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Abstract: This thesis offers a new understanding of the reign of the Emperor Julian, using as a heuristic tool the Christian theological concept of recapitulation (anacephalaiosis/recapitulatio). Recapitulation encompasses similitudo, iteratio, and restitutio: in Christian thought, Adam is the similitudo of Christ, Christ rehearses Adam’s wrong acts for the purpose of setting them right, overwriting the narrative of his failure, and Christ’s work has the goal of restoration of humanity to God’s friendship.

The thesis shows that Julian’s imperial programme is illuminated when viewed in similar terms, with the substitution of his uncle Constantine for Adam. The Emperor Constantine had overwritten the narratives of his own political and religious opponents, while Eusebius of Caesarea had portrayed Constantine as a mimetic Christ-figure. The thesis uses the evidence of Julian’s writings, above all his Oration VII ‘To the Cynic Heracleios’ to argue that Julian himself also adopted this approach and co-opted the Christian language of recapitulation, narrating Constantine’s career as one of religious apostasy which needed to be set right by his own reversal of Constantine’s actions and consequent restoration of the empire to friendship with the gods. Julian cast Constantine as the failed representative who apostatised from Helios and himself as the son of Helios and the divinely chosen representative who would act as saviour for the empire. In this oration, Julian also outlined his role as a new Heracles, sent by his father Helios to be the saviour of the world. In the same work, he criticised Constantine’s desecration of pagan religious places. Both literary and material evidence indicate Julian responded in kind with building programs designed to support a pagan revival: the thesis demonstrates that his activities in Constantinople, Jerusalem, and Antioch in particular show a systematic programme of reversal and restoration. Julian's letters to his priests indicate his plans to supplant Christianity’s ecclesiastical structure, clerical instructions, and charitable activities.

Bringing this theological concept to bear on a series of texts more often considered by classicists than theologians offers, it is hoped, a richer understanding of Julian’s response to Constantine and Christianisation.
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Table 1. Julian’s major discourses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bidez</th>
<th>Wright</th>
<th>Hertlein</th>
<th>Neumann</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Or. 1</td>
<td>Or. 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>First Panegyric to Constantius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Or. 3</td>
<td>Or. 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Panegyric to Empress Eusebia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Or. 2</td>
<td>Or. 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Second Panegyric to Constantius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Or. 8</td>
<td>Or. 8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>On the Departure of Sallust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Or. 7</td>
<td>Or. 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>To the Cynic Heraclelos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Or. 5</td>
<td>Or. 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hymn to the Mother of the Gods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Or. 6</td>
<td>Or. 6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>To the Uneducated Cynics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Caesars</td>
<td>Caesares</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Caesars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Or. 4</td>
<td>Or. 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hymn to King Helios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Misop.</td>
<td>Misop.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Misopogon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Gal.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C. Gal.</td>
<td>Against the Galileans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

1. INTRODUCTION

Matthew’s infancy narrative contains a powerful and enduring story. Jesus, the ‘son of David’ and rightful king of Israel, was hunted down by the unrighteous reigning king Herod, was miraculously spared the slaughter of the innocents, and was subsequently declared the Son of God who would restore righteousness. It would be small wonder if young Flavius Claudius Julianus, the future emperor, saw his own circumstances reflected in this narrative. Julian was born in 331 or 332 to a branch of Constantius I’s dynasty, but slightly removed from the then-reigning emperor Constantine I. Julian’s father Julius Constantius, Constantius I’s son and Constantine’s half-brother, had a much-reduced public role.¹ When Constantine I died in 337, Julian’s branch of the dynasty was all but eliminated in a purge, almost certainly by the man Julian later blamed, his cousin Constantius II.² Soldiers slaughtered Julian’s family, but Julian was spared because of his young age, and his older half-brother Gallus because he appeared mortally ill anyway (Julian, V.270d; Lib., Or. XVIII.10; cf. Socr., III.1; Soz., V.2.9; Amm. XXV.3.23). As Julian grew older, he felt he had been providentially preserved and called to right the wrongs of the past, a perspective perhaps reinforced by Constantius II’s execution of Gallus in 354 (Amm., XIV.11.23).

¹ Julius Constantius was made consul and given the title *patricius* in 335 as Constantine I belatedly rehabilitated him for a public role under Constantine’s successors.
² The deaths of Julian’s father and siblings (but for Gallus) were almost certainly the responsibility of Constantius II: see Burgess (2008), 5-51; *contra* Rosen (2006), who credits military leaders with independent action.
This righting of past wrongs could be described by the term ‘recapitulation’, which I define and place into historical and theological context in chapter one. Recapitulation is a framework that presents a perhaps clearer way of understanding Julian’s religious program and his response to the Constantinian revolution. Julian’s twist on the Christian topos of recapitulatio is also a useful tool for seeing how personal elements in his life and components of his reign can be seen as part of a unified whole. This is something which I believe has not been achieved by previous scholarship, and which I propose to do in this thesis.

Gallus’ execution and the attempted usurpation of Silvanus (Amm., XV.5.15-31) provided the catalyst for Julian’s elevation as Caesar in the same year, the first step in what Julian saw as divine providence opening his way to challenge Constantius II. That divine providence, however, was not a Christian one, as Julian had been given a Christian education, but later reported that at age twenty he had privately rejected Christianity for paganism (Julian, Ep. 111; Lib. Or. XVII.19). Following a number of unexpected victories as Caesar in Gaul, Julian was acclaimed as Augustus by his troops. The incipient civil war was broken off by Constantius II’s unexpected illness and death which abruptly left Julian, now openly pagan, sole ruler.

Faced with having to undo the Constantinian revolution and two generations of state-supported Christianisation, Julian identified the root problem as the apostasy of Constantine to Christianity. In his 361 satire Caesars, Julian stated his intent to make Constantine’s changes as short-lived as the ‘flowers of Adonis’ (X.329d). \(^3\) While one cannot pinpoint when Julian began planning for such an opportunity, this was unlikely to have been an inspiration of the moment. Julian needed a framework

---

\(^3\) For discussion of dating, see chapter three, part two.
for his aspiration, a contemporary myth, as it were, and in early 362 he realised an ideal opportunity to communicate his framework for reversing the Constantinian revolution. Libanius claimed he wrote *Or. VII, To the Cynic Heracleios* in one day in Spring 362 in Constantinople (Lib., *Or. XVIII.157*). The oration was composed for the festival of Cybele in March, and ostensibly was written to criticise Heracleios’ irreverent use of myth. Indeed, I would argue that *Or. VII* holds a unique place in Julian’s career, as the moment when his program for the future crystallised and was presented to his subjects. Rosen has described it as the vehicle for laying out ‘his government program, embedded in a narrative full of autobiographical references’. ⁴ This programmatic statement for Julian’s career contains his political theology, a divine justification of his regime, in which the gods explicitly endorse Julian and his reversal of Constantine and his sons.

One modern scholar refers to Julian as ‘a sort of reverse Constantine’, as in redressing the Constantinian revolution, Julian in many ways mirrored the Eusebian presentation of Constantine. ⁵ Julian cast Constantine and himself as the representatives of their people, with Julian chosen by the gods to recapitulate Constantine’s apostasy. Both emperors desecrated rival religious sites and built their own in response, occasionally at the same site. ⁶ Julian responded to Christian theology by parceling out theological attributes of Christ to existing Hellenic gods. Indeed, Julian drew on Christian material to a greater extent than I believe has been realised. It is my intention to revisit Julian’s reign and how it can be viewed as a pagan recapitulation of Constantine’s reign.

---

⁵ Potter (2004), 506.
⁶ See chapter seven; also Greenwood (forthcoming 2013).
Julian's religious revival reversing the Constantinian revolution is controversial, and he himself is a polarizing historical character. Shortly after his death, Christians and pagans embarked upon a war of rhetoric, each side trying to establish the meaning of the events of Julian’s life. Libanius’ adulation and Gregory Nazianzen’s vituperation both exhibit extreme partisanship. This issue has continued into the modern era, as one biographer emotionally lamented the dearly departed emperor as ‘a tragic figure, a man of infinite promise, cut off before his prime’, while a more balanced scholar candidly admits, ‘it can be hard to remain objective about him’. While an abundance of literary evidence concerning Julian’s reign has survived, much is murky enough to easily admit more than one interpretation. This combination appears to have encouraged people to project their personal views and emotions onto the canvas of Julian’s tale, a procedure which is unhelpful in attempting to reconstruct historical events fairly.

2. DEFINITIONS

There is simply no good way to consistently resolve the choice of terms for Julian’s religion. He defined himself as a *Hellene* in a religious sense, as did Libanius (*Ep.* 1120.2; 1211.2; 1431.5). This term, which I considered at the beginning of my research, is fair in terms of allowing our primary historical figure to define himself, but awkward when it comes to describing Western, Latin-speaking adherents of the same religion. While some have used *polytheist*, that term does not cover

---

7 As thoroughly documented in Elm (2012).
8 Browning (1975), xii; Tougher (2007), 72.
Neoplatonic monotheism or Mithraism. The term *pagan* was originally used generically to describe civilians and has the advantage of being able to describe all adherents regardless of culture or nationality.\(^9\) It is not possible to be entirely consistent with terminology. Therefore, while I realise the incongruity of using a term to describe Julian that he would not have chosen for himself, I will utilize the term *pagan* when speaking in general terms, but when citing or discussing the views of those who describe themselves as *Hellenes* will use their term for themselves.\(^10\)

Similarly, the term *Christianisation* is somewhat unsatisfying. While it is frequently used, it can be used in different ways to refer to individual conversions, laws, architecture and use of space, and so on. In contrast to modern assumptions of incremental gains in political struggle, Peter Brown writes of Christianisation as a ‘narrative . . . the story of a stunning, supernatural victory over the gods’.\(^11\) I believe this description as narrative is a useful one, and fits nicely in regards to Constantine’s use of space, the legal system, and appropriation of culture for the privileging and advancement of Christianity. The narrative of the Constantinian revolution depends upon Eusebius, who provided the triumphal narrative of Christian victory.

### 3. BIOGRAPHICAL OUTLINE

As a minor relative of the Imperial family, the future Emperor Julian likely did not seem destined for historical significance. Yet Julian survived the murder of his

---

\(^9\) For an extended discussion, see Cameron (2011), 14-32.
\(^10\) Perhaps a future goal of scholarship will be the creation of a universally acceptable synthetic term.
family to become the junior partner of the man he held responsible for their death, and ultimately to succeed that man as Emperor. Julian’s tale has excited the imagination for centuries, and still has a hold on the modern mind, as evidenced by the significant number of books devoted to explaining him. As a scholar put it when trying to find a middle ground between two writers vehemently disagreeing over Julian’s thought, ‘both are animated by the same sense of urgency: what to make of Julian matters’.

As a foundation for examining Julian’s actions and writings, it is necessary to provide a brief biographical sketch of Julian’s life. There is broad consensus about most of this framework, so this section will lean much more upon citations from contemporary sources, rather than repetitive references to modern scholarship. Julian was born in A.D. 332 to Julius Constantius, the half-brother of Emperor Constantine, and his Christian wife Basilina, who died several months after giving birth (XII.352b). The exact month and day of Julian’s birth cannot be determined, and even the year is debated. Baynes based his argument for 331 on a statement on Julian’s Letter to the Athenians. Gilliard holds (compellingly, I believe) that the statement of ‘twentieth year’, as interpreted as in Julian’s time, would place his birth in 332, sometime between the last week of April and the first three weeks of May. Julian’s mother Basilina apparently left her estate to the church. In 337 in Constantinople, Julian’s family was murdered. Julian was less than six at the time of the massacre (Ammianus XXV.3.23), and was spared because of his age; his

---

15 Seeck (1919), iii, 98-99.
16 Hunt (1998), 3-4. Burgess (2008), 5-51, has demonstrated that this was almost certainly done on the orders of Constantius.
older half-brother Gallus was spared because he was ill and not expected to live (Lib., *Or. XVIII.10*). Julian later wrote of the attack in his writings (V.270cd, 275a, 281b; VII.228b, 230a; cf. Eun., *Vit. soph.* VII.1.5.3-6.1).

Julian was separated from Gallus and initially entrusted to the custody of Bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia, who was tasked with Julian’s Christian education (Amm. XXII.9.4). In 337, Constantius deposed Paul, the elected bishop of Constantinople, and named Eusebius bishop there (Ath., *Hist. Ar.* VII.1). Eusebius handed Julian over to the tutelage of the classicist Mardonius, whom he later wrote was primarily responsible for his taste for Hellenic literature (XII.352c, 353b; VIII.241c, 274d).

Beginning in 342, Julian was reunited with Gallus and confined on the estate of *Fundus Macelli*, located in Cappadocia at the foot of Mount Argaeus (V.271c; Ammianus XV.2.7; Sozomen V.2). By then, Julian must have realized that he lived at the sufferance of the man likely responsible for murdering his family, a sufferance which might last only as long as Constantius failed to produce an heir. Julian’s tutors attempted to soothe him by repeatedly telling him that Constantius had been deceived and yielded to the will of the army (V.271b). Julian’s new tutor was George of Cappadocia, who later became the bishop of Alexandria. Julian described Macellum as a ‘castle of oblivion’, using the term for remote places Persian unfortunates were sent to disappear permanently (V.271c). Julian later blamed the harshness of this imprisonment for ruining the character of Gallus, and indirectly leading to his reign of terror in Antioch (V.271d).

In 348, Constantius travelled to Macellum and interviewed the youths. Gallus was taken to Constantius’ court at Antioch, and Julian was sent to study in

---

Constantinople. Julian studied rhetoric under the pagan Nicocles and the ostensibly Christian Hecebolius, and was allowed to visit his grandmother’s estate in Bithynia, later writing fondly of his summer visits to her (Ep. 4.427c; Lib., Or. XVIII.12).

Libanius suggested that Constantius feared the positive impression that Julian might make in the πόλις μεγάλη or ‘great city’, and therefore transferred him to Nicomedia (Lib., Or. XVIII.13).18 At Nicomedia, Julian sent someone to transcribe the lectures of Libanius and so became his quasi-student (Lib., Or. XVIII.13-15). In 351, as Constantius was distracted by his civil war in the Western Empire, Gallus was elevated to Caesar and sent to rule in Antioch, while Julian was allowed to go to Pergamum and Ephesus to study, which he reportedly did day and night (Lib., Or. XVIII.18). Eunapius wrote that Julian had freedom of movement during these years, that he would travel where he liked, although ‘accompanied by the Emperor’s suspicions and a bodyguard’ (Eun., Vit. soph. VII.1.9.3). Both Julian and Libanius date his full embrace of Hellenic religion to 351. Julian described himself as, ‘one who till his twentieth year walked in that road of yours, but for twelve years now has walked in this road I speak of, by the grace of the gods’. Given the debate regarding Julian’s date of birth as well as the general way in which Julian terms it, we are left with a broad range of time, even assuming that Julian intended to refer to a ‘conversion’ at a point in time, as opposed to a process (Ep. 111.434cd, Libanius Or. XVIII.18). Although Julian associated with known pagans, he remained quiet about his passion for Hellenism and rejection of Christianity.19 Playing on Aesop’s fable and the popular notion of the ass representing Christianity, Libanius characterised

18 Unfortunately, Norman translates Libanius’ common description of πόλις μεγάλη as ‘capital’, muddying the waters over the role of Constantine’s city for English readers.
Julian as not an ass in a lion’s skin, but a lion in an ass’ skin (Lib., Or. XVIII.19). Himerius, the famous Bithynian sophist, appears to have had a close relationship with Julian, with an association that may extend farther back than most would assume. Barnes notes the likelihood that a fragment of an oration of Himerius was given at Sirmium on 15 March 351, with oblique references identifying the presence of Julian at Gallus’ elevation to Caesar (Him., fr. 1.6).  

In 354, Constantius tired of Gallus’ brutal and defiantly independent rule in Antioch, summoned him to the West and had him beheaded in Histria near Pola without trial (Ammianus XIV.11.20-23). Julian was criticised by Constantius’ courtiers for having visited the now-disgraced Gallus when he came through Constantinople. Although Julian could provide reasons for his decisions, he would perhaps have been overcome by the rumor-mongers of the court had not the Empress Eusebia intervened for him (II.118abc). Tougher makes a good case that Eusebia was not an independent agent in this endeavor, but was acting for Constantius, although the evidence is not conclusive enough to eliminate the possibility that Julian was correct in praising Eusebia’s initiative. Julian was kept at Comum near Milan paulisper, ‘for a short while’, before Eusebia obtained Julian’s freedom (Ammianus XV.2.7-8). Once she intervened, Constantius allowed Julian to continue on for further study, and he studied in Athens for two months under the Christian sophist Prohaeresius, as well as the Hellenist Themistius, and alongside fellow students Gregory Nazianzen and Basil of Caesarea (VI.257d, 258a-d). Himerius was teaching in Athens in 355 when Julian resided in the city  

---

21 Kelly (2008), 286, has shown that here Ammianus deliberately paralleled Constantine and Crispus at Pola.
22 Tougher (1998), 597.
and likely attended his lectures (Soc., Hist. eccl. IV.26.6; Soz., Hist. eccl. VI.17.1). During this time, Julian was apparently secretly initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries (VII.235c; Eun., Vit. Soph. VII.3.1, 6; Greg. Naz., Or. IV.55).

With usurpers of various stripes such as Vetranio, Magnentius, and most recently Silvanus, by 355 Constantius had become very troubled by the unstable situation in the West, but had issues to manage on both borders of his Empire. He considered naming Julian as Caesar, although some of his courtiers spoke against it. Again, the Empress Eusebia stepped in, supporting both Julian’s capability as well as her husband’s idea (II.121b). Tougher notes that it is possible that Constantius allowed Eusebia to put forward the concept, allowing for him to plausibly deny it should it have proved unpopular. After a period of indecision, Constantius committed to elevating Julian to the purple. On 6 November, 355, Constantius made Julian Caesar, and gave him a limited military command in Gaul (Amm. XV.8.5-17). Julian was shortly after married to Constantius’ sister Helena (II.123d; Amm. XV.8.18).

When Julian left for Gaul on 1 December 355, he was tasked with expelling the Germans from Gaul and rebuilding the destroyed Roman forts. He later portrayed the tools he was given to accomplish this ostensible goal as including inadequate numbers of men, limited resources, and obstructive officers and functionaries loyal to Constantius II. Julian was intended to be a mere figurehead, whom Constantius ordered his generals to watch as closely as they did the enemy (V.277d). Julian later described his situation as the worst kind of slavery (V.273c). He wrote of his fear for his life as he was kept behind locked and guarded doors, with visitors searched to

---

prevent outside communication (V.277ab). Despite this dark portrayal, it has been noted that Constantius II treated Julian as a dynastic partner. Julian and Constantius worked successfully in tandem in the campaign in Gaul. While Julian claimed that Constantius became frustrated with the lack of progress and released command of the troops to him in 357, prompting a string of victories including the recapture of Cologne (V.278d), the reality was that the battle of Cologne happened in 356 (Amm. XVI.3.1). Julian was commanding his own troops and working in concert with Constantius II, facts that justify treating his account circumspectly. Nevertheless, it is unarguable that Julian was very successful and his victories restored the security and prosperity of Gaul.

After his string of victories in Gaul, Julian had a foundation from which to seek the purple and supplant Christianity, and Constantius II created an opportunity for action. As the Persians had sacked Amida in October 359, Constantius had grown legitimately concerned about the stability of the Eastern frontier, and also wary of Julian’s meteoric rise in his Gallic campaigns. In the winter of 359/360, Constantius moved to the East and began preparations for a campaign which included the transfer of 23,000 of Julian’s Gallic troops to the Eastern Empire (V.282d). In February 360, the Gallic troops and their leaders assembled in Paris from all over Gaul and Britain. The disgruntled soldiers surrounded Julian’s quarters in Paris (V.284bc). After publicly advising his troops to obey Constantius’ order, Julian retired for dinner with his officers (Ammianus XX.4.12-22). Zosimus, relying on Eunapius’ more contemporary account, indicated that Julian’s dinner guests distributed letters to his soldiers, prompting their acclamation of him as Augustus

(Zos. III.9). After what he described as a divine sign, Julian accepted their acclamation and informed Constantius by letter (V.284c).\textsuperscript{27} Constantius rejected this ‘field promotion’, but events had already moved Julian beyond concern over his cousin’s disapproval. In the summer of 360, Eunapius indicated that Julian and two ‘accomplices’, his physician Oribasius and another friend Euhemerus of Libya, consulted the hierophant. The conspirators were emboldened on the basis of these rites to attempt to destroy the tyranny of Constantius (Eun., fr. 21 Blockley; Amm. XXI.1.6). Julian wintered at Vienne from 6 November 360 to possibly March 361 (Amm. XX.10.3; XXI.1, 2.5, 3.1).\textsuperscript{28} Julian, who had originally enforced Constantius’ anti-Nicene policies and exiled Hilary of Poitiers, shifted his support to the Nicene party, allowing Hilary to lead the council of Paris in 360 (Hilary, \textit{CSEL} LXV.43-46).\textsuperscript{29}

In July 361, Julian marched eastwards to confront Constantius. Julian began moving down the Danube while two other forces marched separately, creating the impression of greater numbers. In mid-July he had passed through Sirmium as far as the pass of Succi, then returned to Naissus, pausing there to regroup and write letters justifying his assertion of power to the leaders of Athens, Sparta, Corinth, and Rome, of which only \textit{To the Athenians} survives (Amm. XXI.10.5).\textsuperscript{30} The Roman Senate responded with a declaration of loyalty to Constantius (Ammianus XXI.10.7).

During his march, Julian had received a night vision of Constantius’ death, and on 3 November 361 Constantius II conveniently died of a fever (Ammianus

\textsuperscript{27} This sequence is recognised as duplicity on Julian’s part by Bowersock (1978), 50-1; Matthews (1989), 98-9; Barnes (1998), 153-5; Kelly (2008), 212.
\textsuperscript{28} Barnes (1993), 228.
\textsuperscript{29} Barnes (1993), 153-4; (1998), 156.
\textsuperscript{30} Barnes (1993), 228.
XXI.2.2). Julian entered Constantinople on 11 December 361 and assumed the throne. According to Ammianus who was generally favorable to Julian, after Constantius’ death, letters once again circulated that he had recognized Julian as his legitimate heir (Ammianus XXI.15.5).

Once Julian became sole Emperor he moved quickly to punish those he believed responsible for the death of his half-brother Gallus (Lib., Or. XVIII.153). A military tribunal began in Chalcedon in December 361, composed of Salutius Secundus, Mamertinus, Nevitta, Jovinus, Agilo, and Arbitio, and eliminating figures Julian held responsible for Gallus’ death, as well as some who were enemies of high-ranking military officials (Ammianus XXI.3.1-12). This included some who had been allied with Julian, who was realistic enough to appreciate the extent to which his accession to power had come through the military.

Julian began his march to Constantinople with promises of religious tolerance, which Ammianus attributed to a cynical effort to foment dissent among rival Christian groups (Amm., XXII.5.4), but he soon introduced a campaign fulfilling the divine mandate he claimed to have been given to clean the household of his fathers. Ammianus implied that Julian did not reveal his paganism until he arrived in Constantinople, but Julian wrote that on the march he and his troops openly worshipped the gods (Julian, Ep. 26.415c; cf. the openly polytheistic Or. V). He issued several edicts which began a process of marginalization of Christians in the Roman Empire (Ep. 83.376c). Julian’s removal of the taxation and travel privileges for Christian clergy which Constantine and Constantius had instituted was monetarily significant, but could as easily be attributed to frugality, and was preserved by his successors. While Julian specifically discouraged persecution and
physical mistreatment (Ep. 61c.424; Ep. 83.376c; Ep. 114.438bc), this did not drive him to punish the Alexandrians for murdering his old tutor George on 24 December, 361 (Hist. Ac. 8).31 The austere Julian was similarly not inclined to tolerate Constantius II’s opulent court, from which he let many servants go. Julian also desired to revive the Greek cities, and pressed citizens to fulfill their obligation to local government service.

Julian inherited a threat on his Eastern border which had given Constantius II enduring problems. Julian began to ready a campaign against Sapor in the East. While Julian had to act to secure his eastern border, the prospect of unifying the Empire behind him following a successful campaign on Persian soil must have been very compelling for him.

