, Leiden, 2020, pp. 124–71.

Schofield, Malcolm, *The Stoic Idea of the City*, Cambridge, 1991.

Schramm, M., ‘Platonic ethics and politics in Themistius and Julian’, in Ryan C. Fowler, ed., *Plato in the Third Sophistic*, Berlin, 2014, pp. 131–43.

Schuddeboom, Feyo L., ‘The conversion of temples in Rome’, *Journal of Late Antiquity*, 10 (2017), pp. 166–186.

Sebillotte, Violaine, ‘La “patris” grecque: essai d’interprétation’, *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz*, 10 (1999), pp. 7–25.

Shaw, Brent, ‘Eaters of flesh, drinkers of milk: the ancient Mediterranean ideology of the pastoral nomad’, *Ancient Society*, 13/14 (1982/83), pp. 5–31.

———, *Sacred Violence: African Christians and Sectarian Hatred in the Age of Augustine*, Cambridge, 2011.

Shaw, Gregory, *Theurgy and the Soul: the Neoplatonism of Iamblichus*, Philadelphia, Penn., 1995.

Silvas, Anna M., ‘The letters of Basil of Caesarea and the role of letter-collections in their transmission’, in Bronwen Neil and Pauline Allen, eds., *Collecting Early Christian Letters: From the Apostle Paul to Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, 2015, pp. 113–28.

Simelidis, Christos, ‘Gregory of Nazianzus and the Christian epigram in the East’, in Christer Henriksén, ed., *A Companion to Ancient Epigram*, 2019, pp. 633–648.

Sironen, Erkki, ‘The epigram habit in late antique Greece’, in Christian Witschel, Carlos Machado, and Katharina Bolle, eds., *The Epigraphic Cultures of Late Antiquity*, 2017, pp. 449–471.

Sizgorich, Thomas, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity*, Philadelphia, Penn., 2008.

Skinner, Alexander, ‘Political mobility in the later Roman Empire’, *Past & Present*, 218 (2013), pp. 17–53.

Skinner, Quentin, ‘A reply to my critics’, in James Tully, ed., *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and His Critics*, Cambridge, 1988, pp. 231–88 (= Q. Skinner 1988a).

———, ‘Language and social change’, in James Tully, ed., *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and His Critics*, Cambridge, 1988, pp. 119–132 (= Q. Skinner 1988b).

———, *Liberty before Liberalism*, Cambridge, 2012.

———, ‘Meaning and understanding in the history of ideas’, *History and Theory*, 8 (1969), pp. 489–509.

———, ‘Some problems in the analysis of political thought and action’, *Political Theory*, 2 (1974), pp. 277–303.

———, *Visions of Politics, Volume 1: Regarding Method*, Cambridge, 2002.

Smith, Andrew, ‘The pagan Neoplatonists’ response to Christianity’, *The Maynooth Review*, 14 (1989), pp. 25–41.

Smith, R. R. R., ‘Late antique portraits in a public context: honorific statuary at Aphrodisias in Caria, A.D. 300–600’, *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 89 (1999), pp. 155–189.

Smith, Rowland B. E., *Julian’s Gods*, New York, 1995.

———, ‘“Restored utility; Eternal City”: patronal imagery at Rome in the fourth century AD’, in Kathryn Lomas and Timothy J. Cornell, eds., *Bread and Circuses: Euergetism and Municipal Patronage in Roman Italy*, London, 2003, pp. 142–66.

Snee, Rochelle M., ‘Gregory Nazianzen’s Constantinopolitan Career, AD 379–81’ (PhD Diss., University of Washington, 1981).

———, ‘Valens’ recall of the Nicene exiles and anti-Arian propaganda’, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 26 (1985), pp. 395–419.

Sogno, Christina, Edward J. Watts, and Bradley K. Storin, eds., *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide*, Berkeley, CA, 2017.

Spawforth, Antony J. S., ‘Corinth, Argos, and the imperial cult: Pseudo-Julian, Letters 198’, *Hesperia: the Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 63 (1994), pp. 211–232.

Speed, Gavin and Denis Sami, eds., *Debating Urbanism Within and Beyond the Walls A.D. 300–700*, Leicester, 2010.