Julian went to Antioch to prepare for a campaign against the Sassanid Empire, and looking forward to seeing again its most famous citizen, Libanius. He went with high expectations, hoping to establish a good relationship with a city he thought highly of (XII.367c; Lib., Or. XVI.53). He arrived in July and remained there through the winter (Ammianus XXII.9.14-15).32 Soon the situation in Antioch became unpleasant for all concerned. There was a food shortage exacerbated by the size of Julian’s army, and his efforts to purchase quantities of food were derailed by market speculators (XII.369cd; Ammianus XXII.14.1). In order to revive the oracle of Apollo at Daphne, Julian removed the bones of the martyr St. Babylas from the
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31 Both Hunt (1985), 192, and Barnes (1993), 155, accept the earlier date of the Historia Acephala, but suggest that Julian was mistaken and George was murdered by Nicene Christians. While the Nicenes in Alexandria evidently did not intervene to save George, I think it is best to accept Julian’s assessment of pagan responsibility. Ammianus XXII.11.8 places the event in 362, but Brennecke (1997), 234-8 points out that Ammianus may have gotten the date wrong from his source, ‘the Arian historian’.

32 Matthews (1989), 108 points out that Julian’s arrival coincided with the festival of Adonis in July, contra Seeck (1919), 210, which opts for June 362.
shrine Gallus had built, leaving other bodies interred (XII.361cd; Ammianus XXII.12.8). It turned into a Christian spectacle and public relations victory, as it appeared Julian tacitly admitted that Christ was working through the body of the sainted martyr, as argued later by Chrysostom (Babylas 90; cf. Soz., Hist. eccl. V.19).\textsuperscript{33} In October 362, the Temple of Apollo at Daphne near Antioch was burned, and Julian assumed it was retribution and publicly blamed Antiochene Christians (Ammianus XXII.13.1-3).

Julian left for the Persian front on 5 March 363. For once, Julian’s military efforts fared poorly. At first, his army advanced with all the appearance of success. However, the distances involved were much greater than in Gaul, and the retreating Persians destroyed food supplies behind them. By mid-summer Julian’s army with its over-extended supply lines was forced to withdraw. Early on the morning of 26 June 363 Julian was wounded in a night skirmish east of the Tigris River near the village of Maranga. In response to a Persian raid, Julian had thrown together his gear and ridden off to meet the threat without his breastplate, and a stray spear pierced his abdomen. Attended by his physician Oribasius and a few confidants, Julian died about midnight on 26 June 363 (Ammianus XXV.5.1).

4. DOMINANT THEMES IN MODERN SCHOLARSHIP

In Julianic studies, some central assumptions are understood and agreed to by all researchers. Historians agree to a general chronology of Julian’s life, and that he genuinely rejected Christianity and genuinely embraced some form of Hellenic

\textsuperscript{33} For Chrysostom’s Babylas, I follow the numbering system of Schatkin (1985).
religion. Researchers also attest to Julian’s undoubted efforts to politically marginalise Christianity, using methods which were far more peaceful than those of some of his Imperial predecessors such as Diocletian. Despite this foundation, there are numerous areas on which no consensus exists. Referring to Julian's early death, Chuvin warns that it means that ‘anyone can recreate the young philosopher-warrior emperor in whatever image he chooses’. As early as 1939 Glanville Downey cautioned that Julian’s complex character encouraged this: ‘the military commander, the theosophist, the social reformer, and the man of letters furnish material out of which scholars have made various combinations’. In assessing the contributions of modern scholarship, I believe it will be helpful to center the discussion on the key scholars who have made significant contributions to the discussion. I shall exclude from this scholars whose research has touched upon Julian without relevance for this thesis, as well as those whose interest was in producing popular level reading material. In some cases, I have taken a single point made by an author and included it in a footnote supporting another scholar’s more significant contribution. Inevitably, some of these works have made important contributions in more than one area. I will divide the scholarly literature into two areas: historical background and Julian’s thought, and then look at some focusing on a theme important to my work, reaction and revenge.

**Historical response**

In 1914, Johannes Geffcken authored *Kaiser Julianus*, a biography focusing sympathetically upon Julian as a microcosm of fourth-century conflicts. It is a rather
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34 Chuvin (1990), 49.  
35 Downey (1939), 305.
compressed work of 174 pages, and both his best insights into Julian and his critical observations on Julian’s texts were absorbed by Bidez shortly thereafter.

Few names are as closely associated with Julianic scholarship as that of Joseph Bidez. He co-edited Julian’s letters and laws in 1922, provided the French translation and commentary of half of the four volume edition of Julian’s works in 1924, and wrote an enduring biography of Julian in 1930. The research of his frequent collaborator Franz Cumont into Mithraism seems to have seeped into Bidez’s portrait of Julian, whom he casts as a committed Mithraist. Bidez viewed Julian as initially tolerant, only turning to persecution late in his reign. Bidez also borrowed from the nineteenth-century scholar Naville, misrepresenting his meaning and claiming that Julian created a ‘pagan Trinity’.  

In 1975, Robert Browning of the University of London provided the fullest English biography to date of Julian, *The Emperor Julian*. His reconstruction of Julian’s life is overwhelmingly positive, privileging Julian’s statements when contested by other witnesses. Browning holds that Julian was a ‘fairly fervent’ Christian who turned from that faith to paganism. In Browning’s view, Julian initially was a loyal if reluctant servant of the emperor, who was carried by events into the rebellion, and even after the acclamation, sought to avoid a conflict with Constantius. He held that Julian ‘adopted the pagan monotheism of the Hellenizing intellectuals of the empire, who held out against the new faith a monotheism in which there was room for the pantheon of the traditional gods and goddesses as allegories or manifestations or reflections of the true One’.  

36 Bidez (1930), 253; cf. chapter six, part three.
37 Browning (1975), 44.
38 Browning (1975), 101-3, 106.
39 Browning (1975), 44.
the centrality of Julian’s religion in his thought as part of the spirit of the age, but
saw Christianity’s suppression as a precondition for the revival of the state.\textsuperscript{40} Hoping
Christianity would implode under the pressure of ‘a regime of free competition
between Christianity and paganism’, Browning maintained that Julian’s eventual
hardening after the debacle at Daphne did not constitute evidence of active
persecution.\textsuperscript{41}

Also in 1976, Diana Bowder finished her D.Phil. thesis at Oxford, entitled
\textit{Paganism and pagan revival: Constantius II to Julian}. In it she traces the events of
the struggle between Christianity and paganism, though without much of an
overarching explanation behind the pattern of Julian’s responses beyond an
unreflective paganism. Portions of this work appear in different form in her 1978
volume, \textit{The Age of Constantine and Julian}.

In 1978, Harvard professor Glen Bowersock authored \textit{Julian the Apostate}, in
which he advanced a number of idiosyncratic arguments, such as the attempt to
invalidated Ammianus Marcellinus as a primary source for Julian’s life, described by
R.S.O. Tomlin as treating Ammianus as ‘worthless where he is not Eunapian’.\textsuperscript{42}
Bowersock suggests repeatedly that Julian was ‘irrational’, and perceives that
‘Julian’s unsettling laughter can be heard throughout the \textit{Misopogon’}.\textsuperscript{43}
Nevertheless, his hermeneutic of suspicion does bear some fruit. In contrast to
Browning, Bowersock holds that Julian conspired with Oribasius and several others

\textsuperscript{40} Browning (1975), 166.
\textsuperscript{41} Browning (1975), 167-8, 183.
\textsuperscript{42} Bowersock (1978), 6-8; Tomlin (1980), 269.
\textsuperscript{43} Bowersock (1978), 13, 18. Bowersock’s unremittingly negative stance prompted Polymnia
Athanassiadi to compare him with Ephrem the Syrian in the new 1992 introduction to her reissued
\textit{Julian and Hellenism}. 
to engineer the acclamation in Paris.\textsuperscript{44} Bowersock, however, extends this duplicity to Constantius II’s deathbed recognition of Julian, suggesting that another manipulative story had been circulated.\textsuperscript{45} Bowersock holds that Julian the ‘Puritanical pagan’ intended from the outset to ‘wipe out the Christians’ and authoritatively establish Hellenism.\textsuperscript{46} Following his edict against Christian teachers, Bowersock’s Julian was ‘indisputably a persecutor’.\textsuperscript{47} Bowersock agrees with Wright that Julian was a monotheistic Neoplatonist, whose religious thought was best described in Sallustius’ \textit{On the Gods and the World}.\textsuperscript{48}

While Timothy Barnes’ 1998 work on Ammianus is not focused on Julian, he makes time for several key asides. Barnes agrees with Wright’s view of Julian as a pagan monotheist, a ‘neopagan rather than a restorer of authentic traditional religion’.\textsuperscript{49} Relating to the degree of theurgy in Julian’s religion, Barnes writes that Ammianus’ reaction to Julian as \textit{superstitio} demonstrates that he ‘so disapproved of Julian’s blend of paganism that he ridiculed the emperor’s religion’.\textsuperscript{50} Barnes highlights the importance of Julian’s Jewish Temple restoration effort, declaring it, ‘obviously central to any interpretation of his personality, his reign, or his religious policies as a whole’.\textsuperscript{51}

1998 also saw the publication of the thirteenth volume of the new \textit{Cambridge Ancient History}, covering the years A.D. 337-425. The first two chapters, on Constantius II and his brothers, and on Julian, are by David Hunt, author of several

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\end{thebibliography}
articles on Constantine and Julian.\textsuperscript{52} Hunt notes Julian’s crafting of Constantine as a ‘hate-figure who had overturned the traditions of the past’.\textsuperscript{53} Related to this theme, he writes that Julian’s actions at court were related to the ‘broader aim of undoing the malevolent work of Constantine, and returning the Roman empire to what, in Julian’s perception, was its purest condition’.\textsuperscript{54}

The popular narrative of Julian as a historical figure is a divided one, based on the portraits drawn by Bidez and Bowersock. Bidez viewed Julian as a reluctant persecutor whose relationship with the Christian church declined in reaction to setbacks. Bowersock viewed Julian very negatively, and highlighted Julian’s duplicity in his rise to power and consistent aggression towards Christianity.

\textit{Julian’s thought}

English speakers will be most familiar with Wilmer Wright, the long-time professor of Greek at Bryn Mawr, as the author of the three-volume Loeb edition and translation of Julian’s works. However, her contribution to Julianic studies began in 1896 with her doctoral thesis at the University of Chicago, in which she explored Julian’s religious thought in much more depth.\textsuperscript{55} This work, later published as \emph{The Emperor Julian’s Relation to the New Sophistic and Neo-Platonism}, was further supported by her 1922 edition of Eunapius’ \emph{Lives of the Sophists}, and from 1913 to 1923 the three-volume \emph{Works} of Julian. From his youth, Julian had been immersed in Homeric Epic and the associated polytheism, but in this view of Julian, Neoplatonic philosophy was central. Wright states that despite

\textsuperscript{52} Hunt (1985b); (1997); cf. also Hunt (2012).
\textsuperscript{53} Hunt (1998), 64.
\textsuperscript{54} Hunt (1998), 64.
\textsuperscript{55} Published under her maiden name of Emily Wilmer Cave France, but for convenience listed in my bibliography as: Wright (1896).
Julian’s many references to the gods in his writings, he ‘recognized that for philosophers and men of letters the old simple faith in the gods of Homer could never take the place of the monotheism that philosophy had been teaching for centuries’.  

Wright identified Julian’s Neoplatonic framework, complete with the typical triadic reality of the Neoplatonists. This is the most frequent position among modern scholars, and is supported by Wright, Bidez, Ricciotti, Wallis, Browning, Bowersock, Malley, and Barnes. Although Wright acknowledges Julian’s use of the ‘language of the Mysteries’, she minimises the influence of Iamblichean theurgy, manifestations, and mystery religion, holding that such allusions were common at the time.

Polymnia Athanassiadi introduced an idiosyncratic view of Julian as a Mithraic pagan monotheist in her 1976 Oxford D. Phil. thesis, published in 1981 as Julian and Hellenism: An Intellectual Biography, and later reissued with a new introduction in 1992 as Julian: An Intellectual Biography. She also later touched on this topic in 1999 with the edited collection Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity. Athanassiadi highlights Julian’s relentless logic - for him Hellenic culture must have been a unity: Hellenic religion, language, and literature all contained within an all-encompassing παιδε/unity. Julian’s statements regarding Helios, Asclepius, and his personal relation to the divine marked him as sui generis, a man believing in an emerging monotheistic system, and believing he had been chosen as its representative and earthly savior. She holds that in Julian’s thought, ‘his primary

56 Wright (1896), 46.
57 Wright (1896), 52.
58 Bidez (1930); Cochrane (1940), 278; Ricciotti (1960); Wallis (1972); Browning (1975), 44; Bowersock (1978), 86; Malley (1978); Barnes (1998), 156-57.
59 Wright (1896), 49-51.
60 Athanassiadi (1981), 1-4.
duty in life was to restore a collapsing *oikumene*'. ⁶¹ As to the manner in which he did so, Athanassiadi writes, ‘What his uncle had done with Christianity, Julian dreamed of repeating with Mithraism’. ⁶² However, like Browning, she viewed Julian’s intentions more charitably, writing that he was a passive participant in his acclamation, and initially planned to ‘inaugurate a reign in which gifted men of whatever creed would be honored and respected’. ⁶³ She was heavily criticised for her extremely positive portrayal of Julian (‘the envy of Libanius’), particularly the level of his commitment to Mithraism,⁶⁴ and in the 1992 re-issue of the 1981 work with a new introduction, reflected that she had over- emphasised Julian’s Mithraism. In any case, as with most other authors, Athanassiadi holds that Julian’s restructuring efforts originated proactively from his Hellenic religion. ⁶⁵ One area which Athanassiadi shares with her rival Bowersock is that of Julian’s instability, writing that Julian’s response in the *Misopogon* is like that of a ‘wronged child’, and that his bitter realization there of his failure as a statesman led to difficulty maintaining contact with reality and his desire to emulate Alexander’s conquest of the east. ⁶⁶

In 1992, Jean Bouffartigue provided a valuable foundation for all future research with his *L’Empereur Julien et la culture de son temps*. In this very specialised monograph, he discusses the contemporary culture and carefully traces Julian’s use of other authors. It is a sure-footed resource on Julian’s mental library, as it were.
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⁶³ Athanassiadi (1981), 73, 120
⁶⁴ Bowersock (1983), 83; cf. 81: ‘With all that she says about theurgy and Neoplatonism it is apparent that she has not looked at R. T. Wallis, *Neoplatonism* (1972), or, for antecedents, John Dillon, *The Middle Platonists* (1977)’.
Bouffartigue also directed the recent thesis of Pascal Célérier, discussed under the next subheading.

Ironically, polytheism, the oldest form of Hellenic religion, is considered revisionist when applied as a framework to Julian. Rowland Smith became the main advocate of Julian as a polytheist with his 1995 work, *Julian’s Gods: Religion and Philosophy in the Thought and Action of Julian the Apostate*, originally his D. Phil. thesis at Oxford. In what he refers to as a ‘revisionist case’, he holds that Julian’s references to the gods he worshipped should be considered as primary.67 While Smith concedes that Julian had an interest in Iamblichan Neoplatonism, and that his thought contained a ‘monotheist or at least henotheist strand’, he argues for reading Julian’s statements about the many gods at face value.68 Smith builds his argument on the evidence for Julian’s interest in sacrifice and worship. He insists, ‘In my view his writings and actions disclose a mentality that remains in important respects an irreducibly polytheist mentality’.69 Smith also holds that Julian’s religion/philosophy was central in motivating his actions as well: ‘Julian’s intolerance of Christianity stemmed from a sense of outrage at those who denied the existence of the many gods and did their best to obliterate the worship of them’.70 He ties this to Julian’s attempt to restore the Jewish Temple at Jerusalem, which he describes as a counter to Constantine’s construction of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.71 Despite this view of Julian’s campaign as a proactive venture stemming from his polytheism, Smith does note that Julian’s ‘hatred of Constantius’ must be kept in mind in order
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67 Smith (1995), xv, 113, 201-2, 222; cf. Tougher (2007), 59: ‘His primary desire was devotion to the old gods’.
to understand him: ‘The Christianity he set himself against was not an abstraction. It was intimately linked in his mind to members of his own family’. ⁷² Ironically, Smith believes that the failure of paganism is tied to Julian’s revival: ‘his universalized theory of paganism at last presented the Christians with just the thing they had lacked till then - an all-embracing version of paganism on which they could focus their attack’. ⁷³

Three recent collections of essays deserve mention as well. The 2008 collection edited by Christian Schäfer, *Kaiser Julian Apostata und die Philosophische Reaktion Gegen das Christentum*, brings together experts focused on Julian’s philosophy, a standout among which is Nesselrath’s study of Julian’s myth in his *Or. VII*. In 2009, *Antiquité Tardive* released a special issue entitled *L’Empereur Julien et son Temps*, containing contributions from many continental specialists on Julian. In 2012, Nicholas Baker-Brian and Shaun Tougher edited a volume entitled *Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate*, even more valuable due to its wider focus.

While Athanassiadi’s monograph had idiosyncrasies which were heavily challenged, it is overall still the most influential work on Julian’s thought. Although within its narrow focus Bouffartigue would likely be the first resource utilised by scholars, Athanassiadi’s work has has much greater circulation and impact.

*Reaction and revenge*

Cambridge scholar T. R. Glover touched upon the saviour motif in his work *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century* (1901). In a description of Julian among the

---

numerous figures of the fourth century, he painted a picture of an emperor who held a very definite sense of mission for his life, writing of Julian’s casting himself as a savior figure: ‘He might indeed be himself the chosen messenger of heaven, for it was a Neo-Platonic doctrine that the gods stoop to give mankind a saviour and a regenerator whenever the divine impulse in the world is in danger of being exhausted. It might be that his name would be thus added to those of Dionysus and Herakles’.74

In a series of four articles in the 1927 and 1928 editions of *Revue belge de philologie et d’histoire*, the Belgian scholar W. Koch provided a close study of Julian’s ‘pagan church’. While he eludes many modern bibliographies, his work should be considered foundational. His conclusion that Julian’s restoration and revival of paganism was ‘une simple imitation de la tradition chrétienne’ has not been unseated in more than eight decades.75

The murders of Julian’s family members suggest revenge and retribution as a topic for his thought, as the deaths of his Julian’s father and brothers was certainly traumatic for him, as were the deaths of more distant relatives and later, his half-brother Gallus. University of Toronto professor Charles Cochrane addressed the outworking of some of these issues. In his 1940 treatment of the collision between Paganism and the Christian religion, *Christianity and Classical Culture: A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine*, Cochrane picked up this thread of revenge and personal mission. Although Julian was only one component in Cochrane’s argument, he perceptively noted two things. First, that because of his
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74 Glover (1901), 58. Glover cites Synesius, *de Providentia*. I.10, 11 as support, although Synesius was born a decade after Julian’s death.

75 Koch (1928a), 81.
sufferings under Constantius, Julian hated his cousin and blamed his uncle for the troubles of the empire, in other words casting Julian’s campaign against Christianity as reaction, rather than action.  

76 Second, in his interest in religious reform, ‘Julian curiously resembled his uncle; and if the cause to which he devoted himself was the reversal of the latter’s work, he nevertheless displayed the same zeal as an imperial missionary’.  

77 That mission coalesced into an identity as the ‘restorer of Romanitas’ and the cleanser of his household from pollution.  

78 Once Julian came into his own, Cochrane believed that he engaged in a concerted campaign. Writing of Julian’s campaign overall, Cochrane compares Julian to Constantine. He noted: ‘Indeed, it might almost be said that the policy of Julian was modeled upon that of his predecessor, whose actions he endeavored, in a spirit of slavish imitation, to reverse’.  

79 Specifically, Cochrane described the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple as ‘a counterblast to Constantine’s erection of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and conceived in precisely the same spirit’.  

80 Completing the work of Bidez, two remaining volumes in the Budé edition of Julian’s works appeared in 1963 and 1964, edited by Christian Lacombrade and Gabriel Rochefort. Their introduction and commentary is helpful and sensible, but hardly detailed. Their most significant contributions relative to this thesis lay in the notes to Or. VII and XI, in which they noted Julian’s making of Christ-figures from both Heracles and Asclepius.  

81 These recasting of gods in a Christ-like fashion

76 Cochrane (1940), 263; cf. Vogt (1963), 52: Julian, ‘shaken by the horrors through which he had lived, turned back from Christianity to the old gods’.  

77 Cochrane (1940), 263.  

78 Cochrane (1940), 263.  

79 Cochrane (1940), 281.  

80 Cochrane (1940), 281.  

81 Rochefort (1963), 63; Lacombrade (1964), 131 n. 3; cf. Wright (1913), 111 n. 4; Simon (1973), 398; Athanassiadi (1981), 133, 197; Barnes (1998), 147-8; Nesselrath (2008), 213-4.
have been briefly noted by a number of modern scholars from Wright onwards, but Lacombrade’s and Rochefort’s commentary is the most useful. Rochefort also highlighted the link Julian drew between himself and Heracles, both the son of Zeus-Helios.\(^\text{83}\)

R. Joseph Hoffmann’s 2004 work is primarily a loose translation of *Against the Galileans*, but he makes two very cogent observations. First, that Julian’s reaction against Christianity took precedence over his campaign for paganism, in other words a reactive campaign, not a proactive one: ‘Julian’s agenda to restore the ancestral religion of his pagan predecessors was formulated specifically to underscore his rejection of Christian doctrine and practice’.\(^\text{84}\) Second, he emphasises the role of Julian’s ‘pagan church’ designed to co-opt Christianity and its charitable functions.\(^\text{85}\)

There are also three unpublished doctoral theses which explored this theme, though they have had less impact. In 1964, Conrad Myers Rothrauff wrote his Ph.D. thesis at the University of Cincinnati, entitled, *The Philanthropia of the Emperor Julian*. While it is a throughly adulatory work, investigating Julian ‘to look for and bring to light the devotion to principle which underlies the actions of all great men’, it is a useful resource for Julian’s philanthropic activities in his restructured paganism.\(^\text{86}\) Scott Bradbury’s 1986 Ph.D. thesis at the University of California, Berkeley, *Innovation and Reaction in the Age of Constantine and Julian*, provides a look at the rhetoric of both sides in the war of cultures. He emphasises Julian’s place among the other critics of Christianity at that time, and notes that studies of Julian’s
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\(^{82}\) Lacombrade (1964), 131; cf. Wright (1913), 419 n. 1; (1923), 315; McKenzie (1958), 156; Athanassiadi (1981), 167; Bouffartigue (1995), 649; Dillon (1999), 113-4.

\(^{83}\) Rochefort (1963), 76; cf. Wright (1913), 137; Athanassiadi (1981), 172; Smith (1995), 185; Guido (2000), 153

\(^{84}\) Hoffmann (2004), 49.

\(^{85}\) Hoffmann (2004), 32.

\(^{86}\) Rothrauff (1964), vi, 102.
policies must be viewed in light of the ‘alleged “innovations” of the House of Constantine’. The required refounding of the empire is compared by Bradbury to that of Romulus.

In 2010, Pascal Célérier contributed a doctoral thesis at the University of Paris entitled *La présence et l’utilisation des écrits de l’Empereur Julien chez les auteurs païens et chrétiens du IVe au VIe siècle*. In it, he argues that both pagan and Christian authors made significant use of Julian’s works over the next two centuries. He highlights how pagan writers including Libanius and Ammianus continued Julian’s attacks on Christianity, and maintained his devotion to Helios.

The focus of modern scholarship on Julian’s response to the Constantinian dynasty has lessened significantly. This is not to suggest that the matter has been ignored by scholars, as future chapters will include citations related to this area, but the trend has been towards other areas of Julian’s thought and action. As the issue of what I term dynastic response has not been invalidated by the efforts of scholars, this is an area of unrecognised opportunity.

*Consensus and room for maneuver*

The majority of modern scholars view Julian’s campaign against Christianity as something proactive stemming from his philosophical and religious commitment to paganism. In my view, this is an error, an easy one to commit, albeit having profound implications, and one which a close examination of the text of *Or. VII* corrects. Although the reactivity of Julian’s campaign could be emphasised more, many scholars do recognise that Julian’s response to Christianity is tied up in his

87 Bradbury (1986), 4.
visceral reaction to his cousin and uncle, whom he blamed for the murders of his family and the woes of the empire in general.