Špidlík, Tomáš J., ‘L’idéal du monachisme basilien’, in Paul J. Fedwick, ed., *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic. A Sixteen-Hundreth Anniversay Symposium*, Toronto, 1979, pp. 221–79.

Stead, Christopher, *Philosophy in Christian Antiquity*, Cambridge, 1994.

Steenbuch, Johannes A., ‘A Christian anarchist? Gregory of Nyssa’s criticism of political power’, *Political Theology*, 17 (2017), pp. 573–588.

Sterk, Andrea, *Renouncing the World yet Leading the Church: the Monk-Bishop in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, Mass., 2004.

Stewart, Zeph, ‘Greek crowns and Christian martyrs’, in Enzo Lucchesi and Henri Dominique Saffrey, eds., *Mémorial André-Jean Festugière: Antiquité Païenne et Chrétienne*, Geneva, 1984, pp. 119–124.

Storin, Bradley K., *Gregory of Nazianzus’s Letter Collection: the Complete Translation*, Berkeley, CA, 2019 (= Storin 2019a).

———, *Self-Portrait in Three Colors: Gregory of Nazianzus’s Epistolary Autobiography*, Oakland, CA, 2019 (= Storin 2019b).

———, ‘The letter collection of Gregory of Nazianzus’, in Christina Sogno, Edward J. Watts, and Bradley K. Storin, eds., *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide*, Berkeley, CA, 2017, pp. 61–80.

Stroumsa, Guy G., *La fin du sacrifice: les mutations religieuses de l’antiquité tardive*, Paris, 2005.

Swain, S., *Themistius, Julian, and Greek Political Theory under Rome: Texts, Translations, and Studies of Four Key Works*, Cambridge, 2014.

Swift, L. J., 'Basil and Ambrose on the Six Days of Creation', *Augustinianum*, 21 (1981), pp. 317–28.

Szymusiak, J M, 'Les sites de Nazianze et Karbala', in *Epektasis : mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Danielou*, Paris, 1972, pp. 545–8.

Talbert, Richard J. A., ed., *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*, Princeton, NJ, 2000.

Tamas, Hajnalka, 'Renunciation and ascetic identity in the *Liber ad Renatum* of Asterius Ansedunensis', in Morwenna Ludlow and Richard Flower, eds., *Rhetoric and Religious Identity in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, 2020, pp. 219–30.

Teitler, Hans C., *The Last Pagan Emperor: Julian the Apostate and the War against Christianity*, Oxford, 2017.

Tenekrides, G., 'Dixit Isocrates et post eum Iulianus Imperator civitates esse immortales', in *Mélanges Triantaphyllopulos*, Athens, 1958, pp. 339–56.

Thomas, Gabrielle, *The Image of God in the Theology of Gregory of Nazianzus*, New York, 2019.

Torres, Juana, 'Emperor Julian and the veneration of relics', *Antiquité Tardive*, 17 (2009), pp. 205–14.

Tougher, Shaun, 'Julian the apologist: Christians and pagans on the Mother of the Gods', in Morwenna Ludlow and Richard Flower, eds., *Rhetoric and Religious Identity in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, 2020, pp. 67–82.

———, *Julian the Apostate*, Edinburgh, 2007.

———, 'The advocacy of an empress: Julian and Eusebia', *The Classical Quarterly*, 48 (1998), pp. 595–9.

Tougher, Shaun and Nicholas Baker-Brian, eds., *Emperor and Author: the Writings of Julian the Apostate*, Swansea, 2012.

Trapp, M., 'The emperor's shadow: Julian in his correspondence', in Shaun Tougher and Nicholas Baker-Brian, eds., *Emperor and Author: the Writings of Julian the Apostate*, Swansea, 2012, pp. 105–120.

Tully, James, ed., *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and His Critics*, Cambridge, 1988 (= Tully 1988a).

———, ‘The pen is a mighty sword: Quentin Skinner’s analysis of politics’, in James Tully, ed., *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and His Critics*, Cambridge, 1988, pp. 7–25 (= Tully 1988b).

Turner, Karen, ‘Law and punishment in the formation of empire’, in Walter Scheidel, ed., *Rome and China: Comparative Perspectives on Ancient World Empires*, Oxford, 2009, pp. 50–82.

Ullucci, Daniel, *The Christian Rejection of Animal Sacrifice*, Oxford, 2011.

Underwood, Douglas R., *(Re)using Ruins: Public Building in the Cities of the Late Antique West, A.D. 300–600*, 2019.

Urbano, Arthur, ‘“Read it also to the gentiles”: the displacement and recasting of the philosopher in the *Vita Antonii*’, *Church History*, 77 (2008), pp. 877–914.

Vaes, Jan, ‘Christian reutilization of the buildings of classical antiquity: an atlas’, *Lotus International*, 65 (1990), pp. 16–39.

Van Dam, Raymond, *Becoming Christian: the Conversion of Roman Cappadocia*, Philadelphia, Penn., 2003 (= Van Dam 2003a).

———, ‘Bishops and clerics in the fourth century: numbers and their implications’, in Johan Leemans, Peter Van Nuffelen, Carla Nicolaye, and Shawn W. J. Keough, eds., *Episcopal Elections in Late Antiquity*, Berlin, 2011, pp. 217–242.

———, *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia*, Philadelphia, Penn., 2003 (= Van Dam 2003b).

———, ‘Hagiography and history: the life of Gregory Thaumaturgus’, *Classical Antiquity*, 1 (1982), pp. 272–308.

———, ‘Inscriptions’, in Scott McGill and Edward J. Watts, eds., *A Companion to Late Antique Literature*, Hoboken, 2018, pp. 505–522.

———, *Kingdom of Snow: Roman Rule and Greek Culture in Cappadocia*, Philadelphia, Penn., 2002.

———, *The Roman Revolution of Constantine*, Cambridge, 2007.

Van der Berg, Robbert M., ‘Live unnoticed! The invisible Neoplatonic politician’, in Andrew Smith, ed., *The Philosopher and Society in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Peter Brown*, Swansea, 2005, pp. 101–115.

Van Hoof, Lieve, ed., *Libanius: A Critical Introduction*, Cambridge, 2014 (=Van Hoof 2014a).

———, *Plutarch's Practical Ethics: the Social Dynamics of Philosophy*, Oxford, 2010.

———, 'Self-censorship and self-fashioning: gaps in Libanius's letter-collection', *Revue Belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 92 (2014), pp. 209–22 (= Van Hoof 2014b).

———, 'The letter collection of Libanius', in Christina Sogno, Edward J. Watts, and Bradley K. Storin, eds., *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide*, Berkeley, CA, 2017, pp. 113–30.

Van Hoof, Lieve and Peter Van Nuffelen, eds., *Literature and Society in the Fourth Century AD*, Leiden, 2014.

———, 'Monarchy and mass communication. Antioch 362/3 revisited', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 101 (2011), pp. 166–84.

Van Minnen, P., 'Medical care in late antiquity', in P. Van der Eijk, H. F. J. Horstmanshoff, and P. H. Schrijvers, eds., *Ancient Medicine in its Socio-Cultural Context*, Vol. 1, Amsterdam, 1995, pp. 153–69.

Van Nijf, Onno, 'Affective politics: the emotional regime in the Imperial Greek City', in Angelos Chaniotis and Pierre Ducrey, eds., *Unveiling Emotions II. Emotions in Greece and Rome: Texts, Images, Material Culture*, Stuttgart, 2014, pp. 351–68.

Van Nuffelen, Peter, 'A war of words: sermons and social status in Constantinople under the Theodosian Dynasty', in Lieve Van Hoof and Peter Van Nuffelen, *Literature and Society in the Fourth Century AD*, Leiden, 2014, pp. 201–17.

———, 'Deux fausses lettres de Julien l'Apostat (la lettre aux juifs , *Ep.* 51 [Wright] et la lettre à Arsacius, *Ep.* 84 [Bidez])', *Vigilae Christianae*, 56 (2002), pp. 131–150.

———, *Rethinking the Gods: Philosophical Readings of Religion in the Post-Hellenistic Period*, Cambridge, 2011.