The majority of Julian scholars agree that the emperor was a typical Neoplatonic monotheist, although Polymnia Athanassiadi and Rowland Smith are notable exceptions. This is borne out by experts on Neoplatonism whose research touches upon Julian, such as John Dillon and Andrew Smith. 89 This incidental similarity to Christianity was exploited by Julian, who crafted several ‘Christ parallels’ which will be addressed in chapters four and five of my thesis. Modern scholars have tended to emphasise Julian’s Hellenic religion and philosophy in their assessment of his thought and action, and have viewed his dramatic reversal of Imperial policy regarding religion through the lens of his new Hellenic religion and philosophy. In essence, they cast Julian as a proactive figure who proceeded from his new Hellenic commitment to engage Christianity, which he found lacking in comparison. This de-emphasizes the elements in his policies reacting against Christianity. Attempting to classify Julian’s thought using religious and philosophical categories creates inconsistencies which prove difficult to resolve. As an example of this issue in Julianic research, Wright assessed Julian’s treatment of two Greek gods and concluded, ‘It is easy enough to find such inconsistencies in Julian’s religious professions’. 90 With different scholars defending one of three categories (Neoplatonic monotheism, Mithraism, and polytheism) as holding claim to Julian’s primary religious commitment, it appears both that Julian was not entirely consistent in regard to philosophical and religious categories, and that those categories may not be exclusive. If the advocacy of these scholars seems forced, perhaps it is because

89 Dillon (1999), 103-15; Smith (2012), 229-37
90 Wright (1896), 51.
they are seeking consistency in the wrong place. This lack of a convincing narrative unifying the evidence suggests that there may be a gap in existing scholarship. I believe this gap can be filled by the story of Julian’s recapitulation and revenge as the consistent and dominant motivating force. Indeed, both threads of pagan thought found a methodological place in Julian’s de-Christianising campaign. The blood sacrifices associated with traditional pagan religion served to offend and undermine Christian triumphalism, while Neoplatonism assisted in the overwriting of Christian theology, as it provided a monotheistic framework allowing Julian to write of parallel Father-son relationships like those of Helios and Heracles.

My thesis develops and brings together the work of previous scholars, focusing on the theme of recapitulation. Numerous scholars have noticed Julian’s manipulation of the gods Heracles and Asclepius into Christ-figures, although usually in brief. 91 I will expand on this and show the extent to which Julian borrowed from Christian theology for these parallels, something which has been insufficiently appreciated. Julian’s efforts to restore the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem are widely understood to be a response to Constantine. This is a consensus I will attempt to build upon and expand to Julian’s wider building program in chapters seven through ten. In a related matter, modern scholars concur as to Julian’s efforts to co-opt the church by patterning his re-invigorated paganism after it. In short, my thesis will argue that the theme tying together these items is that of recapitulation: Julian’s desire to undo Constantine’s Christianisation using the Christian rhetoric of

a divinely chosen representative who would revisit and overwrite the wrongs of the past, restoring the divine intent.

5. SYNOPSIS

In the first chapter, I show how Julian’s pattern of recapitulation finds a foundation in a specifically recapitulatory myth embedded in his Or. VII, written at the moment when his plans for a restoration crystallised. In the Or. VII myth, he used concepts of Christian recapitulation theology, as laid out fully by Irenaeus of Lyons in the second century, and which flowed into Christian thought generally by the fourth century. This theme required an analogy or similitudo between the first failed representative and the second righteous representative. It also required the recapitulatio of the failed representative’s actions by righteous deeds of the new representative. Only then could the restitutio of the realm for the representative’s people be achieved. Within this myth, Julian associated himself with Christ, the original recapitulator, by revisiting his temptation in the gospels and choosing differently.

In chapter two, I demonstrate how Julian’s portrait of Constantine changed from the period where he was Constantius II’s Caesar to the period of his own freedom. One would expect that the pagan Julian’s opinion of the Christian Constantine would move from positive to negative. However, Julian revisited the same topics and overwrote the things he had been forced by circumstances to write previously. These topics touch on the theme of recapitulation, showing how Constantine, previously the deliverer of his people, was recast as their forsaker.
Chapter three begins a section entitled *Similitudo* on Julian’s use of Christian theology to create a similarity to Constantine for his overwriting purposes. I argue here that Julian is distinguished from other anti-Christian polemicists, by his combination of two streams of thought. He both attacks overtly, as did Celsus and Porphyry, and covertly attempts to supplant, as did Hierocles and Iamblichus. In this chapter, I demonstrate the source material Julian borrowed from Christian texts. In chapter four, I argue that Julian restructured Heracles into a parallel to Christ, making him the son of the high god Zeus-Helios and the virgin goddess Athena, a water-walking saviour. Julian then paralleled himself to Heracles, the son of Zeus-Helios and Athena, who would commit the recapitulatory acts necessary to restore the domain of which he was steward. In chapter five, I argue that Julian shortly thereafter repeated this theme, crafting Asclepius the healer god into the pre-existent son of Helios, a saviour of sinful souls. Julian’s contemporaries then responded, writing of him in Asclepian fashion as the healer of the empire, the son of Helios, who would return to his father’s heavenly realm when his earthly task was finished. In chapter six I attempt to focus on the theme of Julian the co-opter of Christian religion, as some scholars have insisted that Julian was trying to copy Christianity and create a ‘pagan Trinity’. I urge caution here, as in most of the texts which I examine closely, Julian is clearly just reflecting the triadic Neoplatonism of his day. This returns our focus to the binitarian approach in which Julian is subverting only the father-son saviour relationship from Christianity, which ties directly to the recapitulation of Constantine central to his pagan revival. In this section of four chapters, one of the contributions I offer is a fairly thorough reading of Julian’s myth embedded in *Or*. VII, scattered among the chapters.
Chapter seven begins a new section on *Recapitulatio*, the actual overwriting of the failed representative’s works. In the first chapter of this section, I discuss the recapitulation of physical space in general, leaving aside occurrences in Constantinople, Jerusalem, and Antioch, which I will treat separately. I argue that Julian revisited a pattern of behaviour found in Constantine: as Constantine desecrated temples and built churches, Julian did the same in reverse. Chapter eight explores the same phenomenon in Constantine’s New Rome. Constantine’s cross in the palace was replaced by Julian’s pagan chapel. I argue that as Constantine claimed his new city for his new religion, Julian reclaimed it for paganism. In chapter nine, I argue for Julian’s attempted rebuilding of the Jewish Temple as a recapitulation of Constantine’s Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which had been portrayed by Eusebius as creating a new Christian Jerusalem over and against the old. In chapter ten, I argue that the series of events in Antioch are best understood through the lens of recapitulation. I argue that Julian’s response to Gallus or Constantius II’s placement of St. Babylas’s remains at Daphne by removing Babylas’ body alone is an example of this kind of recapitulatory overwriting. Chapter eleven investigates Julian’s co-opting of Christian ecclesiology in the creation of his ‘pagan church’. I argue that this was a deliberate response to Constantine’s promotion of the Christian church. This chapter ties together the elements of *similitudo* and *recapitulatio*, overwriting the Christian church by the person cast as the mimetic saviour of the realm.

The significance of what I am about to present is more than an introduction of a novel concept into the scholarly discussion regarding Julian. This thesis offers a new understanding of the reign of the Emperor Julian, using the Christian theological
concept of recapitulation as a heuristic tool. As a framework for Julian’s thought and action, recapitulation can unite the disparate elements of Julian’s thought into a cohesive whole, and can offer plausible explanations for some actions which have been derided or misunderstood in the past. Looking at Julian’s actions in light of this concept of recapitulation highlights his familiarity with and subtle co-opting of Christian theological concepts.
1. INTRODUCTION

The detailed examination of Julian’s autobiographical myth within Or. VII in this chapter requires that I briefly revisit Julian’s early history. Julian’s narrative of Constantine’s reign in mythic form was a tale of greed and apostasy from the gods, which would bring dire consequences (VII.228d). On the death of Constantine, his three sons whom he had neglected to raise properly murdered the rest of the dynasty (VII.228b). Julian and his half-brother Gallus were removed to the estate of Macellum, from which Julian fled when he learned of the true nature of his family’s deaths (VII.230b). In the desert, he was met by Hermes, disguised as a young man, who led him to a mountain where he was given a mission by Helios and Athena (VII.230c). Julian was chosen to replace Constantius II as the steward of the empire (VII.232c), and to restore traditional pagan cult. On the surface, this narrative appears to be merely a personal narrative of Julian’s rise to the throne enlivened by some divine intervention. However, when examined in more detail, it suggests that Julian framed his counter-revolution against his uncle Constantine in Christian terminology. In regards to Julian’s religious revival, Wallis agrees, summarizing Julian’s reign as an ‘attempt to reverse the process begun by Constantine and re-establish the ancient pagan religion in the form of a church with Iamblichean Neoplatonism as its theological creed’.92 This characterization might be summed up

92 Wallis (1972), 96; cf. Cochrane, (1940), 281; Glover (1901), 58.
using the rather broad modern definition of the word, ‘recapitulate’. I suggest that, in addition, we consider Julian’s religious revival as an example of the late antique theological concept of recapitulatio, or in Greek ἀνακεφαλαίωσις. As part of this consideration, we will first examine the divine missions claimed by both Constantine and Julian. In section three, I will discuss Julian’s response to Constantine. In section four, I explain Irenaeus’ framework of recapitulation, including the component parts of similitudo, iteratio, and restitutio. Sections five, six, and seven demonstrate Julian’s adoption of these concepts in his writings and actions, all of which will be referred back to in greater detail and set in context in the remainder of the thesis.

2. ACTION AND REACTION: DIVINE MISSIONS

Julian’s effort at recapitulation concerned Constantine, who earlier in the fourth century had revealed his belief that he was called to a divine mission: converting the empire to Christianity.  

As Moses had his burning bush, Constantine had his vision of the cross, described for us by Eusebius. After he ‘considered what kind of god he should adopt to aid him’ (Eus., Vit. Const. I.27.2-3; Ex. 3.13), Constantine decided to call upon his father’s god, though like Moses, he did not know his name (Eus., Vit. Const. I.28.1-2):

This God he began to invoke in prayer, beseeching and imploring him to show him who he was, and to stretch out his right hand to assist him in his plans. As

---

93 Drake (2000), 282 and Digezer (2000), 121-3 suggest that this was the beginning of Constantine’s effort to create a tolerant syncretistic monotheism, or ‘concord’.
he made these prayers and earnest supplications there appeared to the Emperor
a most remarkable divine sign… About the time of the midday sun, when day
was just turning, he said he saw with his own eyes, up in the sky and resting
over the sun, a cross-shaped trophy formed from light, and a text attached to it
which said, ‘By this conquer’.

Constantine’s vision, also mentioned by the Gallic orator (Pan. Lat. VI
[VII].21.3-7) and Lactantius (De mort. XLIV.5), was explained to him by some
bishops as a call by the Christian God to follow their God and wage war against the
former oppressors of Christianity (Eus., Vit. Const. I.32.3). While my purpose is not
to examine at length the historicity of Constantine’s vision, I follow Weiss’ theory
of a ‘solar halo’ seen by Constantine in 310 and explained to him as containing
Christian meaning in 312. Eusebius related that in a dream Constantine was
instructed by Christ to construct a standard based on the sign to bear before his
armies as protection from his enemies, the labarum, a chi-rho symbol mounted on a
pole, paralleling the divinely altered rod of Moses (Eus., Vit. Const. I.29, 31.3.).

Constantine had described in public letters a framework in which God punished
and rewarded rulers and nations. He argued that it was idolatry that led to the
destruction of Memphis and Babylon, and tied this to persecuting emperors being
punished by God, who rewarded those who worship him (Speech, 11-26). Much of
our knowledge of Constantine comes from his letters quoted by Bishop Eusebius of

94 Weiss (2003), 237-59; cf. Barnes (2011), 74-80. This is the only explanation that does not require
two visions two years apart as in Drake (2000), 187-91; Odahl (2013), 323; or jettisoning one set of
primary sources for the other, as in Grégoire (1930-31), 252-8; Lietzmann (1937), 266; Potter (2012),
156-7, who describes Eusebius’ account as a confused conflation.
95 For labarum coinage, see RIC VII Constantinople no. 19.
Caesarea in his *Vita Constantini*, in which Constantine portrayed himself as a mimetic ruler, mirroring God’s rule on earth. Eusebius worked on his *Vita Constantini* until his death in 339, leaving the work to be published posthumously.

In the work, Eusebius began his comparison by pointing out the special relationship that existed between Constantine and his God, ‘when Constantine, alone among all those who have ruled the Roman Empire, became a friend of the all-sovereign God, and was established as a clear example to all mankind of the life of godliness’ (*Vit. Const.* I.3.4). Eusebius repeated this language of relation to God throughout his works with slight variations, describing the emperor as ‘the friend of God’, ‘most dear to God’, ‘the emperor whom He loved’, and the ‘all-wise and God-beloved ruler’. In his *Letter to the provincials of Palestine* in autumn 324, Constantine claimed that God in his providence, to fulfil ‘his own purposes’, had raised him up to deliver ‘humanity and the state’ from ‘pestilential disease’ (*Vit. Const.* II.28.1). God’s purpose in this was that ‘the human race, taught by my obedient service, might restore the religion of the most dread Law’ (*Vit. Const.* II.28.2). He wrote of his mission as not a matter of preference, but divine calling, describing it as, ‘the best of tasks . . . a gift bestowed on me’ (*Vit. Const.* II.29.1). These statements regarding the ruler were all part of his manifesto liberating and restoring Christians under his rule. Churches had authority to repossess their property, and the emperor

---

97 Constantine’s letters have also been verified by A.H.M. Jones’ identification of an independent copy on papyrus (*P. Lond. 878*), Jones and Skeat (1954), 196-200.

98 Quite possibly edited by Acacius, the following bishop of Caesarea, as Eusebius died 30 May 339: Barnes (1981), 279; Barnes (2011), 10. While it contains much useful historical information, it is not properly a biography, but contains elements of encomium, panegyric, apologetic, and narrative history: Cameron and Hall (1999), 1.


100 This was in essence an edict, a ‘public statement of imperial policy’. Barnes (1981), 209; cf. Millar (1977), 222, 319.
would make good what was needed. In his *Letter to the provincials of the East*, written in 324-5, Constantine clarified his position and condemned polytheism, allowing that pagans could keep their temples, but not resume blood sacrifice, banned in a previous law. Constantine called upon God to offer ‘healing through me’ to his people in the East, and claimed he was guided by God to undertake ‘deeds of salvation’ (*Vit. Const.* II.55.1). He described his task as restoring God’s ‘most holy house’ (*Vit. Const.* II.55.2):

Σὲ νῦν τὸν μέγιστον θεόν παρακαλῶ· εἶης πρᾶός τε καὶ εὐμενής τοῖς σοῖς ἀνατολικοῖς, εἰής πάσι τοῖς σοῖς ἔπαρχιώτας ὑπὸ χρονίου συμφορᾶς συντριβῆσα, δι’ ἑμοῦ τοῦ σοῦ θεράποντος ὀρέγων ἰασίν. καὶ ταῦτά γε αἰτῶ οὐκ ἀπεικότως. ὁ δέσποτα τῶν ὅλων, ἄγιε θεέ· ταῖς σαῖς γὰρ ύψηλης εὐφήμισιν ἑνεστησάμην σωτηριώδῃ πράγματα καὶ δώμυσα, τὴν σὴν σφραγίδα πανταχοῦ προβαλλόμενος καλλινίκου ἑγησάμην στρατοῦ· κἂν ποῦ τής τῶν δημοσίων καλὴ χρεία, τοῖς αὐτοῖς τῆς σής ἀρετῆς ἐπόμενος συνθήμασιν ἐπί τοὺς πολεμίους πρόειμι. διὰ ταῦτα τοῦ ἀνέθηκά σοι τὴν ἐμαυτὸν ψυχὴν ἔρωτι καὶ φόβῳ καθαρῶς ἀνακραθέσαι· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὄνομά σου γνησίως ἁγιᾶτο, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν εὐλαβεῖν, ἢν πολλοῖς τεκμηρίοις ἔδειξας καὶ τὴν ἐμὴν πίστιν βεβαιοτέραν εἰργάσω. ἐπείγομαι γοῦν καὶ τοὺς ὅμοις αὐτός ὑποσχόν τοὺς ἐμοὺς τὸν ἀγιώτατὸν σου οἶκον ἀνανεώσασθαι, ὅν οἱ μυσαροὶ ἐκεῖνοι καὶ ἀσεβέστατοι τῷ ἀτοπήματι τῆς καθαρέσεως ἔλυμηντο.

101 Barnes (2011), 110. Although it may be justified to question its efficacy, the existence of Constantine’s ban on sacrifice has been unjustifiably doubted in modern literature articulating a theory of a more ‘tolerant’ Constantine, e.g. Drake (1982), 465; Turcan (2006), 223-4.

102 The text of *Vit. Const.* is Winkelmann (1975), and the translation is my modification of Cameron and Hall (1999).
Now I call upon you, the supreme God. Be merciful and gracious to your Orientals, and to all your provincials who have been crushed by protracted calamity, and proffer healing through me your servant. This petition is not unreasonable, Master of the Universe, Holy God. For by your guidance I have undertaken deeds of salvation and achieved them; making your seal my protection everywhere, I have led a conquering army. Whatever the public need may anywhere require, following the same tokens of your merit I advance against the enemy. Because of this I have consecrated to you my own soul, purely blended with love and fear; for I genuinely love your name, and dread your power, which you have revealed by many tokens, confirming the strength of my faith. I strive therefore, putting my own shoulders to the task, to restore your most holy house, which those polluted and most unholy men have mutilated with wicked destruction.

While Julian does not directly cite Eusebius’ *Vita Constantini* and may not have had a copy, much of the laws and narrative of Constantine’s reign were well-publicised. Constantine abused the pagan heritage by desecrating, plundering, and occasionally demolishing pagan temples. In several cases, he added insult to injury by building a Christian church on or adjacent to the sites. Constantine also appropriated the pagan past by such things as retention of the traditional pagan title *pontifex maximus* (Eus., *Hist. Eccl.* VIII.17.4), and application of the messianic passages in Virgil’s *Eclogues* to his own purposes (*Speech* 19-21). This combination of claims to being a quasi-saviour and having the right to co-opt pagan tradition would have been intolerable to Julian.
The difference between people’s rhetoric and actions is sometimes quite significant, and there are other possible interpretations of Constantine and the policies he actually pursued. Constantine has been portrayed as a committed Christian, as a syncretistic monotheist, and as an irreligious cynic. But it is clear that whatever Constantine’s own self-understanding, this public portrait of Constantine as firmly committed to Christianising policies is the one to which that Julian was responding.

3. JULIAN AND THE MEMORY OF CONSTANTINE

Julian needed to do something about Constantine’s memory and narrative of Christianisation, and it might have seemed just to enact what is referred to in our ancient sources as the *abolitio memoriae*, or abolishing of a person’s memory. Burgess points out that Julian’s father and family were effectively subjected to *abolitio* after their murders. As early as Domitian, the Senate had demonstrated that even emperors were not immune (Suet., *Dom. XXIII.1*):

\[
\text{scalas etiam inferri clipeosque et imagines eius coram detrahi et ibidem solo affligi iuberet, novissime eradendos ubique titulos abolendamque omnem memoriam decerneret.}
\]

---

104 Burgess (2008), 13.
105 The text of Suetonius is that of Ihm (1907), and the translation that of Rolfe (1914).
They even had ladders brought and his shields and images torn down before their eyes and dashed upon the ground; finally they passed a decree that his inscriptions should everywhere be erased, and all record of him obliterated.

This is described by Varner as, ‘a defining attribute of Roman cultural identity and romanitas’. Future Romans could be banned from using the name of a disgraced ancestor, such as Marcus Manlius (Livy VI.20.14). This process as it related to statuary was described in the later fourth century by Jerome (In Abacuc. II.3.14-16.984-88):  

\[ si \text{ quando tyrannus obtruncatur, imagines quoque eius deponuntur et statuae, et uultu tantummodo commutato, ablatoque capite, eius qui uicerit facies superponitut, ut manente corpore, capitibusque praecisis caput aliud commutetur. } \]

When a usurper is killed, his portraits and statues are also taken down. The face is exchanged or the head removed, and the likeness of him who has conquered is superimposed. Only the body remains and another head is exchanged for those that have been decapitated.

107 The text of Jerome is Adriaen (1964), and the translation is my modification of Varner (2004).
Julian saw himself as the inheritor of the pagan tradition through his grandfather Constantius I, whom he portrayed as a pagan. As the standard bearer for paganism, it would have greatly benefited Julian to somehow overwrite the history of the Constantine, his sons, and their Christianisation. Yet circumstances under which Julian became the sole Augustus made his political relationship with the previous dynasty a complex and difficult one. On his deathbed, Constantius II had recognised Julian as his heir in order to prevent civil war and protect his unborn child. Julian had played his part in the game by participating in Constantius II’s funeral procession and giving him full honours. However much Julian might have desired it, utilising *abolitio memoriae* would have stripped away those political advantages and chipped away at his own legitimacy.

In 361, while at Naissus waiting for his confrontation with Constantius II, Julian wrote a letter to the Senate of Rome, which Ammianus reported was not well received. Julian’s political attack may have been contained in that letter, another document, or presented orally. At any rate, Ammianus wrote *memoriam Constantini ... uexuit*, ‘he abused the memory of Constantine’ (Amm. XXI.10.8; cf. Lib. *Or*. XII.64). Beginning with the *Epistle to the Athenians* (*Or*. V), Julian revisited the compliments he had paid to Constantine in earlier panegyric while Caesar under Constantius II. Constantine the pious (I.7d; III.52a) became the impious apostate (VII.227c, 228b-d; X.317d-318a, 336ab), his generosity (I.8b-d) was recast as greed (X.335b), his positive legacy (I.9a) became embarrassingly ephemeral (X.328d-329a, 329cd), and the deliverer of his people (I.7d-8b; III.52a) became their forsaker.

---

108 This is in contrast to Eusebius (*Vit. Const*. I.13-18), who carefully skirted the issue, citing Constantius’ monotheism, writing of the grace he showed the church, and implying he was a Christian.

109 Den Boeft, et al. (1991), 143. Seyfarth’s text (1978) has this material in a new paragraph.
(VII.228b).¹¹⁰ To move beyond overwriting his own past words presented Julian with some challenges, however.

The situation facing Julian required more than merely the overwriting of an inscription or his own past praise, but also the overwriting of two generations worth of historical events and religious ideas and an emperor’s narrative of himself as the chosen agent of the Christian God. Julian had quite a task before him, but as Athanassiadi wrote regarding Julian, ‘the drama of human history always carries within itself the possibility of catharsis, through those men who at critical moments appear and save a culture from doom by setting it anew on its old foundations’.¹¹¹ To be one of those men and counter Constantine the chosen one and steward of God on earth, Julian’s reaction required something more than *abolitio* could provide, but which could be met by the Christian theological concept of *recapitulatio*.

4. IRENAEUS’ FRAMEWORK OF RECAPITULATION

Back in approximately A.D. 180, Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, presented a theology and a framework of salvation history called recapitulation, drawing on the Pauline Epistles and possibly borrowing from Justin’s lost work, *Syntagma*.¹¹² Although only two of Irenaeus’ works survive today, his writings exerted great influence over developing Christian theology, and were translated into Latin, Armenian, and

¹¹⁰ These portrayals are dealt with more fully in the following chapter.
¹¹¹ Athanassiadi (1981), 163, who writes that Julian’s phraseology in considering the laws of Hellenism ‘from the hearth’ in connection with his religious revival supported this.
¹¹² Steenberg (2008), 16; Houssiau (1955), 218; Wingren (1959), 80. The issue in question is whether Irenaeus’ quotation of Justin ends before or after the passage on recapitulation, which cannot be resolved without further evidence. The two complete English translations of Roberts/Rambaut (1868-9) and Keble (1872) include the recapitulation within the quotation of Justin.
Syriac. Irenaeus was widely cited, and his theology flowed into the streams of authors over the next two centuries. Clement of Alexandria (c. 150-c. 215) demonstrated the continuing currency of this theology of recapitulation, writing of Christ, ‘Fashioning himself in flesh He enacted the drama of human salvation: for he was a true champion and a fellow-champion with the creature’ (Clement, Protreptikos X.86; tr. Lawson). In addition, he was cited by both Latin authors such as Tertullian, Jerome, and Augustine, and Greek authors such as Eusebius. Eusebius, whose works were widely read, cited Irenaeus and his works twenty-three times in his Ecclesiastical History. The literary relationship between Irenaeus and Eusebius is significant, as ‘the wretched Eusebius’ was the one non-Scriptural Christian writer whom Julian quoted by name in his surviving works (C. Gal. 222a, citing Eus., Prep. Evan. 11.5.5). Bouffartigue has also demonstrated Julian’s following of Eusebius’ argument closely in his C. Gal.

Irenaeus offered a brief summation of this unifying concept in a passage on Christ (Adversus Haereses III.18.1, tr. Keble, mod.):

> When he was incarnate and made man, he recapitulated (ἀνεκεφαλαιώσατο, recapituluit) in himself the long histories of men, in one brief work achieving salvation for us; that what we had lost in Adam, i.e. our being in the image and likeness of God, that we might recover in Christ Jesus.