Van Nuffelen, Peter and David Engels, eds., *Religion and Competition in Antiquity*, Brussels, 2014.

Van Renswoude, Irene, *The Rhetoric of Free Speech in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, Cambridge, 2019.

Van Uytfanghe, M., 'L'origine, l'essor et les fonctions du culte des saints. Quelques repères pour un débat rouvert.', *Cassiodorus : rivista di studi sulla tarda antichità.*, 2 (1996), pp. 143–96.

Vanderspoel, John, *Themistius and the Imperial Court: Oratory, Civic Duty, and Paideia from Constantius to Theodosius*, Ann Arbor, MI, 1995.

Verhoeff, Maria, ‘A genuine friend wishes to be a debtor: John Chrysostom’s discourse on almsgiving reinterpreted’, *Sacris Erudiri*, 52 (2013), pp. 47–66.

Veyne, Paul, *Le pain et le cirque: Sociologie historique d’un pluralisme politique*, Paris, 1976.

Vinson, Martha, ‘Gregory Nazianzen’s *Homily 15* and the genesis of the Christian cult of the Maccabean Martyrs’, *Byzantion*, 64 (1994), pp. 166–192.

Viroli, Maurizio, *For Love of Country: An Essay on Patriotism and Nationalism*, Oxford, *For Love of Country*, 1997.

Vogler, Chantal, ‘L’administration impériale dans la correspondance de saint Basile et saint Grégoire de Naziance’, *Publications de l’École Française de Rome*, 159 (1992), pp. 447–464.

Vössing, Konrad, ‘The value of a good education: the school law in context’, in Hans-Ulrich Wiemer and Stefan Rebenich, eds., *A Companion to Julian the Apostate*, Leiden, 2020, pp. 172–206.

Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew, ‘*Civilis princep*s: between citizen and king’, *Journal of Roman Studies*, 72 (1982), pp. 32–48.

———, ‘The cities of Cassiodorus: the resilience of urban values’, in Javier Martínez Jiménez and Sam Ottewill-Soulsby, eds., *Remembering and Forgetting the Ancient City*, Oxford, 2022.

Ward-Perkins, Bryan, *From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages: Urban Public Building in Northern and Central Italy, AD 300–850*, Oxford, 1984.

Watt, John W., ‘Julian’s *Letter to Themistius* and Themistius’s response’, in Shaun Tougher and Nicholas Baker-Brian, eds., *Emperor and Author: the Writings of Julian the Apostate*, Swansea, 2012, pp. 91–103.

Watts, Edward J., *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria*, Berkeley, CA, 2006.

———, *The Final Pagan Generation*, Berkeley, CA, 2015.

Watts, Edward J. and Cristiana Sogno, ‘Epistolography’, in Scott McGill and Edward J. Watts, eds., *A Companion to Late Antique Literature*, Hoboken, 2018, pp. 389–400.

Webb, Ruth, ‘Between rhetoric and poetry: Libanios' use of Homeric subjects in his *progymnasmata*’, *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, 95 (2010), pp. 131–52.

Weber, Max, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, Tübingen, 1922.

———, *Wirtschaft und gesellschaft. Die Stadt*, ed. Wilfried Nippel, Tübingen, 1999.

Weis, Bertold K., ‘Kaiser Julians Obelisken-Brief an die Alexandriner’, *Hermes*, 92 (1964), pp. 106–15.

Weisweiler, John, ‘From empire to world-state: ecumenical language and cosmopolitan consciousness in the later Roman aristocracy’, in Richard E. Payne, Myles Lavan, and John Weisweiler, eds., *Cosmopolitanism and Empire: Universal Rulers, Local Elites, and Cultural Integration in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean*, Oxford, 2016, pp. 187–208.

———, ‘Populist despotism and infrastructual power in the later Roman Empire’, in Clifford Ando and Seth Richardson, eds., *Ancient States and Infrastructural Power: Europe, Asia, and America*, Philadelphia, Penn., 2017, pp. 149–78.

———, ‘The price of integration: state and elite in Symmachus’ correspondence’, in Peter Eich, Sebastian Schmidt-Hofner, and Christian Wieland, eds., *Der wiederkerende Leviathan: Staatlichkeit und Staatswerdung in Spätantike und Früher Neuzeit*, Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 343–74.

———, ‘The Roman aristocracy between East and West: divine monarchy, state-building and the transformation of the Roman senatorial order (c. 25 BCE – 425 CE)’, in T. Minamikawa, ed., *New Approaches to the Later Roman Empire: Proceedings of a Conference held at Kyoto University on 8 March 2014*, Kyoto, 2015, pp. 31–52.

Welton, Megan, ‘The city speaks: cities, citizens, and civic discourse in late antiquity and the early Middle Ages’, *Traditio*, 75 (2020), pp. 1–37.

Wenzel, Aaron, ‘Libanius, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the ideal of Athens in late antiquity’, *Journal of Late Antiquity*, 3 (2010), pp. 264–285.

Wessel, Susan, ‘The suffering of Christ, humanity and the lepers in Gregory Nazianzen’, *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 68 (2015), pp. 381–397.

Westberg, David, ‘The letter collection of Procopius of Gaza’, in Christina Sogno, Edward J. Watts, and Bradley K. Storin, eds., *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide*, Berkeley, CA, 2017, pp. 394–417.

Whitby, Mary, ‘“Sugaring the pill”: Gregory of Nazianzus’ *Advice to Olympias* (Carm. 2.2.6)’, *Ramus*, 37 (2008), pp. 79–98.

———, ed., *The Propaganda of Power: the Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, Leiden ; Boston, 1998.

Whitby, Michael, ‘Factions, bishops, violence, and urban decline’, in Jens-Uwe Krause and Christian Witschel, eds., *Die Stadt in der Spätantike: Niedergang oder Wandel? Akten des internationalen Kolloquiums in München am 30. und 31. Mai 2003*, Berlin, 2006, pp. 441–61.

White, Carolinne N., *Christian Friendship in the Fourth Century*, New York, NY, 2002.

Whitmarsh, Tim, ‘Exile and identity in the Second Sophistic’, in Simon Goldhill, ed., *Being Greek under Rome: the Second Sophistic, Cultural Identity, and the Development of the Roman Empire*, Cambridge, 2001, pp. 269–305.

Whittow, Mark, ‘Ruling the late Roman and Byzantine city: a continuous history’, *Past & Present*, 129 (1990), pp. 3–29.

———, *The Making of Byzantium, 600–1025*, Berkeley, CA, 1996.

Wickham, Chris, *Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean, 400–800*, Oxford, 2005.

———, ‘The other transition: from the ancient world to feudalism’, *Past & Present*, 103 (1984), pp. 3–36.

Wiemer, Hans-Ulrich and Stefan Rebenich, eds., *A Companion to Julian the Apostate*, Leiden, 2020.

Williams, Rowan, ‘Pre-Nicene orthodoxy?’, in Rowan Williams, ed., *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, Cambridge, 1989, pp. 1–23.

Williams, Stephen, *Diocletian and the Roman Recovery*, London, 1985.

Wilson, Robert R., ‘The City in the Old Testament’, in Peter S. Hawkins, ed., *Civitas: Religious Interpretations of the City*, Atlanta, GA, 1986, pp. 3–14.

Wood, Ian, *The Transformation of the Roman West*, Leeds, 2018.

Wright, Wilmer C., *The Emperor Julian’s Relation to the New Sophistic and Neoplatonism*, London, 1980 (repr.).

Xenophontos, Sophia A., ‘Imagery and education in Plutarch’, *Classical Philology*, 108 (2013), pp. 126–138.

Zhao, Dingxin, ‘The Han bureaucracy: its origin, nature and development’, in Walter Scheidel, ed., *State Power in Ancient China and Rome*, Oxford, 2015, pp. 56–89.

Zubaida, Sami, ‘Max Weber’s “The City” and the Islamic City’, *Max Weber Studies*, 6 (2006), pp. 111–118.

Zuiderhoek, Arjan, ‘The ambiguity of munificence’, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 57 (2007), pp. 196–213.

———, *The Ancient City*, Cambridge, 2016.

———, *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire: Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor*, Cambridge, 2009.