113 Both written in Greek, Against Heresies survives in an intact Latin translation and Greek and Armenian fragments, and Proof of the Apostolic Preaching in Armenian. Irenaeus’ other treatises and letters known to us from Eusebius’ Hist. Eccl. are not extant.
This theology involved the gathering of humanity under a representative, that representative’s overwriting of the past representative’s failure, and the divine salvation of those represented.\textsuperscript{117} Recapitulation involved the summation of the race in one representative. Irenaeus’ thought appears to draw upon the Epistle to the Ephesians for this.\textsuperscript{118} Eph. 1.10 described Christ’s οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν, ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ‘plan for the fullness of time, to recapitulate all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth’. Irenaeus’ term for this, ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, in Latin \textit{recapitulatio}, is derived from the substantive κεφάλαιον, the ‘chief point’.\textsuperscript{119} As Adam was the father of all humanity, his sin affected all humanity.\textsuperscript{120} Restoration was possible because Christ summed up humanity in himself as their representative.\textsuperscript{121} Adam’s disobedience led to the loss of God’s likeness for all, but Christ’s act of righteousness made all his people righteous. The three concepts within recapitulation which Irenaeus emphasized were \textit{similitudo}, \textit{iteratio}, and \textit{restitutio}.

\textit{Similitudo}

The first step was what Irenaeus referred to as the \textit{similitudo} or ‘analogy’ between the two representatives. This is a development of Rom. 5.14, where Paul wrote of Άδάμ, ὁς ἔστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος ‘Adam, who is a type of the one who was to come’. Irenaeus wrote that Christ, like Adam, ‘should be formed as man by God, to have an analogy (\textit{similitudinem}) with the former as respects His origin’ (\textit{Adv.}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[117] Osborne (2001), 99.
\item[118] Houssiau (1955), 217; Osborne (2001), 115.
\item[119] Liddell and Scott (1998), s.v. Κεφάλαιον: 944.
\item[120] Pittenger (1952), 33.
\item[121] Osborne (2001), 99.
\end{footnotes}
Irenaeus held that Luke’s genealogy (Lk. 3.23-38) ran back from Jesus to Adam to demonstrate that Jesus recapitulated Adam and all in between (Adv. Haer. III.22.3). Further, as Adam was created in God’s image, so too Christ was also the image of the invisible God (Adv. Haer. V.12.4; Gen. 1.27; Col. 1.15). This similitudo had to exist for the actions of the obedient ‘son of God’ (Lk. 3.22) to overwrite those of the disobedient ‘Adam, son of God’ (Lk. 3.38-4.3).

Recapitulatio

Irenaeus used the term recapitulatio both in its more technical sense referring to ‘gathering up’, and also in the sense of iteratio, ‘reiteration’. Irenaeus developed that line of thought, writing that the first Adam’s actions were reiterated by Christ, the second Adam, turning failure into success (Adv. Haer. III.18.1). This revisiting of events consisted of the representative’s precisely revisiting the key choices, but making the proper choice. While this process culminated in Christ’s sacrifice at Gethsemane, it included his entire life of perfect obedience. Irenaeus specifically noted several examples. Adam’s transgression of eating the fruit at Satan’s behest was rectified when Christ was taken to the wilderness to be tempted, and refused to eat at Satan’s behest (Adv. Haer. V.21.2; Gen. 3.1-7; Mt. 4.1-11; Lk. 4.1-13). Adam’s disobedience regarding the Tree of Life was rectified by Christ’s obedience in willingly going to the tree of the cross (Adv. Haer. V.16.3; Gen. 2.16, 3.12; Phil. 2.8). As Adam was given life on the sixth day of Creation, Christ’s obediently

---

123 Minns (2010), 110.
124 cf. Lawson (1948), 143, ‘The fundamental fact in the work of Christ is that He went through all the experiences of Adam, but with the opposite result’.
undergoing death on the sixth day of the week brought about a new Creation and a new humanity (Adv. Haer. V.23.2; Gen. 1.27; Mk. 15.42-3; Jn. 19.14, 21). Therefore, Irenaeus’ theology of recapitulation effectively extended the redemptive work of Christ to all the actions across his lifetime (Adv. Haer. III.18.7).

Restitutio

The ultimate end of recapitulation was the *restitutio* of humanity by divine intervention. Irenaeus held that the human and divine relationship, broken by Adam’s disobedience, could be restored, writing: *in amicitiam restituit nos Dominus per suam incarnationem, mediator Dei et hominum factus*, ‘the Lord restored us to friendship by His Incarnation, being made mediator of God and men’ (Adv. Haer. V.17.1, tr. Keble). Following on Paul’s statement, ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἁπαθήσκουσιν, οὕτως καὶ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζωοποιηθήσονται, ‘For as all die in Adam, so all will be made alive in Christ’ (1 Cor. 15.22), Irenaeus wrote that through Christ could come the solution for Adam’s disobedience: *Luctatus est enim, et vicit: erat enim homo pro patribus certans, et per obedientiam, inobedientiam persolvens*, ‘For He wrestled and overcame; being as He was a man contending for His fathers, and by obedience paying the debt of disobedience’ (Adv. Haer. III.18.6 tr. Keble; cf. III.18.7, 21.10). Salvation history corresponds to the history that went before, with the negative actions of Adam overwritten by the positive actions of Christ. This leads to a ‘consummation of all things in which every element of the end is linked to its corresponding component at the beginning through the work of Christ’.

---

125 Steenberg (2008), 86.
127 Nielsen (1968), 59-60.
128 Dunning (2009), 59.
failure and disobedience was revisited and the story of Christ’s perfect obedience was written over it, with this recapitulation restoring the image of God in the new redeemed humanity that had been gathered into Christ (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, III.18.1, 7; 22.4; IV.34.1; V.14.2, 21.2; *AP* 34).

I have presented the text of Irenaeus as the clearest and most thorough proponent of recapitulation. While Irenaeus and other writers have been identified as espousing elements of this recapitulation theology in their writings, I am not necessarily arguing that Julian must have copied from one of their texts, as the concept had contemporary currency. As J.N.D. Kelly wrote,

> Running through almost all the patristic attempts to explain the redemption there is one grand theme which, we suggest, provides the clue to the fathers’ understanding of the work of Christ. This is none other than the ancient idea of recapitulation which Irenaeus derived from St. Paul, and which envisages Christ as the representative of the entire race . . . All the fathers, of whatever school, reproduce this motif.¹²⁹

Recapitulation is first of all a useful organisational concept. It provides a framework to describe Julian’s revisiting of Constantine’s actions, particularly his Christianisation of the empire. Recapitulation was also, I believe, a useful motif among others in Julian’s rhetoric, and one he turned to consistently. While Julian did portray himself as the representative divinely chosen to restore his beloved Hellenism, and did in ways parallel himself, Constantine, and Christ, I am not

¹²⁹ Kelly (1968), 376-7.
claiming that he viewed himself in the theological and specifically soteriological Christian sense of recapitulation.

5. JULIAN’S SIMILARITY WITH CONSTANTINE

Julian’s outline of his recapitulatory plan is found in Or. VII, To the Cynic Heracleios, in which he critiqued the contemporary Cynics for diverting from their historic positions. As part of this, Julian held that all philosophies, as far as they were true, were one, and demanded that philosophical positions be tested for congruence, and self-contradictory positions dismissed (IX.184c, 186b). Despite this rigorous approach, Julian viewed the expression of truth in mythic form as appropriate, and even cited philosophers of whom he approved who had used myth (VII.215bc, 207e, 209a). Ironically, Julian allowed for allegorised interpretation of the myths of his culture, but responded to Christianity uniquely, insisting upon and ridiculing a literal treatment of its texts.130 As an example, Julian crafted his own myth, a thinly veiled version of his early life. Julian took the opportunity provided by a letter occasioned by a need to chastise an impertinent philosopher to return to one of the themes he inserted throughout many of his works, drawing some extended comparisons with Constantine and Constantius.

For Christians, Adam as the first man and ‘son of God’, representing his race, had failed and turned from God, whereas Christ the ‘new man’ and Son of God (cf. the contrast in Lk. 3.38, 4.3), was the summative representative of the race who would restore the relationship between God and the people Christ represented. In the

130 Wilken (1984), 182.
framework Julian articulated, pagans could have a similar understanding, with Julian as the representative of Hellenism much as Constantine had been the representative of Christianity. According to Julian, not only was Constantine the representative of his people, their fate was tied to his (VII.228d). Yet, as Constantine rejected the gods, they abandoned his house (VII.229a). In this passage, Zeus spoke to Helios (VII.228d-229a):

«Ὡς παῖ», εἶπεν, «οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ἀρχιωτέρον ἐν θεοῖς βλάστημα, μνησικακεῖν ἐπὶ δυνατή τῆς ὑπερψίας ἀνδρὶ αὐθαί δαι καὶ τολμηρῷ, δοὺς σε ἄπολεύσαν αὐτῷ τε καὶ γένει καὶ παισίν αἴτιος ἐγένετο τῶν τηλικούτων παθημάτων; 'Ἡ νομίδες, ὅτι μὴ χαλεπαίνεις αὐτῷ μηδή ἁγανακτεῖς μηδʼ ἐπὶ τὸ γένος αὐτοῦ τοὺς οἰστούς θήγες, ἐλαττόν εἶναι <σέ> γε αἴτιον αὐτοῦ τῆς ξυμφορᾶς, ἐρημον αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν ἀφεῖς;

‘Oh son, divine offspring131 more ancient than heaven and earth, do you still have contempt in your mind for the arrogance of that willful and audacious man, who brought such great suffering on himself and his race by deserting you? Do you think that as you do not grieve him nor show vexation nor sharpen the arrows upon his race, that you are less responsible for his misfortune, as you cast out his house desolate?

Identifying the chosen one

131 Julian’s presentation of the relationship between Zeus and Helios was typical of neoplatonism, but his language of the father/son relationship seems drawn from Christianity. Lampe (1961), 299, notes that βλάστημα or ‘offspring’ was also used of Christ in Methodius, Symposium III.4.
Julian wrote that looking down from on high, the gods identified him as their chosen one. In the myth, a rich man (manifestly Constantine) apostatized away from Helios, bringing consequences upon his people. When he died his nephew (described only as a boy but clearly Julian) ran afoul of one of the heirs, his cousin (Constantius II), who murdered his family and imprisoned him. Julian, the child of Helios, was chosen by the gods as the saviour of Hellenism (VII.229cd):

Leon δὲ ὁ Ζεὺς ἀρχεῖαι πρὸς τὸν Ἡλίον· »Τούτῳ τὸ παιδίον;» ἐφη· ἐκ γενενές δὲ ἶν αὐτῶν ἄρα παρερριμένον που καὶ ἀμελούμενον, ἀδελφόδους ἐκείνου τοῦ πλουσίου καὶ ἄνευς τῶν κληρονόμων.

And then Zeus said to Helios, ‘This is the child’. But this particular one was a blood-relation, nephew of that rich man and first cousin of the heirs, who had been cast aside by those who had no care for him.

Describing the chosen one

In Julian’s myth, the gods described their chosen one and his qualifications and nature. Julian’s recapitulation was emphasized by the fact that he cast himself not only in the role of the ‘good Neo-Flavian heir’, but also, in a further parallel to Christian theology, portrayed himself as the son of the wronged god Helios. This highlighted the two recapitulatory narratives. Adam, ‘the failed man’, fell away from God, but the wronged God sent his son Christ, ‘the second Adam’, to overwrite the actions of the fallen Adam. In the pagan narrative, Constantine, the failed heir, fell

132 These identifications are recognised by all commentators: Wright (1913), 137; Rochefort (1963), 76; Athanassiadi (1981), 172; Smith (1995), 185; Guido (2000), 153.
away from Helios, but the wronged Helios sent his son Julian, the corrective heir, to overwrite the actions of the apostate Constantine. The boy was revealed to be the son of Athena the virgin goddess and Helios, whom Julian equated with Zeus (VII.229c-230a):  

«τούτο», ἑφη, «σὸν ἕστιν ἔκγονον. Ὄμοσον οὖν τὸ ἐμὸν τε καὶ σὸν σκῆπτρον, ἢ μὴν ἐπιμελήσεσθαι διαφερόντως αὐτοῦ καὶ ποιμανεῖν αὐτὸ καὶ θεραπεύσειν τῆς νόσου. Ὅρας γὰρ ὅπως οἶον ὑπὸ καπνὸν ρύπου τε ἀναπέλπησται καὶ λιγνός, κίνδυνος τε τὸ ὑπὸ σοῦ σπαρέν ἐν αὐτῷ πῦρ ἀποσβήναι, »hwnd μὴ σῦ γε δύσει ἄλκην». Ὁι δὲ ἐγὼ τε ἐξυγχωρῶ καὶ αἱ Μοίραι· κόμιξε οὖν αὐτὸ καὶ τρέφε.» Ταῦτα ἀκούσας ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡλίος ἑὐφράνθη τε ἡσθείς τῷ βρέφει, σωζόμενον ἐτι καθορῶν ἐν αὐτῷ σπινθήρα μικρὸν ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἐντεῦθεν ἔτρεφεν ἐκείνο τὸ παιδίον, ἐξαγαγόν 

"Εκ θ’ αἵματος ἐκ τε κυδομοῦ ἐκ τ’ ἀνδροκτασίης·’ ὁ πατὴρ δὲ ὁ Ζεὺς ἐκέλευσε καὶ τὴν Αθηνᾶν, τὴν ἀμήτορα τὴν παρθένον, ἠμα τοῦ Ἡλίῳ τὸ παιδάριον ἐκτρέφειν.

He said, ‘This is your offspring. Swear by my sceptre and yours to take him especially, to shepherd him, and to heal him of his illness. For you see how he is as if stricken by smoke, filth, and soot, and there is danger that the fire sowed in him by you will be extinguished, “if you will not exert your strength” (Homer, Iliad IX.231). But the Fates and I will give place to

---

133 The Greek text of Julian’s Or. VII is that of Rochefort (1963), and the translation is my own. This is also discussed in detail in chapter four, part four.

134 I have translated the neuter αὐτὸ as ‘him’, as it corresponds to the neuter term ἔκγονον, ‘offspring’.
you, therefore save and rear him’. King Helios heard this and was cheered
and took pleasure in the babe, seeing that in him a small spark of himself
was saved. And from then he reared that child he had brought forth from
the blood and tumult and slaughter of men. And Father Zeus commanded
motherless Athena the virgin to rear the child together with Helios.

Julian’s portrayal of himself as the son of the god from whom Constantine
apostatized, heightens the parallel with Irenaean recapitulation. The parallel is
extended when one considers that there is a third character besides Julian and Christ
who fits this above description, Heracles (as portrayed idiosyncratically by Julian in
the same work (VII.219d-220a):

ἀτε γὰρ ἐν τοῖς σπαργάνοις ἀποστάσιςς τοῦ δράκοντας, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὰ
παρατατόμενος τὰ τῆς φύσεως στοιχεῖα, θάλπη καὶ κρυμοὺς, ἐῖτα τοῖς
ἀπορωστάτοις καὶ ἁμαξωστάτοις, ἐνδείᾳ λέγω τροφῆς καὶ ἐρημίᾳ, καὶ τὴν δὲ
αὐτὸν πορείαν ὑμαί τὸν πελάγους ἐπὶ τῆς χρυσῆς κύλικας, ἤν ἐγὼ νομίζω
νῇ τοὺς θεοὺς οὐ κύλικα εἶναι, βαδίσαι δὲ αὐτὸν ὡς ἐπὶ ξηρᾶς τῆς θαλάττης
νενόμικα. Τί γὰρ ἀπορον ἣν Ἀρακλεί; Τί δ’ οὐχ ὑπήκουσεν αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῖῳ
καὶ καθαρωτάτῳ σώματι, τὸν λεγομένων τούτων στοιχείων ὀδυσσεύστων
αὐτοῦ τῇ δημιουργικῇ καὶ τελειουργῇ τοῦ ἄχραντου καὶ καθαροῦ νοῦ
dυνάμει; Ὡν ὁ μέγας Ζεὺς διὰ τῆς Προνοίας Αθηνᾶς, ἐπιστήμης αὐτῷ
φύλακα τὴν θεοῦ ταύτην ὄλην ἐξ ὅλου προέμενος αὐτοῦ, τῷ κόσμῳ σωτῆρα
ἐφύτευσεν.
For instance, when in swaddling clothes he strangled the serpents, and then ranging himself against the natural elements, heat and cold, then to the most difficult and unconquerable circumstances, I mean in need of nourishment and in isolation. I think of his journey across the open sea in the golden cup, and this I think by the gods was not truly a cup, but I believe he walked on the sea as on dry land. For what was impossible to Heracles? What of the so-called elements enslaved to the creative and consummating power of his immaculate and pure mind did not hearken to his divine and most pure flesh? Him great Zeus through Athena who is forethought begat to be the saviour of the world, and placed as guardian over him this goddess he had brought forth whole from the whole of himself.\(^{135}\)

Julian altered Heracles from tradition’s son of Alcmene and Zeus via sexual intercourse, to being the son of Athena the virgin goddess and Zeus-Helios.\(^{136}\) In addition, in Julian’s hands, Heracles had been begotten to be the saviour of the world.\(^{137}\) Julian, the child of Helios, was chosen by the gods as the savior of

\(^{135}\) Zeus-Helios \(\tau\sigma\varphi\eta\rho\alpha\delta\varphi\pi\nu\epsilon\varsigma\varsigma\nu\varsigma\alpha\varphi\varsigma\theta\iota\varsigma\varsigma\nu\varsigma\alpha\varphi\varsigma\varsigma\), ‘begat to be the saviour of the world’ Heracles, whose physical nature was \(\theta\varepsilon\iota\circ\kappa\varsigma\theta\alpha\pi\varsigma\tau\alpha\varsigma\theta\iota\varsigma\varsigma\nu\varsigma\alpha\varphi\varsigma\varsigma\). Guido (2000), 156, points out that Athena in Julian’s hands is not extruded from Zeus’ head, but taken whole from the whole of him, in essence a replica (cf. Julian, XI.149b). Here, Zeus and Athena are presented as identical in substance and separate in person. \(\Pi\rho\rho\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \Lambda\theta\eta\gamma\varsigma\) was the goddess’ cult title at Delphi and Delos: Liddell and Scott (1998), s.v.: \(\Pi\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\alpha\omicron\varsigma\). Also see chapter four, part three.

\(^{136}\) Similar to Christ’s virgin birth in Mt. 1.18-23, Lk. 1.26-35, and the early third-century Roman Creed. Julian wrote of Zeus and Helios as equivalent in a fairly typical Neoplatonic structure, with The One, Zeus, and Helios occupying the three \(\text{hypostases}\) or realities. Helios was the high god of the intelligible realm. Elsewhere, Julian equated Helios, Apollo, and Mithra. Julian “recognised that for philosophers and men of letters the old simple faith in the gods of Homer could never take the place of the monotheism that philosophy had been teaching for centuries.” Wright (1896), 46; cf. Athanassiadi and Frede (1999), 191.

\(^{137}\) Similar to Christ in 1 Jn. 4.14, “the Father has sent his son to be the saviour of the world,” \(\sigma\varphi\tau\omicron\varsigma\tau\alpha\varsigma\varsigma\nu\varsigma\alpha\varphi\varsigma\varsigma\) \(\tau\omicron\varsigma\varsigma\nu\varsigma\alpha\varphi\varsigma\varsigma\). Modern scholars are aware that Julian’s presentation here is at least unusual, although their comments range from footnotes to brief summaries: Wright (1913), 111 n4; Lacombrade (1964), 131 n3; Athanassiadi (1981), 133, 197; Barnes (1998), 147-8; Nesselrath (2008), 213-4. Specifically,
Hellenism and the steward of the empire, and was given a body specifically for this mission (VII.229cd, 232c; 234c). His selection was confirmed by the fact that he received direct prophecy (Lib., XIII.48).\footnote{Wright (1913), 70, sees Julian in this oration as a ‘second Heracles’; Athanassiadi (1981), 133, as ‘a second Heracles-Mithra’.}

When Diocletian (emperor A.D. 284-305) established the Tetrarchic system in A.D. 293, he provided an Augustus and a Caesar to lead both the eastern and western empire. Many emperors had been portrayed in divine terms, but Diocletian put this into new terms. Within this structure, Diocletian as the senior Augustus was the son of Jupiter and head of the ‘Jovian’ line, with Maximian the junior Augustus as son of Hercules and head of the junior ‘Herculian’ line (see e.g. \textit{Pan. Lat.} 10 (2).11.6). The novelty of this development was noted by numerous observers and close contemporaries (Lact., \textit{De mort.} LII.3; \textit{Pan. Lat.} XI.10.5; Aur. Vict., \textit{De Caes.} 39; Eutr. IX.26; Amm. XV.5.18). The emperors thus became \textit{Jovii} and \textit{Herculii}, Julian’s grandfather being part of the Herculian line. This creates a contrast between Constantine the bad Herculian and Julian the good Herculian, reinforced by Julian’s literary association of himself with the god.

This association of Julian the son of Helios and Heracles the son of Zeus-Helios was noted and reflected back by contemporaries. Himerius the Bithynian orator composed an oration to Julian in which he wrote that due to Julian’s sharing his nature with Helios, he was able to enlighten people and show them a better way (\textit{Or.} XLI.92-3). Eunapius confirmed that Julian called the Sun (Helios) his own father, clarifying that Julian was by no means claiming that Helios had impregnated his mother Basilina, but was asserting divine ancestry (1.229.3-6).\footnote{Wright (1913), 70, sees Julian in this oration as a ‘second Heracles’; Athanassiadi (1981), 133, as ‘a second Heracles-Mithra’.} \footnote{cf. Gregory (1983), 355} \footnote{Dindorf 1.229.3-6= Müller fr.=Blockley fr. 28.}
emphasized the divine recognition of this special claim to being the son of Helios, who rode his chariot across the heavens, having another god address Julian as ‘child of the charioteer god, who is ruler of all’ (1.229.1-2). Libanius compared Julian to Heracles (XII.28) and wrote that men would sacrifice to Julian as they did to Heracles (XV.36).

**Confirming the chosen one**

In *Or.* VII, Julian’s identity as the chosen one was confirmed to him three times by the gods. The familial relationship is reinforced in two places where Athena refers to Julian as the son of herself and Helios. In the first, she confirmed his divine parentage when warning him of dangers ahead from Constantius II and his courtiers: 

Μάνθανε . . . ὁ λόστε, πατρὸς ἀγαθοῦ τουτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐμὸν βλάστημα, ‘Understand, dearest, offspring of myself and of this good god your father!’ (VII.232d). Further on in that discourse, she again addresses him as μου . . . ὁ παῖ, ‘my son’ (VII.233a). At the close of the myth, Julian’s mission was confirmed as being a part of the divine plan, as Helios informed Julian, Ἄσθι δὲ σεαυτῷ τὰ σαρκία δεδόσθαι <τῆς> λειτουργίας εἶνεκα ταυτησί· ‘Now know a body was given you on account of this service’ (VII.234c). Julian was given tokens of the gods’ endorsement of him as their representative, much as Constantine had claimed. Eusebius related that in a dream Constantine was instructed by Christ to construct a standard based on the sign in his vision to bear before his armies as protection from his enemies (Eus., *Vit. Const.* I.29, I.31.3). This was the labarum, a *chi-rho* symbol mounted on a pole. As a victorious symbol of both the Christian God and the

---

140 Dindorf 1.229.1-2 = Müller fr. 24 = Blockley fr. 27.
Emperor Constantine, the *labarum* was widely depicted, appearing for example on the reverse of coins such as *RIC* VII Constantinople no. 19, where the labarum is piercing a snake representing the devil. This was reflected in artwork over one of the gates in the Imperial Palace in Constantinople, which depicted the victorious Constantine spearing the devil, represented again by a snake (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.3).

Julian’s divine encounter ended with his receiving divine tokens of his own from the gods: the γοργόνειον, or gorgon’s head breastplate from Athena, a torch from Helios, and most importantly a golden rod (*χρυσ/υνι1FC6ν/υλι1FE5άβδον*) from Hermes (VII.234ab). As in our Constantinian example, these signified the gods’ protection, his kingship, and his status as a divine representative.\(^\text{141}\)

6. JULIAN’S RECAPITULATION OF CONSTANTINE

Julian claimed to have been given a mission by the Hellenic gods, one which involved several components. Julian was tasked with cleansing away impiety, which involved restoring worship of the gods (VII.231d). Even more specifically, Julian was instructed to cleanse the house of his ancestors (VII.234c). This was possibly a response to Constantine’s claim to be divinely tasked with cleansing God’s house. Recall that Constantine had written that he was told: τὸν ἄγιότατον σου οἶκον ἀνανεώσασθαι, ὅν οἱ μυσαροὶ ἐκεῖνοι καὶ ἀσεβέστατοι τῷ ἀτοπήματι τῆς καθαρέσεως ἐλυμήναντο, ‘to restore your most holy house, which those polluted and most unholy men have mutilated with wicked destruction’. Countering this, Julian wrote that his mission consisted of a reversal: βουλόμεθα γάρ σοι τὴν

προγονικὴν οἰκίαν, αἰών τῶν προγόνων, ἀποκαθῆραι, ‘we wish your ancestral house
to be cleansed, in reverence to the ancestors’. Recall that the polluters of that house
were Constantine and Constantius II. Julian blamed Constantine and his sons for
plundering some ancestral temples which were theirs to steward, and demolishing
others while constructing Christian churches (which he called ‘sepulchres’)
(VII.228c).

One phase of Julian’s myth bears a remarkable similarity to the account of
Christ’s temptation in Matthew. As Christ was taken into τὴν ἔρημον, or ‘the
wilderness’ to be tempted (Mt. 4.2), so Julian fled into the ἔρημιάν, or ‘wilderness’
(VII.230b). As Christ was taken by Satan to the πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ, or ‘pinnacle of
the Temple’ (Mt. 4.5), Julian was taken by Hermes to a great and high mountain
(VII.230d). As Christ was taken to a ὁρος ὑψηλὸν λίαν, or ‘very high mountain’ to
view the world below and be offered it (Mt. 4.8), so Julian was taken to a σκοπιάν or
‘mountain peak’ by Helios to view the empire below and be offered it (VII.232a).
Helios offered Julian a divine mission, asking: «Ἀν όν, ἔφη, «σὲ ἐγὼ μετὰ ταυτηρί
tῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, ἐπιτάπτοντος τοῦ Διός, ἀντὶ τοῦ κληρονόμου τοῦτον πάντων ἐπίτροπον
tούτων καταστήσω;», ‘What then, if on Zeus’ orders, Athena here and I replaced this
heir as steward of all this with you?’ (VII.232c).142 Although Christ, obedient to his
father, rejected Satan’s offer, Julian was obedient to his father Helios, and accepted

142 Julian’s narrative must have been attractive to his contemporaries, as his associate Libanius
reflected his story in an oration in 362. Regarding Julian’s transition from student to ruler, Libanius
wrote that events in Julian’s accession to power showed that his life had been ‘ordered by divine
counsel’ (τοῦ βουλαίς διαμόνων διοικεῖσθαι, Lib., XIII.20, tr. Norman; cf. Amm. XVI.1.4). More
specifically, Libanius gave the credit for removing Constantius to the all-seeing, all-powerful Helios.
‘The all-seeing all-hearing Sun [πάντα ὑπὲρ τούτων ἂν καὶ ἀκούσαν Ἡλιος] knows what our feelings then
were, and what the end of the war for which we prayed, and this the gracious god granted . . . He
removed from the scene that rival . . . and placed the whole world under a specialist in empire’ (ὁπό
tῷ τεχνίτῃ τοῦ βασιλέως, Lib., Or. XIII.35-36, tr. Norman).
his mission (VII.233d). Helios directed Julian not merely to cleanse away impiety, but as he reiterated in closing, ‘to cleanse his ancestral house’ (VII.234c).

As will be examined in greater detail in subsequent chapters, Julian followed through on this mission of recapitulation. Julian revisited cities, doctrines, actions and events important to Christian historical and cultural self-definition and attempted to replace them with pagan alternatives, using these building blocks to rewrite the Christian narrative as a pagan narrative, a palimpsest of sorts. In each case, Julian rectified Constantine’s transgression. In this effort, he portrayed himself as the chosen one of the gods, doing their will by cleansing the Empire of Christianity, and as the ‘head of household’ for all of paganism. According to Himerius, the young emperor introduced or re-introduced pagan cult in Constantine’s cult-free city (Him., Or. XLI.8). Julian reclaimed the palace by installing a pagan chapel (Julian, XI.130c; Lib., Or. XVIII.127; XII.80-1). At Antioch, he introduced a restructured paganism co-opting features which had been successful for Christianity, as noted by virtually all modern scholars, and called by some a ‘pagan church’ (eg., Ep. 84a.430b-d; Ep. 89b.289b, 291d; Soz., Hist. Eccl. V.16). He attempted to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem in response to Constantine’s church there (Lib., Or. XV.77, Or. XVI.53). Throughout the empire, Julian restored temples and encouraged local destruction of churches (C.Th. XV.1.3; Lib., XVIII.126; Julian XII.357c, 361a). Finally, Julian paralleled the theological role of Christ by crafting himself a role as the son of god and saviour figure (VII.219d-220a, 229c-230a).

There is additional evidence that Julian portrayed himself in some sense as a mediator for all his people. In a private letter, Julian wrote that sacrifices to the gods

---

143 Bidez (1930), 266-71; Browning (1975), 177; Bowder (1978), 100; Bowersock (1978), 87; Barnes (1998), 156; Nicholson (1999), 1; Hoffmann (2004), 32.
on his behalf were efficacious for all Hellenes (Ep. 10).\textsuperscript{144} This representative role is recognised by Susanna Elm, who writes of Julian: ‘All citizens of the politeia were united in his person as leader . . . The analogy between these two kings, Zeus-Helios and Julian, though never made explicit, runs through the hymn like a subtle leitmotif’.\textsuperscript{145}

7. JULIAN’S PROMISED RESTORATION

Julian depicted the restitution as dependent upon the good will of the gods, who would provide rewards for the Empire, for the pagan faithful, and for the representative. In contrast to what Julian perceived as the dire situation under Constantius II, the empire would be restored by a worthy ruler chosen by the gods. The people would have a ruler who would, as he put it, ‘love them as the gods loved him’ (VII.233c). The gods instructed Julian to be pious towards them, loyal to friends, and humane to the people (VII.234d). The faithful steward would restore pagan temples and the cult within them. While Constantine received punishment from the gods (VII.228c; cf. X.336b), the gods would deify their chosen representative (\(\theta\varepsilon\varphi\varsigma \varepsilon\sigma\eta\), ‘you will be a god’), to whom it would be granted to look upon Zeus (VII.234c). The eschatological component was so profound that Pascal Célérien views Or. VII as almost a ‘contre-évangel’, with Julian in the role of both author and hero.\textsuperscript{146} Julian was surely aiming at an ideal restored oikoumene, but the details are scant. Speculative projections of what Julian might have done following

\textsuperscript{144} Libanius also wrote that Julian should be prayed to. Or. 15.36. Nock (1957), 122-23, suggests that this was rhetoric similar to the homage Christians might have given to St. Babylas the martyr. Taken in totality with the other pieces of evidence, it seems more.\textsuperscript{145} Elm (2012), 290.\textsuperscript{146} Célérien (2010), 579.
his restoration are likely to reflect more on the speculator than Julian. However, I
would suggest that his *Caesars* suggests what kind of ruler Julian would have
envisioned becoming: the ideal philosopher-king patterned loosely on Marcus
Aurelius (Amm. XVI.1.4; Eutr. X.16.3).147 While contemporaries wrote of Julian’s
modeling himself after Marcus, this is not to endorse a view of Julian as a slavish
adorer of Marcus.148 Hunt has rightly noted that Julian’s mentions of Marcus were
few and far between, and the idealised Marcus who won the prize for best emperor
was, ‘a contemporary creation . . . a projection of Julian’s own self-identification’.149

8. CONCLUSION

In this discussion of Julian’s *Or. VII*, my concern is with the rhetoric of his political
theology, rather than his internal belief or lack thereof in the literal events of his
myth and the gods’ divine intervention in his life, things beyond the historian’s grasp
in any event. With this caveat in mind, I am arguing that Julian’s presentation of
recapitulation in *Or. VII* set the tone for his reign, and reappeared in his later
writings and actions. Julian co-opted a theme that had worked well for Constantine,
presenting himself as a divine deliverer, albeit of a very different divinity. By
making use of the concept of recapitulation, Julian presented Constantine as the
disobedient representative of his people (VII.228d), while Julian was the good
representative (VII.232c). While Constantine was contemptuous of the gods and
deserted Helios (VII.227c, 228d), Julian was the offspring of Helios and

147 For this patterning, see Kelly (2005), 413-4; Lacombrade (1967), 9-22; although Hunt (1985b),
287-98 cautions that too much has been made of this.
148 As in Athanassiadi (1981), 200 n. 31.
149 Hunt (1985b), 297.
demonstrated his devotion to him (VII.229cd, 231). As the gods cursed Constantine for his failure (VII.228b), Julian was chosen as the steward of the gods (VII.232c). Constantine impiously ‘overwrote’ temples with churches (VII.228b-d), while Julian would cleanse the empire of impiety (VII.231d). Though Constantine had brought suffering to his people by his bad actions (228d), Julian would restore the empire by doing the will of gods as their steward (231d, 234c). Julian’s role-playing portrayal of himself in his rhetoric was not such a radical departure, as he has been identified elsewhere as portraying himself as Achilles, Hercules, Alexander, and Marcus Aurelius.¹⁵⁰

While Julian’s ambition to cleanse the empire of impiety might seem beyond the ability of one man, we should recall that in the same century, Constantine was perceived as having changed the religious landscape of the empire, cementing his changes through a stable, lengthy reign. Had Julian’s program of recapitulation been successful, he would have not only erased the Christian narrative from the cultural slate, he might have effectively written over it his own narrative of pagan revival. Recapitulation as a framework offers a perhaps clearer explanation for why Julian chose to incorporate Christian language and concepts in his reorganisation of pagan religion, recrafting of pagan gods, and response to Constantine. The rest of the thesis will explore the relation to these concepts of similitudo, iteratio, and restitutio as Julian strove to recapitulate the Constantinian revolution.

SECTION II: VEXATIO

memoriam Constantini ... vexavit, 'he abused the memory of Constantine'

(Amm. XXI.10.8)

CHAPTER TWO: JULIAN'S PORTRAIT OF CONSTANTINE

1. INTRODUCTION

The split between the descendants of the half-brothers had very personal consequences for Julian. The murder of Julian’s family kindled his hatred and desire for revenge against Constantius, as noted by numerous modern scholars.\(^{151}\) In his works, Julian’s made clear that in his mind, he extended the blame to include Constantine, whose apostasy made Constantius’ crimes possible (VII.227c), and Christ, who apparently absolved the two of their heinous crimes (X.336ab). In five different works, Julian created a ‘portrait of Constantine’ for his readers. Julian’s changing portrait of Constantine brings thought and action together, as both an indicator of his method, and an integral part of it. First, it shows something of Julian’s mindset, demonstrating how he ‘overwrote’ his past praise with condemnation. Second, it is part of the demonstration of the failure of the past representative, Constantine. This portrait was bifurcated, with Julian casting Constantine as the stereotypical ‘good emperor’ while under Constantius II’s rule,

\(^{151}\) E.g. Cochrane (1940), 263; Barnes (1981), 263; Momigliano (1963), 52.
and then as the stereotypical ‘bad emperor’ once free to do so. In both cases, his narrative relied upon typical categories such as developed by Dio Chrysostom, who Julian mentioned at VII.212c. As noted by Asmus, themes in Julian’s Or. VII strikingly resembled Dio Chrysostom’s Περὶ βασιλείας.\footnote{Asmus (1895), 9-11. According to Oldfather (1915), 280, in his later years, Asmus reportedly backed away on the extent of Julian’s debt to Dio.} Dio described a scenario in which the mimetic ruler was endorsed by the gods and represented Zeus to his people (Dio Chr., I.12):\footnote{The text and translation of Dio Chrysostom are that of Cohoon (1932).}

Let me state, then, what are the characteristics and disposition of the ideal king, summarizing them as briefly as possible - the king ‘to whom the son of Saturn gives the sceptre, making him the lawgiver, that he may rule the rest’ (Hom., Il. II.24-25). Now it seems to me that Homer was quite right in this as in many other sayings, for it implies that not every king derives his sceptre or royal office from Zeus, only the good king, and that he receives it

φέρε εἴπωμεν τά τε ἡθη καὶ τήν διάθεσιν τοῦ χρηστοῦ βασιλέως, ἐν βραχεί περιλαμβάνοντες ὡς ἔνεστιν, ὃ ἔδωκε Κρόνου παῖς ἀγκυλομίτεω σκῆπτρον τ᾽ ἠδὲ θέμιτας, ἵνα σφίσι βουλεύῃσιν. πάνυ γὰρ οὖν καλῶς σὺν ἄλλοις πλείσσιν Ὄμηρος, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, καὶ τοῦτο ἔρη, ὡς οὐχ ἀπαντάς παρὰ τοῦ Διῶς ἔχοντας τὸ σκῆπτρον οὔδὲ τὴν ἁρχὴν ταύτην, ἄλλα μόνον τὸν ἄγαθὸν, οὔδὲ ἐπ᾽ ἄλλοις τισὶ δικαίοις ἢ τῷ βουλευεσθαί καὶ φροντίζειν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁρχομένων,

152 Asmus (1895), 9-11. According to Oldfather (1915), 280, in his later years, Asmus reportedly backed away on the extent of Julian’s debt to Dio.
153 The text and translation of Dio Chrysostom are that of Cohoon (1932).
on no other grounds than that he shall plan and study the welfare of his subjects.

This idea of kingship was clearly important to Ammianus, who had Julian repeating these sentiments at his death, sentiments which escaped Valens and Valentinian and indicated their shortcomings (Amm. XXV.3.18, XXIX.2.18, XXX.8.14). Here we see the framework, appealing back to Homer, for Julian’s receiving the tokens of kingship from the gods (VII.234a), in opposition to Constantine receiving his labarum from the Christian God, whom Julian characterised as a mere regional deity (C. Gal. 100c). The mimetic ruler also was responsible to govern under divine guidelines. As Dio wrote, he ‘orders and governs his people with justice and equity in accordance with the laws and ordinances of Zeus’ (Dio Chr., I.45). One would expect a pagan emperor following a Christian emperor to change policies and public statements, but it was the focus that was exceptional. In fact, Julian revisited exactly the same categories and overwrote his previous disingenuous account. When writing of Julian’s conversion, Libanius’ statement that Julian ‘washed a sour story clean with sweet discourse’ (Lib., XVIII.18) may or may not have been obliquely referring to this phenomenon, but is equally applicable.

Julian wrote two different panegyrics to Constantius II, *Panegyric in Honor of the Emperor Constantius* (Or. I) and *The Heroic Deeds of the Emperor Constantius* (Or. III). His circumstances while writing varied, leading to a certain difference in tone, but the portrait he painted of Constantine and his sons was consistent in both. He praised Constantine for being an ideal emperor, surpassed only by his son.

---

154 Den Boeft, et al. (2005), 95-6, demonstrate that Ammianus’ discourses draws on numerous treatises on kingship, eg. Plato, *Rep.* 342e; Xen., *Aeg.* VII.1; Them. *Or.* XIII.12.
Interestingly, he praised Constantine for being a good emperor, but not specifically for being a good Christian, as panegyric was typically a vehicle to praise religious piety without specifying a particular faith commitment. Julian would comment directly upon Constantine’s religion once he had more freedom of action. Julian was not yet venting his true feelings, as he was thoroughly in the power of Constantius. These works are frequently devalued in comparison to Julian’s later writings as facetious, and indeed Julian carefully sought conceal his true thoughts in them. Although Julian wrote them from the West, his polished Greek orations targeted an audience well-versed in Greek literature. Julian the crypto-pagan had reason to parrot back the ‘received’ view of Constantine for his own protection, and painted a picture of Constantine in these orations that was adulatory and safe.

Once the situation changed, however, Julian changed his version drastically, although addressing the same issues, much like a photo negative version of the portrait of the Emperor Constantine. Julian’s version was so negative at points that Ammianus Marcellinus wrote that Julian showed poor taste in the extent of his abuse of Constantine’s reputation (Amm. XXI.10.8). This version of Constantine emerges in three documents, Julian’s *Letter to the Senate and People of Athens* (*Or. V*), *The Caesars* (*Or. X*), and *To the Cynic Heracleios* (*Or. VII*). In them, Julian portrayed Constantine and his sons as apostates of low character and little ability. As Cameron notes of this theme in general, ‘It was not just that abandoning and proscribing the old gods lost mankind their favor. Rulers who pursued such policies were corrupted in a variety of ways, and in turn corrupted the empire they ruled’.

---

155 Cameron (2011), 655.
This chapter will review Julian’s portrait of Constantine across a span of approximately five years, and how he used this to tie together thought and action. In section two, I review the documents in which Julian painted his Constantinian portraits, both positive and negative. Subsequent sections demonstrate that Julian’s portrayal of Constantine not only changed in a broad sense, but revisited and overwrote specific positive comments with negative comments on the same characteristics: the pious ruler, the beneficent ruler, the creator of a legacy, and the deliverer of his people.

2. JULIAN’S CHANGING PORTRAYAL OF CONSTANTINE

**Or. I**

Julian’s *Panegyric in Honor of the Emperor Constantius* (*Or. I*), written after his elevation to Caesar in 355, carefully concealed his true thoughts about Constantius II. Julian probably composed this work after traveling to Gaul on 1 December 355, and most likely in early 356. Athanassiadi argues that *Or. I* is the defence Julian’s chamberlain Eutherius offered on his behalf to Constantius in the winter of 356-57. Ammianus records the bare fact of Eutherius’ presentation in XVI.7.3-4, but I find a connection between this and *Or. I* quite unlikely. This dating means that Julian’s situation at the time of writing was extremely unstable. In the oration, Julian addressed Constantine’s legitimacy, his identity, achievements, reception, popularity, and legacy. All of these were potentially dangerous topics, but in each case Julian took the safe approach to the issues. Libanius held a high opinion of

---

Julian’s oratory, and specifically praised his first oration to Constantius (Lib., Ep. XXX.1).\textsuperscript{157} It has been suggested that Julian used the orations of Themistius and Libanius as models.\textsuperscript{158} Julian seems to follow Libanius on issues such as education (Julian, I.11cd; Lib., LIX.33-4), the battle of Singara (Julian, I.22d-25b; Lib., LIX.59.99-120), and courtiers (Julian, I.17b-18a; Lib. LIX.122). Bidez noted that Julian followed Menander’s rules for a basilikos logos, but was not enslaved to them, and Tougher has shown how Julian’s diversions are possibly subversive.\textsuperscript{159}

\textit{Or. III}

Despite all of the obstacles in Julian’s way, the situation in Gaul changed dramatically. Julian produced a string of successes in Gaul, attributing this to divine aid (V.280d). As has been noted by scholars, Julian accomplished these victories working in tandem with Constantius, as demonstrated by their pincer movement in the 356 campaign against the Alammani (Amm. XVI.2-4).\textsuperscript{160} In his account, Julian alone drove the barbarian enemy out, rebuilt the Roman forts, and restored the prosperity of Gaul. Julian’s success won the heart of his native soldiers, and his self-aggrandisement engendered suspicion in that of Constantius II.

Julian wrote \textit{The Heroic Deeds of the Emperor Constantius} (\textit{Or. III}) in the summer of 358. As there was peace with Persia, it can be dated after the lowland campaigns, but not later than 358 (III.56b, 66d). This date helps explain some of the difference in tone between the first and second orations, as by then Julian wrote in a considerably different context. Julian did not deliver this oration to Constantius

\textsuperscript{157} Bowersock (1978), 37; Athanassiadi (1981), 60-1.
\textsuperscript{158} Gladis (1907), 15-20; Daly (1980), 3; Whitby, (1999), 82.
\textsuperscript{159} Bidez (1932), 4; cf. Bouffartigue (1992), 516; Tougher (2012), 24-29.
\textsuperscript{160} Bowersock (1978), 38; Barnes (1998), 151-3.
personally either, as they were never together again. Given the role of panegyric in society, where such speeches could be based around the idea of a public address, it may have been delivered to any group of educated listeners for a variety of occasions. Bradbury even suggests the possibility that Julian may have delivered it to a group of philosophically-minded friends as a discourse on the role of kingship, good and bad. The oration portrays the development of Julian’s relationship with his cousin Constantius II. Julian hinted at unrest when he opened the Oration with Homeric references typical to panegyric, but chose to begin with King Agamemnon’s failure to treat his general Achilles well, a jab which would fit his newfound semi-autonomous status at that time (III.49c-50a). He also subtly warned of Homer’s moral that kings should not behave insolently or use their power unjustly (III.50bc). Julian was writing in such a way that if he was not subtly referring back to the murder of his family in 337 or of Gallus in 354, he was certainly allowing that potential interpretation. Hal Drake casts Julian’s second self-referential panegyric to Constantius as a rather dangerous parody. If not openly hostile, the oration was certainly uncomfortable. Despite the tone, the oration contains the germ of Julian’s future religious program, an ideal priest-king ruler who is θεοφιλ or ‘god-beloved’ (III.68b, 70c-d, 90a).

Or. V (Ep. Ath.)

In July 361, Julian marched into Illyricum to confront Constantius, and began moving down the Danube while two other forces marched separately, creating the

---

161 Seeck (1919), 205-8.
164 Drake (2012), 42.
impression of greater numbers. While pausing at Naissus in late October 361 to regroup, Julian wrote letters to four cities justifying his assertion of power. Anticipating the coming clash with Constantius, Julian sent letters to the senates of Athens, Sparta, Corinth, and Rome, of which only Ep. Ath. (Or. V) and a fragment of Ep. Cor. (Wright frag. 3) survive. Ammianus referred to Julian’s abuse of Constantine, which may have been contained in the letter to the Romans, to another city, or in another document altogether. The historian wrote: Tunc et memoriam Constantini ut novatoris turbatorisque priscarum legum et moris antiquitus recepti, vexavit..., ‘Then he passed on to abuse the memory of Constantine as an innovator and a disturber of the ancient laws and of customs received of old…’ (Amm. XXI.10.8, tr. Rolfe). Julian revealed his view of Christianisation in the Letter to the Senate and People of Athens, which also sheds considerable light on Julian’s view of his predecessors. Humphries argues that Julian’s exposition on good and bad rulers in the unique Letter to the Athenians is an attempt to hang the title of tyrant upon Constantius II. It is one of his most compelling works, and in it he convincingly portrayed himself as a champion of both justice and paganism, calling upon the gods to witness the justice of his cause (V.280d, 284b, 285d).

Or. X (Caesars)

During his march on Constantinople, Julian had received a night vision of Constantius’ death, and on 3 November, 361 Constantius II conveniently died of a fever (Amm. XXI.2.2). Likely having the legacy of Constantine and Constantius in

---

165 Den Boeft, et al. (1991), 143.
166 Humphries (2012), 81-6.
167 Humphries (2012), 78.
mind as he entered Constantinople as sole emperor on 11 December, 361, Julian composed *The Caesars* for the week-long feast of Saturnalia, which began on 17 December.\(^{168}\) Lacombrade argues that Julian’s phrase ‘gardens of Adonis’ places the composition in July 362 when Julian entered that city, an unnecessarily arbitrary connection.\(^{169}\) Baldwin makes much of Julian’s use of Christ as evidence for a date in winter 362-3, but it is unwise to view Christ as a foreign intrusion here, as Constantine and his relationship to Christ were key to Julian’s theme of the failures of Constantine as a leader, precisely due to his weakness and incontinence in turning from the gods, most notably Helios (VII.228d), to follow the Christ whom Julian ridiculed.\(^{170}\) Pack notes that Julian could hardly be unaware of the looming juxtaposition of the festivals celebrating Sol Invictus and Christ’s birth (25 December).\(^{171}\)

Julian further expounded his view of leadership and Constantine’s Christianization in *The Caesars*. In the work, the competing historical leaders from Julius Caesar to Constantine and his sons were brought in and interrogated by the gods on their principles of leadership and governance. The work has a satirical tone and some surface similarity to Lucian’s *Philosophies for Sale* or *Dialogues of the Dead*, and is categorised by Hooley as Menippean satire.\(^{172}\) However, this comparison should be tempered by the references to Plato, admired for using myth to convey serious teaching, and Silenus, the wise tutor of Dionysus (X.306c). Baldwin points out that as there is a human host, and human guests are seated

---

\(^{168}\) I agree with Wright (1913), 343, regarding the December 361 date.

\(^{169}\) Lacombrade (1964), 27-30.

\(^{170}\) Baldwin (1978), 458, claims that the ‘artistically crude’ insertion of Christ indicates a date at the time *C. Gal.* was being composed.

\(^{171}\) Pack (1946), 153.

separately from the gods, this suggests that the standards used to judge the contestants are realistic and humanly attainable.\(^{173}\) Relihan notes that while *Caesars* highlights for readers the negative examples for rule and leadership, it also demonstrates ‘that Julian alone is the true believer, that Julian alone is the true emperor, that history converges on him and that he is the focal point of the divine gaze’.\(^ {174}\) Regarding his historical purpose and growing sense of mission, Hunt writes that Julian’s portrayal of Constantine’s opulence ‘reflected a growing obsession with the “revolution” of the Christian Constantine’.\(^ {175}\)

**Or. VII**

As noted in the previous chapter, Julian wrote *Oration VII*, *To the Cynic Heracleios*, in spring 362 in Constantinople (Lib., XVIII.157). The bulk of the oration is a collection of commonplace criticisms of the Cynics.\(^ {176}\) Julian critiqued the contemporary Cynics for diverting from their historic positions. As part of this, Julian held that all philosophies, as far as they were true, were one, and demanded that philosophical positions be tested for congruence, and self-contradictory positions dismissed (IX.184c, 186b). Despite this rigorous approach, Julian viewed the expression of truth in mythic form as appropriate, and even cited philosophers of whom he approved who had used myth (VII.215bc, 207e, 209a). As an example, Julian crafted his own myth, a thinly veiled version of his early life. Julian took the opportunity provided by a letter occasioned by a need to chastise an impertinent philosopher to return to a common theme, drawing some extended comparisons with

\(^{173}\) Baldwin (1978), 458.
\(^{175}\) Hunt (1998b), 64.
Constantine and Constantius. In the long myth within the oration, Julian retold events since the reign of Constantine, and revealed what drove him. Julian’s thorough outlining of qualities here appears to be quite deliberate. Again, in Julian’s long myth, he portrayed himself as the ‘child of Helios’ (VII.229c), in response to Constantine the ‘forsaker of the gods’ (VII.228d). In similar fashion, Julian was ‘dedicated to the gods’ (VII.231b), in contrast to Constantine and his sons, the despoiler and destroyers of ancestral temples, respectively (VII.228b). Of course, this was rhetoric designed for the public as well as the recipient, and we should not be constrained to assume that Julian believed the events described in his myth literally. However, it opens a window onto his thought, and certainly shows the (metaphorical) narrative of events that he wanted understood by his audience.

3. CONSTANTIUS I THE EXEMPLAR

Julian praised Constantius I on several occasions in his works (I.7ab; III.51d-52a; X.315ab). Each time, he used his grandfather as a template or exemplar for good Roman leadership and piety. Libanius characterized Constantius I as ‘an emperor who held wealth in especial contempt and won the especial affection of his subjects’ (Lib., XVIII.8). From his accession in A.D. 284, the Emperor Diocletian had energetically restructured the Empire and his reforms seemed to have arrested the decline of the Empire. His installation of a tetrarchy of leaders, with an Augustus and a Caesar in both East and West, appeared to be a major contribution towards ushering in a period of stability. In his first oration, Julian praised three historical personages in a rather over-simplified picture of the first tetrarchy: the Augustus
Diocletian, his co-Augustus Maximian and the Caesar (later Augustus) Constantius I, the latter two being Constantius II’s maternal and paternal grandfathers, respectively (I.7ab). Notably, all of Julian’s choices were Roman emperors, and none were Christians. Eusebius held that Constantius I was a Christian, although this was contradicted by his own portrayal of Constantine as the first Christian emperor (Vit. Const. I.13.1-17.3). Julian portrayed him as a pagan in favour with the gods (X.336b). Julian contrasted the value placed upon cooperation by Constantius I and Maximianus to the selfish handling of imperial responsibility by Constantine and Constantius II, possibly hinting that Constantius II should share power equally. Indeed, he seemed to be praising them for their refusal to seek ultimate rule. Despite this awkward truth, Julian was here overtly praising Constantius II by lauding his grandfather.

In III.51d-52a, Julian led off with a discussion of Constantine’s father and Constantius II’s grandfather, Constantius I. Julian praised Constantius I for successfully ruling the warlike tribes of Gaul, Iberia, and Britain. Julian referred to their victories over the peoples of this region, and the subsequent stabilization of the frontier. These were areas that he generally thought were important, as he brought them up as failures for Constantine and Constantius II. Julian referred to the ‘distinctions’ of the two emperors, Constantius I and Maximianus. Interestingly, Julian’s praise for his ancestor Constantius I is never rescinded, as we find happening for the kind words for Constantine and Constantius II.

On the other hand, when Julian was able to overtly criticize Constantine, he held up Constantius I as a contrast to his son, who failed to meet his standard. In his Caesars of 361, Julian used the example of Constantius I and Diocletian’s other
tetrarchs acting as Diocletian’s bodyguard and sharing his burdens, to highlight characteristics of selflessness, unity, and self-control (X.315ab). These were not just ideal qualities of leadership from Julian’s perspective, but provided a stark contrast to his perception of and portrayal of Constantine and his progeny. Likewise, the tetrarchs were held in high esteem by the gods for their mutual supportiveness, although Constantine’s grandfather Maximian was ejected from the feast by Justice for his intemperate and vicious behavior (X.315bc). Julian provided Constantius I a much warmer welcome than he did Constantine, identifying with him and introducing him as τὸν ἐμὸν πάππον Κωνστάντιον, ‘my grandfather Constantius’ (X.315a). Julian wrote even more approvingly of his grandfather than his own father, possibly linking himself more to the dynastic head for his religious fidelity or his public achievements. There is no mention of apostasy, and the gods approve of Constantius I to the point of remitting some of the punishment due his apostate descendants.¹⁷⁷ In other words, the founding Augustus of Julian’s dynasty received the pagan seal of approval, as the gods admitted the tetrarchs to enter and sit in an honourable place, unlike Constantine. One of the key characteristics praised by Julian in this passage is the self-restraint of Diocletian and his fellow leaders. He refused greater privileges than his peers, and they reciprocated by guarding him and sharing his burdens. Julian repeated this theme throughout his career, emphasizing his austerity and lack of self-interest, qualities which the gods approved, in contrast to Constantine and Constantius’ greed and incontinence.

¹⁷⁷ Lacombrade (1964), 13.
Eusebius wrote that Constantine was pious (εὐσεβής) and from a most pious father (Hist. Eccl. IX.9.1). Yet when Julian wrote of Constantine’s piety, he did so in a slightly different sense. In Or. III, Julian addressed the issues of legitimacy surrounding Constantine’s rise to power, and stressed the emperor’s well-known piety, writing that when he had obtained the purple, he did so εὐσεβῶς, ‘piously’ (III.52a). While εὐσεβής usually is an equivalent to the Latin pius for emperors, given the context, I believe Julian here was not referring to piety towards the gods, but rather Constantine’s sense of filial devotion towards his father Constantius I. ¹⁷⁸ Julian wrote that Constantine observed the rules of propriety and did not usurp his father, and did so without violating his conscience.

In Caesars, Julian cast Constantine as an exemplar of impiety. In the competition for the title of greatest Roman emperor, those who did not model themselves after the gods were not initially allowed to compete, but an exception was made for the villain of Julian’s piece to make an entrance. Constantine was characterised in the familiar trope of the tyrant enslaved to τρυφή, or ‘luxury’, and was allowed to enter only as far as the threshold (X.317d-318a). Again, we see reference to Constantine’s lack of self-control, a failing which led to many of his actions, and which Julian contrasted with his own self-control and circumspection. This, in Julian’s opinion, made Constantine the perfect Christian exemplar, as will be demonstrated shortly. Constantine’s shaming entrance was in contrast to Alexander, who despite not being a Roman emperor competed and ranked well,

having deliberately modeled himself upon Heracles, as much as his mortality allowed (X.325a).

Julian re-emphasised Constantine’s impiety with a comparison to another pagan exemplar, Marcus Aurelius. As the gods interviewed the Roman leaders, various approaches were dismissed contemptuously, until Marcus Aurelius was interviewed and answered that the highest aim was τὸ μιμεῖσθαι . . . τοὺς θεούς, ‘the imitation of the gods’ (X.333b). Rather unsurprisingly in Julian’s hands, the gods agreed that Marcus Aurelius’ modeling himself after them was the best choice. Julian also had Marcus Aurelius specify that he modeled his behavior after Achilles and Zeus (X.334d). Elsewhere, Julian wrote the ideal ruler must eliminate what was ‘mortal and brutish’ from his soul and therefore exhibit divine conduct (VI.259ab). Since ruling was beyond man’s own strength, kings required this divine character (VI.260c). Julian and Ammianus both corroborate Julian’s desire to emulate Marcus Aurelius (VI.253a; Amm.XVI.1.4; cf. Eutr. X.16.3). Ammianus also subtly portrayed Constantius as dissimilar to Marcus Aurelius while Julian was similar to him (Amm. XXI.16.11-12).\footnote{Kelly (2005), 412-13.} Notably, Marcus provided not only the exemplum of the successful general, but also the serious philosopher and persecutor (in moderation) of the Christians.

At the close, the contestants chose a god to identify themselves with, and Julian had Constantine make his dissolute way to Jesus, stopping on the way with Pleasure and Incontinence (X.336a). Jesus called Constantine to him with the promise of forgiveness for those identified as a φθορεύς, ‘seducer’, μιαιφόνος, ‘defiled with blood guilt’, ἐναγής, ‘accursed’, and βδελυρός, ‘brutal’, even allowing for
recidivism and repentance (X.336b). The key point here relates to Constantine’s rejection of Hellenism for Christianity. Presenting Constantine as a ‘hate-figure’, Julian wrote that Constantine abandoned the gods for a succession of vices, iniquities that reached their culmination in Christianity, which Julian ridiculed for its apparent willingness to blithely forgive the same repeated sins. Related to the previous point of reversing the gains of Christianity, Julian believed that he could demonstrate that Christianity succeeded only by taking advantage of the simple-minded (C. Gal. 39b), a theme he fully developed in his later work Against the Galileans. Julian clearly thought Constantine’s Christianity foolish, given his behaviour and those of his sons. In contrast, Julian approvingly cited Plato’s discipline for prospective rulers, who should develop ‘respect for others’ and ‘self-control’ (XII.354b), while rulers with souls that sought pleasure and indulgence, who trampled over the rule of law, would have no hope of salvation (VI.258d-259a). Julian followed this by reminding his readers that the feckless Constantine and his sons were punished for their ἀθεότης, or ‘godlessness’ (X.336b).

Implying that Constantius I was not only a good Roman emperor, but a good pagan, Julian wrote that the gods allowed Constantine and his sons an abatement of their punishment for the sake of their ancestors Claudius and Constantius I. This ‘ancestor’, Claudius Gothicus, had been claimed by an orator during Constantine’s reign as the third-century founder of the Constantian dynasty (Pan. Lat. VI.2.1). Julian ‘saw no . . . advantage in issuing a contradiction’, but the fiction was dropped by the time of Eutropius, c. A.D. 370.181

180 Hunt (1998b), 64.
181 Syme (1983), 68.
As previously discussed, in *Or. VII*, Julian continued his critique of Constantine’s impiety, describing him as a rich man, ‘willing to enrich himself both by righteousness or unrighteousness, for he had contempt for the gods’ (VII.227c, my translation). In the first portion of his myth (VII.227c-230a), Julian treated the period up to the end of his childhood. The section began with the granting of his grandfather Constantius I’s estate to his uncle, Constantine, and closes with the orphaned Julian’s adoption by Helios and Athena. The next section begins with Julian’s coming to adulthood and the horrible adult knowledge that his cousin and distant guardian Constantius II was responsible for the murder of his family. The myth began with a retelling of Constantine’s reign, in which Constantine was the rich man, Constantius II his surviving heir, and Julian the dispossessed ‘child.’ Julian used this passage to lay the groundwork for Constantine’s failure as the heir of Constantius I (VII.227c):

Πλουσίων ἀνδρὶ πρὸβατα ἤν πολλὰ καὶ ἀγέλαι βοῶν καὶ αἰπόλια πλατέ’ ἀγιῶν, ἵπποι δὲ αὐτῶ πολλάκις μυρίαι ἔλος κάτα βουκόλεοντο, καὶ ποιμένες δοῦλοι τε καὶ ἐλεύθεροι μισθωτοί, καὶ βουκόλοι βοῶν καὶ αἰγῶν αἰπόλοι καὶ ἱπποφορβοὶ τῶν ἱππῶν, καὶ πλείστα κτήματα. Τούτων δὲ αὐτῶ πολλὰ μὲν ὁ πατὴρ ἀπελελοίπει, πολλαπλάσια δὲ αὐτῶς ἐκτήσατο, πλούτειν θέλων ἐν δίκῃ τε καὶ παρὰ δίκην <ἐμελέ> γὰρ αὐτῶ καὶ τῶν θεῶν ὀλίγον.

A certain rich man had many sheepfolds, cattle herds, *free-range goat herds*, tens of thousands of horses that *grazed his marsh-meadows*, slave shepherds and free hiredmen, cattlemen, goatherds, horse-grooms, and the greatest
territory. But while his father had left him much of this, he had won much more for himself, willing to enrich himself both by righteousness or unrighteousness, for he cared little for the gods.

In the creation of this myth of the time before his family’s murder, Julian set the scene as a ‘golden age’ with two quotations from Homer. In the first, Eumaeus described Odysseus’ vast holdings, wrongfully usurped, to his visitor, who was Odysseus in disguise (Od. XIV.99-102): 182

... ἐγὼ δὲ κέ τοι καταλέξω.

δώδεκ’ ἐν ἡπείρῳ ἄγέλαι: τόσα πώεα οἶων,

tόσσα σωῦν συβόσια, τόσοι ἀιπόλλια πλατέ’ αἰγών

βόσκουσι ξεῖνοι τε καὶ αὐτοῦ βότορες ἄνδρες.

... I shall tell you the amount of it:

twelve herds of cattle has he on the mainland; as many flocks of sheep;
as many droves of swine; as many wide-ranging herds of goats

all tended by hired labour or his own herdsmen.

In the second, Dardanos, the son of Zeus and ancestor of the Trojans whom the Greeks would conquer, left his estate to his son, ‘the richest of mortal men’ (II. XX.221). 183

182 Od. XIV.103, cf. Iliad II.474. The text of Odyssey is that of von der Mühll (2000), and the translation is that of Murray’s revision of Dimock (1995).
183 The text of Iliad is that of West (1998-2000), and the translation is my modification of Lattimore (1951): ‘and in his possession were three thousand horses who...’.
Dardanos in turn had a son, the king, Erichthonios,
who became the richest of mortal men,
three thousand horses of his pastured along the low grasslands

By using this passage to criticise Constantine, Julian reclaimed a passage he had employed earlier (A.D. 358) in praise of Constantius II’s wealth, when he described τὰς Τρωὰς ἵππους, αἱ τρισχίλιαι ὁσάι εἶλος κάτα βουκολέοντο, ‘the mares of Tros that numbered three thousand and pastured in the marsh-meadow’ (Or. III.52b, tr. Wright). This atmosphere evaporated as the passage concluded with a foreboding hint of tragic disaster due to Constantine’s impiety, as ἐμελέ... ὅλιγον, ‘he cared little’ for the gods. As a result of Constantine’s apostasy from paganism, his heirs lacked virtue and fought one another for the shares of his wealth. Julian would use this myth to highlight the conflict between Christianity personified as Constantine and paganism personified in himself; contrasting the weak first heir of Constantius I, and the obedient heir who would overwrite the failures of the first.

The historical background that Julian referred to had begun with the reign of Constantine, the heir of Constantius I, Augustus from 305 until his death in 306 at York. Constantine had indeed inherited much from his father Constantius, including the endorsement as Augustus, a portion of the Roman Empire to rule, and loyal
troops to back it. Using his own abilities, Constantine had built upon this inheritance by defeating Maxentius on 28 October 312 and then Licinius on 18 September 324 to become sole Augustus (Lact. De mort. XLIV.11; Epitome XLI.7). Constantine had demonstrated his contempt for the gods by converting to Christianity and changing the legal status of the new religion.

Julian wrote elsewhere that cities governed by a mortal man without the assistance of one of the overseeing gods would suffer hardship as a result (VI.258c). Julian held that holding correct views of God required perfect virtue (VI.265a), the lack of which on Constantine’s part led to disaster for the corrupted emperor and his legacy. This focus on Constantine is also visible in Julian’s sarcastic questioning of the Antiochenes regarding their adoption of Christ as the guardian of their city instead of one of the gods (XII.357c).

Julian also catalogued the progressive effects of Constantine’s impiety. Constantine’s desecration of the temples had led to his sons’ destruction of the temples, all because they thought so little of the gods (VII.228b-d). Returning to the theme of Christianization, Julian wrote that the sons continued their father’s trend of godlessness, demolishing temples and stealing the ἀνάθηματων or ‘offerings’. While the definition of ἀνάθημα is ‘that which is set up’, this would include offerings, ornaments, monuments, or statues. It is important to recall the contemporary record about Constantine’s plundering of temples for both valuable metals and statuary (Eus., Vit. Const. III.54.1-6; Eun., Vit. soph. VI.11.3.2-5.7; Lib., Or. XXX.6). Julian’s statement regarding the building of μνήματα or ‘tombs’, refers to the distinctive Christian practice of building churches over the bones of martyrs.

(Eus., Vita Const. III.47; Eun., Vita soph., VI.11.5.6; Soz., Hist. Eccl. VIII.17.5; Socrates, Hist. Eccl. VI.23). In his catalogue of those palace officials released from their duties by Julian, Ammianus cited ‘those creatures’ of the court that had been ‘fattened on the robbery of temples’ (Amm.XXII.4.3). Libanius wrote that the desecration of temples and banning of ritual motivated Julian’s willingness to assume the role of Augustus (Lib., Or. XVIII.22-3). Eunapius, too, wrote that Christians made war on the temples and boasted that they had ‘overcome the gods’ (Eun., Vit. Soph. VI.11.5.6).\(^{185}\) These actions reinforced two related characteristics of the Christians in the Second Flavian Dynasty: they were godless, and they were thoughtless.

5. CONSTANTINE’S GENEROSITY (AND GREED)

Earlier in the century, Lactantius had described the young Constantine as ‘a young man of the highest integrity, entirely worthy of the rank of Caesar’ (De mort. XVIII.10). Eusebius had praised Constantine’s brilliantly adorned attire, and recorded that when settling disputes Constantine would dispense gifts to all parties so they would leave the court happy (Eus., Vit. Const. III.10; IV.4). Julian too initially praised Constantine’s generosity with the people’s wealth, taking the ill-gotten gains of Licinius and generously returning the wealth to the people (I.8b). Julian wrote that Constantine repaid Athens’ honour of him with tens of thousands of measures of grain, possibly a subtle noting of Constantine’s corrupt desire for luxury and praise (I.8d).

\(^{185}\) Eun., Vita soph., VI.11.5.6 = Loeb 425. For further exploration of this theme, see chapter seven, part two.
One of the later criticisms of Constantine was that he had spread around lavish gifts in order to buy loyalty. Of course, coming to rule in the Eastern part of the empire where he had few connections, this was likely a realistic political expediency. However, the perception this created was that of Constantine enriching his friends at the expense of the empire’s coffers, and the temples denuded to replenish the imperial treasury. In Julian’s view, Constantine’s expensive lifestyle, church building program, and gifts to smooth the way of his entering Eastern society were the source of the denuding of the temples. The opulence of Constantius II’s court did nothing to dismiss Julian’s view of Constantine’s character flaw in this area. Julian turned his earlier portrayal on its head in his later writings, Caesars (X) and Or. VII. In Caesars, when asked, Constantine revealed that his ambition was to accumulate vast wealth and use it for the personal benefit of himself and his friends (X.335b). This statement of Constantine followed a speech by Marcus Aurelius outlining his desire in life to imitate the Hellenic deities. Julian here developed Constantine’s character traits he mentioned earlier of being a slave to pleasure and enjoyment. This was a theme he also reinforced in his Oration to the Cynic Heracleios, where he wrote of ‘the rich man’ (Constantine), who was eager to enrich himself by any means (VII.227c). Julian acted upon his principles in this matter, and Ammianus later wrote of Julian’s dismissal of the redundant palace attendants accumulated by Constantine and Constantius (Amm.XXII.4.1). This paralleled Julian’s description of Constantius elsewhere as ‘luxurious and extravagant’ (Ep. 202), pertinent as Julian saw Constantius as a continuation of Constantine (I.9a). This return to a previous civilitas was attractive to cultured pagans such as Julian’s contemporaries Claudius Mamertinus, Libanius, and Ammianus Marcellinus.
These criticisms were not limited to only Julian. Aurelius Victor wrote that Constantine failed to set a limit to his ‘lavishness and ambition’ (Aur. Vict., De Caes. XL.12), and also wrote of the rampant corruption committed by Constantius’ appointees, (Aur. Vict., De Caes. XLII.19). Claudius Mamertinus attacked the greed of Constantine and Constantius, and their luxurious courts, which insulated them and allowed courtiers to demand bribes for access (Pan. Lat. XI.11.1-3; XI.20.4), whereas Julian’s stripped-down court and modest living allowed access and honesty to flourish (Pan. Lat. XI.11, XI.12, 28-30). This provided a significant contrast to Constantius I, who Libanius later wrote ‘held wealth in especial contempt’ (Lib. XVIII.8). However, Libanius pointed out in Julian’s funeral oration that Julian’s father Julius Constantius ‘was more fitted to rule than the actual ruler (XVIII.8). Julian’s theme of Constantine’s degenerate pursuit of τρυφή and its associated praise was picked up both by Eunapius and Zosimus (Eun., Vit. Soph. VI.2.8.1-6.2.9.1; Zos. II.32.1). Ammianus wrote that Constantine began the corruption of his staff, but Constantius II filled them with graft, particularly temple plunder (Amm. XVI.8.12; XXII.4.3). Libanius described the court staff as ‘a useless horde of people maintained to no purpose’ (XVIII.130). Socrates wrote that Julian restored the property extorted by Constantius’ eunuchs (Soc., Hist. Eccl. III.1).

6. CONSTANTINE’S POSITIVE (AND NEGATIVE) LEGACY

Julian wrote that Constantine was a great victor, with great accomplishments needing no embellishment from him (I.7d). Over the course of three decades, Constantine had indeed achieved major success. Constantine had been a successful
junior officer, and in his own right won major military victories over his imperial rivals. Constantine first triumphed over Maximian without having to fight at Massilia in 310. He then defeated the forces of Maxentius at Segusio, Verona, and Rome (312). Maxentius was forced to come out of Rome and give battle to Constantine by the rioting of the populace who declared for Constantine, and so on 28 October 312, he left the capital, crossed the Tiber, and was disastrously defeated by Constantine (Eus., *Hist. Eccl.* IX.9.1; Lact., *De mort.* XCI.4, 7.; Lib., CIX.20; Zos. II.15.2., *Pan. Lat.* XII (IX).16.1, IV (X).28.1). Eusebius compared Maxentius’ drowning in the Tiber to that of Pharaoh in the Red Sea (Eus., *Hist. Eccl.* IX.9.4). Constantine overcame Licinius’ armies at Cibalae (8 October 316) and Adrianople (316).\(^{186}\) He was then victorious over Licinius again at Adrianople (3 July 324), and Chrysopolis (18 September 324).\(^{187}\) In addition, Constantine stabilized the frontier with numerous successful campaigns against the barbarians. Of course, this was a matter of perspective, as Libanius later blamed Constantine for having ‘sown the seeds of the Persian war’ (Lib., XCIX.2; cf. Amm. XXV.4.23; Zos. II.34.2). Julian himself later found things to criticize about Constantine’s military achievements.

Further, he praised the greatness and rapid growth of the new city that bore Constantine’s name (I.8c). Constantine’s thirty-one years of rule had without doubt left his mark upon the empire, but one of his most visible changes was Constantinople. Whatever Julian’s feelings about Constantine’s actions in founding Constantinople, he recognized the significance of this action. It was not only a momentous historical change, but it altered the nature of Constantine’s legacy, providing an ever-present physical and monumental reminder of him. Indeed, Julian

---

\(^{186}\) Gregoire (1938), 586; Barnes (1981), 67.

noted shortly after that Constantine still seemed to be ruling (I.9a). Julian not only praised Constantine’s many and good works, but also his ensuring their continuity through properly rearing Constantius II (I.9a).

Following his accession as sole ruler, Julian made clear that Constantine’s achievements were insubstantial and would be short-lived. In the banquet in Caesars, when Constantine’s turn to be judged came, he found himself without adequate ammunition, due to the pitiful nature of his accomplishments (X.328d-329a). Julian specifically drew a comparison between Constantine’s achievements and those of Alexander, Caesar, Octavian, Trajan, and Marcus Aurelius, intending to show that in this light, his assessment of triviality was just. Julian held Constantine’s campaigns against barbarians (βαρβάρους) to be embarrassing (X.329a), although he did have some successes against the Sarmatians. Julian allowed that Constantine had defeated two leaders (Maxentius and Licinius), but denigrated him by emphasising their wretched and pathetic nature. While both were pagans, Julian criticized them for their traits ‘most hateful’ (ἐχθίστω) to gods and men alike (X.329a). Maxentius in particular had reportedly forced his attentions on numerous married women in his domain (Eus., Hist Eccl. VIII.14.2, 16; Vit. Const. I.34), and had also apparently busied himself in Rome by killing senators (Eus., Hist. Eccl. VIII.14.3; Pan. Lat. XII (IX).4.4). Aurelius Victor described Maxentius as a beast driven by lust (Aur. Vict., De Caes. X.40).

In the Caesars, Constantine held forth on his achievements, but in Julian’s portrayal the weakness of his position was evident to all hearers. Julian placed Silenus at the scene to further skewer Constantine’s claims, and referred to Constantine’s efforts as ephemeral as ‘gardens of Adonis’ (X.329cd). This was not
only because he believed they lacked staying power against the weight of culture, tradition, and religious practice summed up in Hellenic παιδε/uni1F77α, but also because he himself was actively working to reverse Constantine’s results. At the time of writing, Julian must have seen his cause in the ascendancy, having just had his own path to undisputed rule cleared by the premature death of Constantius II from fever. Constantine had changed the legal status of Christianity, and given it preferential treatment. Both Constantine and his sons had made certain limited moves to suppress pagan worship. Yet not enough time had passed to cause anyone to think the situation was irreversible, witnessed by both some pagans’ enthusiasm for Julian’s proclamation of his own beliefs and Christian concern regarding the same.

7. CONSTANTINE THE DELIVERER (AND FORSAKER) OF HIS PEOPLE

Julian viewed Constantine as not only the emperor, but the representative of his people. Lactantius also wrote of Constantine in a way that suggests this view of the leader as representative was common at the time. He wrote that because of Constantine’s virtue and knowledge of God, his actions fulfilled the requirements of righteousness, and he was a fitting representative for ‘rearranging the condition of the human race’ (Lact., Div. inst. VII.27, tr. McDonald). Julian initially wrote of Constantine as the liberator of his people from tyranny, but once sole ruler, changed this assessment to one who endangered and jeopardised his people.

In 355, Julian had written of Constantine in glowing terms (I.7d-8b, my translation):
As to might in battles, you would recognise by his great accomplishments, and needs no words of mine. He crossed the whole empire, getting rid of tyrannies, but not overthrowing lawful reigns. He inspired his subjects with affection, so that his soldiers still remember his grace and magnanimity, and worship him just as though he was a god. And the multitude in the cities and on the farms were praying that he might be victorious, not praying thus to be delivered from the yoke of the tyrants, but that they would be ruled by your father.

With reference to ‘tyrannies’, Julian was again tying into an existing literary tradition and reinforcing the legitimacy of Constantine. Julian’s praise of Constantine echoes Eusebius’ statement that Constantine made war on Maxentius to secure Roman liberty for her citizens (Eus., Hist. Eccl. IX.9.2). Constantine had begun as the son of one of Diocletian’s Tetrarchs, and culminated his career as sole Augustus of the Roman empire. This involved a string of civil wars as one by one
the other leaders succumbed. While Constantine may indeed have been urged to action by persecution of Christians in the other leaders’ domains, it was likely difficult to avoid an uncomfortable awareness of ambition in the emperor. Every time Constantine made another conquest, the loser was portrayed as a usurper, a persecutor, or a tyrant, ironically, the same epithet used of Constantius II by Nicene Christians. It was in this period that *tyrannus* came to mean ‘usurper’ and ‘persecutor’.\(^{188}\) Lactantius cast Maximian as ‘a second Tarquin the proud’ (*Lact.*, *De mort.* XXVIII.4), and wrote of the *captivitas* in which Maxentius held the citizens of Rome (*De mort.* XXVI.2). Eusebius also cast Constantine and Licinius as ‘two men beloved of God, against the two most impious tyrants’ (*Eus.*, *Hist. Eccl.* IX.9.1, tr. Oulton). Eusebius wrote that rather than follow Constantine’s example, Licinius copied the ‘evil manners and wickedness [κακοτροπίαν] of the impious tyrants’ (*Eus.*, *Hist. Eccl.* X.8.2, tr. Oulton).

Although in 313, Licinius was apparently pro-Christian, he drifted from ambivalent tolerance to begin the persecution of Christians once again, as described by Eusebius (*Eus.*, *Hist. Eccl.* X.8.10-1; *Vit. Const.* I.51-3; II.20.2; II.30.1).\(^{189}\) This accomplished little for his cause, but did provide Constantine a plausible excuse to make war on Licinius, playing the role of ‘Christian liberator’, a role encouraged by Lactantius (*Lact.*, *Div. Inst.* I.1.13). Licinius explicitly ordered imperial administrators to sacrifice, as he apparently did all Christians, lay and clergy alike (*Eus.*, *Hist. Eccl.* X.8.10; *Vit. Const.* I.54.1; *C.Th.* XVI.2.5). Local magistrates treated Christians as criminals (*Eus.*, *Dem. Evan.* III.5.78, V.3.11, VI.20.17, cf. II.3.155, III.7.36, VII.1.132, VIII.1.61). Given this ammunition, Constantine was

---

189 Cameron and Hall (1999), 224, 227.
able to plausibly describe Licinius as ‘the common enemy of the civilized world’ (Eus., Vit. Const. II.66, tr. Cameron and Hall).

The end of persecution provided relief to persecuted Christians in the East, whose plight was thoroughly documented. This coincided with the accession of the first avowedly Christian emperor, seen by many as evidence of the culmination of God’s plan to reconcile Himself with his creation. Eusebius portrayed Constantine in a Mosaic motif, as God’s mighty servant who grew up in the court of tyrants, received a sign, led God’s people to safety, and became the divine lawgiver. Eusebius recorded the victory over the (pre-Licinius) persecutors by quoting Isaiah 2.13 regarding the ‘day of the Lord’, and continuing with ‘henceforth a day bright and radiant with rays of heavenly light, overshadowed by never a cloud, shone down upon the churches of Christ throughout the whole world’ (Hist. Eccl. X.1). Post-Licinius, Eusebius used numerous Messianic images to describe Constantine, the ‘friend of God’, i.e. God laying Licinius low, prone beneath the feet of Constantine (Ps. 110.1; Heb. 1.13, 10.13); Constantine stretching out his right hand to all who were perishing (Ps. 20.6, 60.5, 108.6), an image also taken up by Julian (C. Gal. 200b).

One of the rhetorical devices used by Eusebius was that Constantine won victories without battle, implying that they were delivered to him by God. Eusebius referred to ‘his usual bloodless victories’ (Eus., Vit. Const. IV.53 tr. Cameron and Hall). These God-given victories are derived from the Christian Scriptures (Josh. 6.2, 8.1, 10.10, 11.8; 2 Sam. 8.6; 2 Chron. 13.18, 14.12). This phrasing was also utilized by a governor of Thrace, praising Constantine’s ‘bloodless victories from

---

190 Cameron and Hall (1999), 36.
191 Cameron, Alan (2011), 97.
West to East’ (SEG 51 2001, 695). Themistius referred twice to Constantius II’s bloodless victory over Vetranio (Them., Or. II.37ab; Or. III.45b-46a). Libanius wrote in similar vein of Julian’s advance into Illyricum: ‘nowhere had he to resort to fighting and bloodshed: his quick wits and the desire for him as their emperor was sufficient’ (Lib. XVIII.12). This provided a contrast to Constantius II’s massive casualties at Mursa, on the Drava River in Pannonia. Julian described in detail the hard-fought battle, which ended with ‘the greatest slaughter’ (III.60bc). While some sources merely mention the battle, Eutropius points out that the vast casualties could have provided security and possibly even victory against foreign enemies (Eutr., Brev. X.12.1; Aur. Vict., De Caes. 42.2; Jer., Chron. 238).

Julian’s reference to the affection of Constantine’s subjects was not mere flattery. The veterans who followed Constantine on his campaigns were no doubt pleased to be led by a victorious general who had a solid record of providing both victory and reward. Lactantius wrote that ‘his extraordinary affability made him the object of the soldiers’ affection and of private citizens’ choice’ (Lact., De mort. XVIII.10). Lactantius, wrote that following the defeat of Maxentius, Constantine was ‘received as emperor with great joy by the Senate and people of Rome’ (Lact., De mort. XCIV.10). While liberties of the population under Rome in the fourth century were rather limited in comparison to their forebears, his rule could also be seen as bringing wealth, political stability, and religious freedom. Many of the population received Constantine enthusiastically, but beyond that, Julian’s perception that the population treated Constantine in a worshipful sense was also likely widespread. Aurelius Victor, likely a pagan, but writing cautiously during

---

192 Barnes (1993), 105.
Constantius II’s reign, wrote that Constantine’s finer qualities ‘carried Constantine up to the stars with the prayers of all . . . if he had set a limit to his lavishness and ambition . . . he would have been practically a god’ (Aur. Vict., De Caes. 40.14-15).

In his Or. III, Julian continued this flattering portrayal of Constantine as the liberator from tyranny (III.52ab). Julian reminded his audience that Constantine had conquered in the interest of liberating the Roman people from τυραννίδας, not power acquisition, a standard claim in panegyric (III.52a).

However, once free to do so, Julian made the most dramatic turnaround of his various portrayals of Constantine, casting him as one whose failure jeopardised his people’s safety and relationship with the divine (VII.228b, my translation):

Εἶτα ἐπίμπλατο φόνων πάντα, καὶ ἡ τραγικὴ κατάρα ύπὸ τοῦ δαίμονος εἰς ἔργων ἤγετο· τὰ πατρῷα γὰρ Ἰακόπτῳ σιδήρῳ διελάγχανον καὶ ἦν πάντα ἀκοσμίας πλήρη.

Then all things were filled with slaughter, and the tragic curse from the Deity came to pass. For they divided their inheritance with a sharpened sword and all was complete chaos.

The ‘tragic curse’ or τραγικὴ κατάρα harks back to Classical usage in dramatic and philosophical literature, possibly alluding to the curse on Oedipus’ house (Euripides, Phoenissae 67; Plato, Alcibiades II.138c). This interpretation is not an ideal fit, as the literary Oedipus was thought highly of as man and king but brought down by the tragic flaw of ὃβρις, while in Julian’s hands Constantine was a bad man and a bad
emperor whose disobedience and apostasy inflicted tragedy on others. However, κατάρα also frequently meant ‘a curse incurred through sin’. In that sense it figures prominently in the Christian Scriptures, specifically regarding the curse brought by Adam’s disobedience: ἐπικατάρατος ἡ γῆ ἐν τοῖς ἐργοῖς σου, ‘cursed is the earth because of you’ (Gen. 3.17 LXX), and when God promised to curse those of his people who turned away from Him to follow other gods (Deut. 11.26-28; 30.19 LXX). It was also used extensively in this sense by influential patristic authors such as Origen, who wrote: ἡ πᾶσα γῆ αὐτῆ ἐπικατάρατος ἐν τοῖς ἐστὶ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ ἄποθανότων, ‘the whole earth itself was cursed by the works of Adam and all those who died in him’ (C. Cels. VII.29.1; cf. VII.28.34, 39; 29.1; Co. Jo. XX.10; Ath., De inc. XXV.5; Ap. Const. VI.22.1; Apoc. Enoch V.5). Supporting this, while Wright translates δαίμονος as ‘heaven’, it is more accurate to render it as ‘the Deity or ‘the Divine Power’. As we unfold these passages, I will argue that such a Biblical allusion fits the context more consistently.

Referring to the murder of his family, Julian wrote that the rich man’s foolish heirs, Constantine II, Constantius II, and Constans, did not share the inheritance with all those Constantine had designated as heirs. One of these displaced heirs was Julius Constantius, the half-brother of Emperor Constantine. Julius Constantius and his Christian wife Basilina had produced a son Flavius Claudius Julianus in Constantinople in 332, although Basilina died several months after giving birth (XII.352b). In 337, Julian’s family was murdered in Constantinople at the instigation

---

193 Lampe (1961), s.v. κατάρα: 715
194 The text of Origen is Marcovich (2001), and the translation that of Chadwick (1980).
195 Liddell and Scott (1998), s.v. δαίμονος: 365; cf. uses in Julian’s favorite texts, Iliad XVII.98 and Odyssey III.27.
Julian was spared because he was less than six; his older half brother Gallus because he was thought to be terminally ill (Amm. XXV.3.23; Lib., XVIII.10). Echoing Julian’s version, in his *Epitaphios* for Julian, written at some point between 364 and the late 360s, Libanius wrote that, ‘Constantine had no sooner ended his life, than the sword passed through almost his whole house, fathers and children alike’ (Lib. XVIII.10, tr. Bradbury; cf. Amm. XXI.16.8; Eun. Vit. Soph. VII.1.5.3–6.1; Zos. II.40.3.). Non-Christian authors beginning with Libanius laid the blame for the murders at the feet of Constantius. In his *Epitaphios* for Julian, written between 364 and the late 360s, Libanius referred to the Augustus as ‘the man who had wronged him [Julian] most . . . the murderer (φονεύς) of his father and brothers’ (Lib. XVIII.31, tr. Bradbury). Christian authors attributed responsibility to the army beginning with Eusebius, who wrote in 337-9 that the troops declared they would only recognize Constantine’s three sons as sovereigns, although given his situation, he could have written little else (Eus., Vit. Const. IV.68.2). Gregory Nazianzen stated that Constantius saved Julian from the military uprising (IV.21; cf. Orosius VII.29). Eutropius wrote that Constantius ‘permitted rather than ordered’ the murders (sinente potius quam iubente, Eutr., de Caes. X.9). In the mid-fifth century Socrates (*Hist. Eccl.* III.1, 438–42), and Theodoret (*Hist. Eccl.* III.1) were the first Christian historians to allow Constantius responsibility.

In *Or.* VII’s council of the gods, Julian had Zeus dialogue with Helios regarding Constantine’s legacy (VII.228d):

---

196 Discussed fully in the introduction, part three.
197 The work has the fiction of commemorating Julian’s funeral, but could only have been based on source material from the army’s late 363 return to Antioch and Libanius’ composition of *Or.* XVII first as a basis.
Zeus was moved by mercy. Looking at Helios he said, ‘Oh son, divine offspring more ancient than heaven and earth, do you still have contempt in your mind for the arrogance of that willful and audacious man, who brought such great suffering on himself and his race by deserting you?’

Julian made plain where he believed the blame lay for all the troubles of the empire and its citizens. Constantine was the root cause, and the seminal event was his desertion of Helios. This is emphasized in Julian’s following reference to τὴν οἰκίαν, ‘the house’ of Constantine, abandoned in turn by Helios (VII.229a). Libanius wrote of Constantine’s defection in a casual way, writing that when Constantine entered Rome after defeating Maxentius, he ‘thought it to his advantage to recognize some other as a god’ (Lib., XXX.6). However, in the judgment of the gods according to Julian, Constantine’s rejection of pagan religion was not merely a personal decision with personal ramifications. Constantine’s personal religion influenced the practice of Roman State religion.
Constantine’s process of Christianisation likely made many pagans uncomfortable, and from Julian’s more rigorist point of view, it could not be allowed to continue. Julian wrote that a decline had befallen the empire (X.329c), and blamed this on the ruler’s embracing of Christianity. This perceived calamity could include Constantius’ and Constans’ earlier loss of territory north of the Danube in 337-8. In addition, Constantius had been forced to send Julian to Gaul to help control a barbarian incursion he encouraged by letter, which destabilized Magnentius the Western usurper, but also destroyed towns, families, and Roman prestige (Lib., Or. XVIII.33-36). Even if exaggerated by Libanius, this version of events would have been influential with Julian, given his involvement in the Gallic campaign from 355. Julian also claimed that Constantius did this to him after his acclamation (V.286a). Even if the crisis seems insignificant from our distance, Julian considered it plausible.

These excerpts are not only historical, but presentational: Julian portrayed a crisis in the state for his readers by repainting his previous portrait of Constantine. This is critical, as it shows Julian presenting his view that the ruler was a representative of his people who would gather them up with him in his fate, a key component of similitudo. Julian shows that Constantine was a failure as a representative of his people. The concept of recapitulation is also seen here in terms of Julian’s initial step of iteratio, overwriting the embarrassingly effusive praise he Lavished on this failed heir.

198 Barnes (1981), 262.
199 Bowersock (1978), 33.
SECTION III:
SIMILITUDO

CHAPTER THREE:
JULIAN AMONG OTHER POLEMICISTS

1. INTRODUCTION

From humble beginnings, Christianity had survived persecution and competition from Gnosticism and Mithraism. It had produced defenders such as Origen capable of engaging the wider culture intellectually in his *First Principles*, and refuting pagan attacks in his *Contra Celsum*. After Constantine’s endorsement of the religion, it had flourished dramatically. The subsequent reign of Constantius II continued to solidify this relationship (albeit between state and non-Nicene Christianity). To a non-Christian observer, the rapid integration of Christianity with Imperial power would likely have seemed alarming. The Christian religion had not flourished unchallenged, however. Once the wider culture took notice of Christianity in the second century, writers began to provide criticism of the new faith. Among these, we can count Galen, Fronto, and Lucian. By far the most important and substantial were three that are frequently grouped together in their own category: Celsus’ *The True Word* (c. A.D. 180), Porphyry’s *Against the Christians* (c. A.D. 300), and Julian’s *Against the Galileans* (A.D. 362-3).\(^{200}\) Van Dam has recently written that Julian’s ‘skill as an anti-Christian theologian nevertheless deserves more

\(^{200}\) Wilken (1984), xiii.
study’, and indeed, in Julian’s attacks on Constantine’s religion, there is a component which has not received adequate attention. Julian synthesized two different streams of pagan engagement of Christianity, combining the direct attack of Celsus and Porphyry with the more syncretistic approach of Hierocles and Iamblichus. This component distinguishes Julian from his polemical predecessors, but some scholars have assessed Julian as unimaginatively following Celsus and Porphyry and falling short of their standard. Although praising Julian elsewhere, Wright holds that ‘Julian’s arguments against the Christian doctrine do not greatly differ from those used in the second century by Celsus, and by Porphyry in the third’. Smith criticizes Julian’s ‘readiness to repeat standard criticisms’, and specifically categorized his work as inferior to ‘Porphyry’s painstaking and coolly expressed critique’. Even Athanassiadi, generally favourable to Julian’s *Contra Galilaeos*, held that it was Porphyry who authored ‘the most formidable of all attacks on Christianity’. In contrast, I will argue that Julian’s attack on Christianity, overtly attacking Christian claims while quietly transferring attributes from Christ to pagan gods, was both more subtle and more skilful than he has been given credit for. Given Julian’s interest in co-opting Christian versions of incarnation and soteriology, I will focus on those topics in treating this aspect of his recapitulation of Constantine.

---

201 Van Dam (2013), 360-1, n. 8.
202 Some others hold Julian’s *Contra Galilaeos* in high regard, or at least held it a work of great significance, such as Bouffartigue (1992), 379: ‘Le contre les Galiléens était une œuvre de toute première importance’; cf. Athanassiadi (1981), 161, and Wilken (1984), 191.
203 Wright (1923), 314.
2. THE POLEMICAL APPROACH

By the second century, educated pagans had begun to take notice of the followers of Christ. A variety of Christian writings made dramatic claims for Christ, including his being the pre-existent son of God, an incarnate deity, who was born of a virgin, miraculously commanded the elements, and was the universal saviour from sin. In the late second century, the philosopher Celsus attacked these Christian truth claims as untenable.\textsuperscript{206} While little is known about Celsus as an individual, his \textit{Alethes Logos}, which survives in its lengthy quotations in Origen’s \textit{Contra Celsum}, represents the contemporary educated pagan argument against Christianity. Celsus approached Christianity from a henotheistic perspective that allowed for worship of traditional subordinate gods synthesized from many cultures to be passed to the one high God, a view which could not tolerate exclusivist Christianity. He characterized the idea of incarnation as \textit{αἰσχρός}, or ‘disgraceful’ (\textit{C. Cels.} IV.2.11), and following Plato, insisted that incarnating would cause the changeless God to participate in the \textit{μίασμα τοσοῦτον}, or ‘great pollution’ of our reality (\textit{C. Cels.} VI.73.20-1).\textsuperscript{207} Insisting that Jesus was born of an adulterous union between his mother Mary and a Roman soldier, Celsus also rejected the virgin birth (\textit{C. Cels.} I.32.20). Celsus also dismissed the concept of Christ, the Christian \textit{λόγος}, descending for sinners, as an omniscient, omnipotent God would simply correct sinners (\textit{C. Cels.} IV.3, 8.28). Finally, Celsus dismissed the sign-miracles claimed for

\textsuperscript{206} The reference to persecution in \textit{C. Cels.} VIII.69 suggests a date in the late 170s, perhaps during the local persecution of Lyons in 177-8. While this was a local persecution, Eusebius seems to treat other persecutions contemporaneously (\textit{Hist. Eccl.} V.1.3), see discussion in Chadwick (1980), xxvi-xxviii.

\textsuperscript{207} Here following the thinking of Plato, who taught that the Good or the One was beyond being. \textit{Rep.} VI.509b = \textit{C. Cels.} VI.64.22; cf. IV.14.9-12; VI.64.13, 22; VI.73.17-21; Chadwick (1980), 379.
Christ as evidence of sorcery, not divinity (C. Cels. I.38.8-11), and specifically attributed the feeding of the five thousand to magical tricks (C. Cels. I.68.3-9).

Porphyry of Tyre was both a supporter of Diocletian’s Great Persecution (A.D. 303-13) and the author of Κατὰ Χριστιανών, likely written c. A.D. 300. It has been suggested that Porphyry provided the theory, and the Great Persecution was the practise. In addition to that polemic, Porphyry penned Philosophy from Oracles, a positive contribution to the public religious debate about traditional paganism and the extent to which it might assimilate Christianity. In that work, Porphyry compiled oracular responses to support his assertions regarding the piety owed God, lesser divinities, and ‘divine men’, including both heroes such as Heracles and men of outstanding piety as Jesus. Porphyry, praised as ‘the most learned and astute’ of the anti-Christian writers, also derived fame from his mainstream contributions to philosophy, including works on Aristotle and Homeric epic.

In his Κατὰ Χριστιανών, which survives in fragments cited primarily by Eusebius and Augustine, Porphyry, the disciple of Plotinus, author of his Life, and editor of his Enneads, was shocked that any could consider the congruence of ideal and material in one person. Indeed, Augustine hinted that the incarnation was Porphyry’s primary stumbling block: ‘you despise Him because of the body that He received from a woman, and because of the shame of the Cross’ (Aug., De Civ. X.28, tr. Dyson). Porphyry also held that Jesus the material human could not provide the image of the Ideal, writing that Christ merely ἀνέρος εὔσεβή προφερεστάτου, ‘displayed the piety of an outstanding man’, whom Christians mistakenly

---

208 Barnes (1994), 60-5.
210 Wilken (1984), 126.
worshipped out of ignorance (Porphyry, *frag.* 345F.22). Porphyry’s view can be summed up by his sarcastic quotation of an oracle of Apollo regarding a misguided Christian: *Pergat quo modo vult inanibus fallaciis perseverans et lamentari fallaciis mortuum deum cantans quem iudicibus rectae sentientibus perditum pessima in speciosis ferro vincta mors interfecit,* ‘Let her continue as she pleases, persisting in her empty delusions, and lamenting in song as a god one who died for delusions, who was condemned by judges whose verdict was just, and executed publicly by the worst iron-bound death’ (Porphyry, *frag.* 343F).

Porphyry’s work was long conflated with an unnamed philosopher that the Christian apologist Macarius Magnes responded to in his late fourth-century work the *Apocriticus.* While scholars beginning with Harnack included in the Porphyrian corpus the fifty-five fragments of the anonymous philosopher, recent scholarship has moved away from Porphyrian authorship for a variety of reasons. Despite this, some recent collections of Porphyry continue to include the philosopher Macarius responded to. For the purpose of this argument, it is primarily important that the cited passages were part of the anti-Christian literary tradition to which Julian was heir. The anonymous philosopher specifically rejected the incarnation, ridiculing the impure idea of incarnation in a womb *μεστ/uni1F78ν α/uni1F35µατος χορίου κα/uni1F76 χολ/uni1FC6ς κα/uni1F76 τ/uni1FF6ν τοί/uni1F14τι πολλ/uni1FF7 τούτων τούτων/uni1F00τοπωτέρων,* ‘full of blood, afterbirth, bile, and yet more disgusting things’ (Macarius, *Apocriticus* IV.22). The Anonymous took a sarcastic approach to the Christian doctrine of salvation, concluding that if Christ did not save all

---

211 Eus., *Dem. Evan.* III.7.2 = Porphyry 345F; and in Latin, Aug., *De Civ. XIX.23 = Porphyry 345aF.* Although the first five feet of a hexameter line, this does not appear to be quoting known literature.  
213 For which see Meredith, (1980), 1119-1149; Barnes (1973), 424-42; (1994), 53-65.  
214 Eg., Hoffmann (1994).  
215 The text of Macarius’ *Apocriticus* is that of Goulet (2003), and the translation is my own.
universally, then οὐκ ἰσφαλὲς τοῦτο προσφεύγειν καὶ σώζεσθαι, 'it is not safe to run to him for refuge and be saved' (Macarius, Apocriticus III.4).

In his Contra Galilaeos, Julian directly critiqued Christian theology in the polemic vein of Celsus’ Alethes Logos and Porphyry’s Contra Christianos, winning praise from Wilken for his ‘inside knowledge of biblical interpretation and theological reasoning’.

Julian wrote the work in Antioch during the long winter nights of 362-3 (Lib., Or. XVIII.178). As Bouffartigue has demonstrated, Julian made consistent use of Porphyry. Julian primarily focused on the criticism that Christianity was an illegitimate schism from Judaism, but also consistently rejected the claims that Jesus was God incarnate and was pre-existent. Libanius described the book as one ‘in which that fellow from Palestine is claimed to be a god and a son of a god’ (Lib. Or. XVIII.178).

Julian attacked the incarnation, which he derided in a private correspondence as irrationabilitatem (Ep. 90; cf. C. Gal. 262d). While acknowledging the historicity of Christ’s σηµεία or ‘sign-miracles’, the emperor dismissed them as insignificant things done among a low class of people (C. Gal. 191de; cf. Mk. 1.29-34; Lk. 11.14; Jn. 5.2-9, 9.1-2). Julian ridiculed the concept of substitutionary sacrifice for the sins of another, deriding Christ as a ‘corpse’ whose death accomplished nothing, and insisting that he was unable to save the souls even of friends and relations (C. Gal. 213b). This polemical approach exists in his other works as well. In his satire Caesares (Or. X), Julian wrote that following the gods’ review of the lives of the Roman emperors, those emperors
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217 Bouffartigue (1992), 385, who also highlights Julian’s response to Eusebius at the same time.
219 The text of Libanius is that of Foerster (1903-27), and the translation is that of Norman (1969).
220 Julian’s Ep. 90 to Photinus is extant only in a Latin copy, the original Greek was likely Ἀλογος. For a new translation and commentary of Ad Photinum, see appendix B.
sought out one god to be their guardian and guide. Constantine went from Pleasure to Incontinence, in whose company he found Jesus, who blithely offered him cleansing of his sins, no matter how often he might repeat them (X.336ab). Clearly, Julian saw himself as an inheritor of the polemical tradition of Celsus and Porphyry, but he was also more.

3. THE SYNCRETISTIC APPROACH

There was another stream of anti-Christian pagan thought more syncretistic in its method. Sossianus Hierocles and Iamblichus, both in the early fourth century, suggested that Christian truth claims were not impossible, but also not unique, citing the lives of figures presented in parallel to Christ. Hierocles’ successful career included appointments as governor of the province containing Palmyra (CIL 3.133), vicarius Orientis, provincial governor of Bithynia (Lact., De mort. XVI.4), and finally as prefect of Egypt (P. Cairo Isid. 69; Eus., Mart. Pal. V.3).\textsuperscript{221} While in Bithynia, Lactantius identified Hierocles as playing a significant role in Diocletian’s Great Persecution (Lact., De mort. II.2; V.2.2, 12; XVI.4).\textsuperscript{222} As a contribution to Diocletian’s religious campaign, Hierocles made polemical use of the third-century Life of Apollonius of Tyana, written by Philostratus about the first-century wonderworker at the request of the empress Julia Domna. In his Lover of Truth based on this work, Hierocles systematically paralleled Apollonius and Christ, dismissing the significance of miracles attributed to Christ by claiming them as gifts.

\textsuperscript{221} Barnes (1976), 243-4.
\textsuperscript{222} Jones (1971), 432; Barnes (1976), 242.
of special men such as Apollonius of Tyana.\(^{223}\) One quotation will serve to summarise Hierocles’ pointed comparison: εἴπερ ἡμεῖς μὲν τὸν τὰ τοιαῦτα πεποιηκότα οὐ θεόν, ἀλλὰ θεοίς κεχαρισμένον ἀνδρὰ ήγούμεθα, οἳ δὲ δι’ ὀλίγας τερατείας τινὰς τὸν Ἱσησοῦν θεόν ἀναγορεύουσι, ‘We do not think a man who performed such deeds to have been a god, but only a man pleasing to the gods; while they are led by a few illusions to declare Jesus a god’ (Eus., *C. Hierocl.* II.2).\(^{224}\)

Iamblichus was a Syrian teacher of the theurgic variety of Neoplatonism, who wrote *On the Pythagorean Life* prior to A.D. 326.\(^{225}\) While it is true that Iamblichus did not attempt to directly refute Christianity, he shaped the *Vit. Pyth.* into a tale of a divine soul incarnated with a message of enlightenment for humanity, as Meredith put it, ‘a more than adequate rival of Christ, in precisely those areas where Christians claimed that Christ was unique’.\(^{226}\) In this work, Pythagoras, whose birth was foretold by the Delphic Oracle, was the son of Apollo and the human woman Parthenis (Iambl., *Vit. Pyth.* II.5-6).\(^{227}\) His soul was ‘sent to humankind from Apollo’s retinue, and was Apollo’s companion or still more intimately linked with him’ (Iambl., *Vit. Pyth.* II.8).\(^{228}\) In his adulthood, the people ‘counted him among the gods’, and while some called him Apollo Healer (Paian), others claimed he had ‘appeared in human form (ἐν ἄνθρωπινῃ μορφῇ φανῆναι) to the people of that time for the benefit and amendment of mortal life, and to grant mortal nature the saving

\(^{223}\) Porphyry briefly referenced magic as the source of Christ’s signs, as it was for the Egyptian Magi, Apollonius, and Apuleius. Harnack (1916), 46, frag. 4 = Jerome, *Tract. de Ps.* LXXI 225ff (CCL 78.89); cf. Barnes (1976), 241.

\(^{224}\) The text and translation of Eusebius’ *Contra Hieroclem* is that of Jones (2006). In my attribution of Eusebius as the source, I recognise the strong possibility of a different Eusebius: Hagg (1992); Barnes (1994b), 60 n. 25.

\(^{225}\) The dating for Iamblichus’ work is based on when his pupil Sopater joined Constantine’s court, Clark (1989), xi.

\(^{226}\) Meredith (1980), 1124-5; Clark, (1989), ix, xi.

\(^{227}\) Dillon (1991), 35.

\(^{228}\) The text of Iamblichus is that of Deubner and Klein (1975), and the translation is that of Clark (1989).
spark of happiness and philosophy’ (Iambl., Vit. Pyth. VI.30). For Iamblichus, the priest Abaris met Pythagoras and ‘He was convinced, by most sacred tokens which he saw in Pythagoras and which he had, as a priest, foreseen, that this was no other: not a human being resembling the god, but really Apollo’ (Iambl., Vit. Pyth. XIX.91). Pythagoras revealed his purpose to Abaris, namely that ‘he had come for the welfare and benefit of humanity. For that reason he was in human form’ [ἄνθρωπομορφός] (Iambl., Vit. Pyth. XIX.92). Dillon notes possible similarities between Pythagoras and Christ involving the miraculous catch of fish (Iambl., Vit. Pyth. VIII.36; Mt. 1.16-20; Mk. 4.18-22; Lk. 5.1-11), and the discourses with followers. Despite Meredith’s protest that ‘there is not a single reference either to Christ or to Christianity’, and the work is therefore too oblique to be a riposte to Christianity, I agree with Philip that the conceptual parallels are strong and these passages were likely intended to provide a counter-weight to Christianity.

Julian may have drawn for inspiration on the writings of Hierocles and Iamblichus, who had equated Apollonius and Pythagoras with Christ. Beyond this, he may have found more specific inspiration in an offhand comment made by Celsus, who had asked why when Christ became a god, he did not become Asclepius, Dionysus, or Heracles. This even took place with Christian authors,

---

229 Ironically, Meredith (1980), 1124, notes Iamblichus VI.30’s similarity to Phil. 2.
230 Clark (1989), 2-3 cautions that while Iamblichus’ system did not allow for a divine incarnation in the material world in the Christian sense, that still did not disallow Pythagoras being ‘a theophany of Apollo’.
231 Dillon (1991), 26, 61, 63.
such as Justin Martyr, who in the second century had noted the surface similarity between Heracles, Asclepius, and Christ (Dial. LXXIX.3):²³⁴

And when it is asserted that Hercules, the son of Jupiter and Alcmene, was strong and traversed the whole earth, and that, after death, he, too, ascended into heaven, ought I not conclude that the Scriptural passage about Christ, ‘strong as a giant to run his course’, was similarly imitated? And when the devil presents Aesculapius as raising the dead to life and curing all diseases, has he not, in this regard, also, emulated the prophecies about Christ?

Perhaps taking his cue from such texts, Julian engaged in a deliberate re-crafting of pagan deities, transferring characteristics from Christ to Asclepius and Heracles in order to counter the Christian presentation of Christ. The relationship between the writings of Celsus and Julian takes on more power when one realizes that Julian portrayed Dionysus as one of the traditional gods integrally related to Helios. Julian equated these gods to Helios in different ways, writing that Zeus coincided with him (XI.143d), Apollo abode with him and shared his οὐσίας or ‘substance’ (XI.144a), Dionysios shared his throne (XI.144b), and Asclepius was begotten by him (XI.144b).

Wright suggests that in Julian’s discussion of the gods in Or. XI, his apparent intention was to ‘provide the Hellenic counterpart of the positive revealed religion of Christianity’.²³⁵ This is in contrast to Meredith, who writes, ‘And yet, with all this, it must be added that there is not a single reference either to Christ or to

²³⁴ The text of Justin’s Dialogue with Trypho is that of Falls (1948).
²³⁵ Wright (1913), 351.
Christianity’. These Hellenic parallels are conceptual, not verbal. Technically, what Julian did with Christian texts was not allusion, which implies intellectual engagement with one particular text. In his engagement of Christian theological texts, Julian did not want to draw a direct allusion to them, but because he was engaging their concepts, it produced a genuine intertextual relationship. Julian was not disguising the framework, but also did not want to give credit to Christianity. Rather, Julian’s examples of striking and unavoidable similarity are a case of theology engaging theology.

4. CONCLUSION

This engagement took the form in Julian’s writings of a Heracles who walked on water, was the son of the high god Zeus-Helios and a virgin mother, and was begotten to be the saviour of the world (VII.219d-220a); a Hermes who was the divine guide to salvation and the high god Zeus-Helios (VII.230a); and an Asclepius who was the pre-existent son of Zeus-Helios, begotten to be the saviour of the world, specifically of sinful souls, and incarnated as a man (XI.144b, 153b; C. Gal. 200ab). These claims demand that a concern be addressed first, namely the prevalence of syncretism in this period and the possibility of accidental cross-pollination. If the appropriation of theological characteristics were going the other direction - if, say, Athanasius had claimed that in Christ’s descent to Hell he borrowed and returned Cerberus - would one require verbal parallels before recognizing a deliberate co-opting of classical literary material? The likelihood that

---

236 Meredith (1980), 1125.
Julian, intelligent and trained both classically and in Christian theology, would unwittingly make such statements accidentally must be considered as remote indeed, but make such statements he did. It had taken centuries for the men Asclepius and Heracles to become gods, but in Julian’s hands, they became overnight gods who incarnated as men to become saviours of the world. The parallel with Iamblichus is particularly striking when one considers Iamblichus’ presentation of Pythagoras the son of Apollo (Vit. Pyth. II.5-6), and Julian’s presentation of Asclepius the son of Helios-Apollo-Zeus (XI.144b, 153b; C.Gal. 200ab), and that of Heracles the son of Zeus (VII.219d-220a). Julian’s re-crafting of the gods Asclepius and Heracles was unique, taking Christian attributes of Christ that he and other pagan writers rejected in principle, and reallocating them to existing pagan gods. These attributes were not insignificant, but some of the central facets of Christian theology. Co-opting these theological attributes for paganism would have detracted significantly from Christianity’s uniqueness and potency. This means that according to our extant evidence, Julian stands as the great synthesiser of the two streams of thought among the anti-Christian writers, although it should be noted that Jerome does mention that Porphyry referenced magic as the source of Christ’s signs, as it was for the Egyptian Magi, Apollonius, and Apuleius.  

237 This tactic, along with Julian’s forcing Christian teachers out of education (Ep. 61c.424; cf. C.Th. XIII.3.5), and arguing that Christ was not divine in his polemic Contra Galilaeos (C. Gal. 39a; cf. Ep. 90), was a strategic attempt to undercut Christianity without resorting to persecution or brute force.

237 Harnack (1916), 46, frag. 4 = Jerome, Tract. de Ps. LXXXI 225ff (CCL 78.89); cf. Barnes (1976), 241.
This chapter begins in broad strokes to outline the literary aspect of Julian’s *similitudo* and *iteratio*. As I will examine more fully in the next chapters, Julian’s recrafting of Heracles and Asclepius paralleled some aspects of Constantine, Julian, and Christ. Julian’s attacks on Christianity also contained an element of supplantation, overwriting the core components of Constantine’s religion with an alternative pagan narrative. Julian’s use of these gods, his Christian sources, and his purpose within his overarching campaign of recapitulation will be explored fully.
CHAPTER FOUR:
HERACLES, CHRIST, AND JULIAN

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter will examine a traditional component of paganism that the young emperor synthesized in a new way in his Or. VII, composed for the festival of Cybele in March of A.D. 362. In this work, the clearest place in all Julian’s writings where he lays out a framework for his response to Christianity, he took the Cynic philosopher Heracleios to task for his impertinence and improper use of myth. This chastisement allowed Julian to proceed successively through critiquing the Cynics as a whole, the Christians who bore some similarities to the Cynics, discussing the proper use of myth, and then presenting an autobiographical ‘myth’ which cast the Christians and their exemplar Constantine in the worst light. The overall theme of the autobiographical myth embedded within Or. VII is the choice of Julian for a divine mission to restore the worship of the gods. Julian populated the myth with the gods Zeus-Helios, Athena, and Hermes, as well as human characters representing himself, Constantine, and Constantius II.\(^{238}\) These portrayals can be easily overlooked within a complex and multi-layered work in which he also chastised an irreverent philosopher, reiterated his justifications for rebelling against his cousin Constantius II (cf. V.270c-271d), presented a re-crafted version of Heracles, and laid

\(^{238}\) Although Julian refers to ‘the youth’, ‘his uncle’, and ‘his cousin’, it will be clearer to refer to them by name. Commentators agree regarding these identities: Wright (1913), 137; Rochefort (1963), 76; Athanassiadi (1981), 172; Smith (1995), 185; Guido (2000), 153.
out his government program. Julian portrayed himself as a second Hercules and son of the high god Helios-Zeus, whom Julian viewed as being two hypostases of the same god alongside the Good in a tripartite Neo-platonic framework. Scholars have briefly noted this, as Wright did in her introduction to Julian’s *Oration Against Heraclius*, holding that Julian ‘plays the part of a second Heracles’.  

Recent research in this area necessitates a re-evaluation of what this means, as emperors had appropriated the trappings of divinity for some centuries, with some like Maximian specifically claiming association with Hercules. In the past, scholars were content to rely upon Cicero and Varro’s skepticism as representative of the Roman people’s views on emperor worship. Many scholars accepted that people rather cynically engaged in acts of worship, but did not believe the human emperor to be divine. Emperor worship has been characterised as merely an ‘institutional metaphor’. This is possibly influenced by a Christian concept of divinity that emphatically placed a gulf between human and divine, *das ganz Andere* or ‘the wholly other’. The acts themselves were qualified by the insistence that any worship must have only been of the deceased emperor (Cassius Dio, *Roman History* L1.20.6), or of their *numen* or *genius*. Hopkins argues against this distinction: ‘Most people probably did not bother with the demarcation; the emperor was clearly both man and god’. The approach has shifted in the last thirty years to a focus on
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240 This is complicated by Julian presenting the two hypostases as speaking to one another, but is most clearly seen in Julian XI.136d-140a; cf. the discussion in Elm (2012), 293-99; A. Smith (2012), 229-37.
241 Wright (1913), 70; cf. Athanassiadi (1981), 133.
242 L. Taylor (1931), 237-8; Bowersock (1973), 180-7;
244 Otto (1925), 25; Weinreich (1926), 633; Klauck (1996), 72.
the acts performed by Romans, characterised by Peppard as focusing on the terrain itself rather than a map to it.\textsuperscript{247} In addition, this view suggests that divinity was seen as being on a ‘sliding scale’ without the unbridgeable gulf between it and humanity.\textsuperscript{248} This evidence assembled by a group of modern scholars strongly suggests that Roman people apparently worshipped the living emperor as part of an ‘honours for benefaction’ structure, both in the eastern provinces and in Italy.\textsuperscript{249} This has implications for the reign of Julian, and lends a new perspective to his presentation of himself as the son of god.

Julian displayed his talent for creative synthesis in this presentation of himself and his link to the divine, combining the mimetic ruler-philosophies of both pagans and Christians, as exemplified by Maximian and Constantine, and also subtly presenting himself to the classically-educated among his audience as Hermes, the divine guide both of and to the gods.\textsuperscript{250} Thus, in response to Constantine’s apostasy, Julian announced his divine mission was to cleanse the empire of Christian impiety and call upon the gods (VII.231d), a mission in which he presented himself not only as the divinely chosen champion Heracles, but also as the divine guide Hermes.

2. RULERS AND DIVINITY

The Greco-Roman world was familiar with the language of divinity used for rulers. In addition to outside cultures with divine rulers such as the pharaohs, Alexander the

\textsuperscript{247} Peppard (2011), 33.
\textsuperscript{248} Toynbee (1947), 126-7; cf. Nock (1928), 31; Gradel (2002), 25-6.
\textsuperscript{249} Clauss (1996), 400; Ando (2000), 385-98; Gradel (2002); Peppard (2011), 39.
\textsuperscript{250} Libanius, \textit{Or.} XVIII.157 reported that Julian claimed to have composed \textit{Or.} VII on one day in Constantinople, but the work is sophisticatedly layered, suggesting that we may be dealing with the panegyrical \textit{topos} of a composition tossed off quickly with great facility; cf. Lib., \textit{Or.} XII.94.
Great claimed to be the son of Ammon (Arrian, *Anabasis* 3.3-4), a move which Julian criticised in an early speech in 356 (I.45d-46a). Perhaps more pertinently to this study, Alexander was also reported as affecting the lionskin and club of Heracles, as well as dressing as Hermes in public (Athenaeus 12.537e). By Julian’s time, Roman emperors had claimed divinity for several centuries. In a culture heavily influenced by Christianity, moderns tend to think of divine and human as two radically separated categories. However, that was not the ‘honours for benefactions’ system of the Roman empire, where divine and human honors differed in degree, not kind.\(^{251}\)

One aspect of the treatment of living emperors as gods is their relation to their predecessor, an example of which was the relation of C. Julius Caesar and his adopted son Octavian. Following his assassination, Caesar was declared *divi Iulius* by the Roman Senate in 42 B.C., followed by Octavian’s adoption in turn of the title *divi filius*. While many moderns have projected an attitude of tolerant disbelief onto the Roman populace, continued research, particularly into material evidence, demonstrates that emperor worship was widespread and taken seriously.\(^{252}\) As one scholar has noted,

> Sophisticated Romans may not have believed that the emperor was a god, nor did the courtiers who saw him, but they sacrificed to him, as though he was a god, and perhaps they covered the conflict of evidence with a metaphysical metaphor - god made manifest, son of god, the least of gods but highest of mortals, son of Apollo, Hercules on earth.\(^{253}\)

\(^{253}\) Hopkins (1978), 242.
This practice of emperor worship continued to develop over time, as the emperor Commodus tried to assimilate himself to Hercules to the extent of converting the statue Colossus into his own image, styled as Hercules.\textsuperscript{254} This took on a different flavour in the third century, when Aurelian (emperor A.D. 270-75) emphasised the worship of Sol Invictus, the god associated with his \textit{gens}, and adopted the title \textit{deus et dominus natus}.\textsuperscript{255} Diocletian (emperor A.D. 284-305) established the Tetrarchic system in A.D. 293, with the eastern and western empire each led by an Augustus and a Caesar. Many emperors related themselves to their deified predecessors, but Diocletian not only refined the imperial power structure, but promulgated a different mode of being the son of god. Within this structure, Diocletian as the senior Augustus was the son of Jupiter and head of the ‘Jovian’ line, with Maximian the junior Augustus as son of Hercules and head of the junior ‘Herculian’ line (\textit{Pan. Lat.} X(II).11.6). Marcel Simon holds that Diocletian’s use of Jupiter and Hercules and their father/son relationship was a deliberate engagement of Christianity: ‘Rather than being meant to attract its followers, his theological system may have endeavoured to resist it by borrowing from it the elements of a line of defence’.\textsuperscript{256}

Simmons summarizes the message of Diocletian’s new ‘imperial theology:’ ‘A new age has dawned: the great heavenly emperor manifests his will through his son, the great king of earth.’\textsuperscript{257} The newness of this development was noted by numerous observers and close contemporaries (Lact., \textit{De mort.} LII.3; Aur. Vict., \textit{De Caes.} 39; Eutr. IX.26; Amm. XV.5.18.). The two Emperors were \textit{diis genitis et deorum

\textsuperscript{255} Dumézil (1970), 422-3, 621; cf. Hijmans (2009), 601.
\textsuperscript{256} Simon (1973), 398.
\textsuperscript{257} Simmons (1996), 69.
creatoribus, ‘born of gods and creators of gods’ (ILS 629). An anonymous panegyrist spoke of the adoration of the emperors’ subjects (Pan. Lat. XI.10.5):\(^{258}\)

\begin{quote}
non opinione traditus sed conspicuus et praesens Iuppiter cominus
inuocari, non aduena sed imperator Hercules adorari.
\end{quote}

they invoked not the god transmitted by conjecture, but a visible and present Jupiter near at hand, they adored Hercules not as the stranger but as the emperor.

Diocletian demanded obeisance as to a god, and taking this motif seriously to the end, when he retired and invested new leaders with the purple, he did so in front of a column with a statue of Jupiter (Pan. Lat. XI.10.5; Eutr., Breviarum IX.26; Lact., De mort. XIX.2). For Romans, this concept was reinforced every time they looked at the coins declaring this imperial theology, as well as the shrines to Jupiter and Hercules, which acted as ‘force-multipliers’ for the ubiquitous images of the emperors.\(^{259}\) The emperors thus became Jovii and Herculii, Julian’s grandfather being part of the Herculian line.

Constantine, a Herculian himself, though a failed one from Julian’s perspective, was the first Roman emperor to embrace Christianity, and in so doing crafted a particular role for himself as something more than the champion of his faith. Prior to this shift, he had accepted praise as a divine emperor (Pan. Lat. VI.1.5-2.5). In autumn 324, Constantine composed his Letter to Alexander and Arius, urging the

\(^{258}\) The text and translation of the Pan. Lat. are those of Rodgers and Nixon (1994).

\(^{259}\) RIC 6.700-701.
two peacefully to resolve their Christological differences, and claiming he was
divinely called by God as his helper to restore the state (Vit. Const. II.64-5). This
public statement demonstrates Constantine’s successful integration of his imperial
role within his new religion, portraying himself as not only the champion of
Christianity, but in a sense the earthly mirror of the Christian God, the two working
in harmony to fulfill the divine plan on earth. This theme was adopted and expanded
by Eusebius in his De laudibus Constantini, written for Constantine’s Tricennalia in
Constantinople on 25 July 336, in which he lauded the emperor and his relation to
his God. In the De laudibus Constantini Eusebius made significant use of the
concept of μίμησις, with Constantine in his kingdom mirroring God in heaven,
explicitly stating that ἃνω βλέπων κατὰ τὴν ἀρχήτοπον ἰδέας τοῦς κάτω
dιακυβέρνων ἰθνεί, ‘looking upwards, he makes straight below, steering by the
archetypal form’ (De laud. III.5). Eusebius drew a clear parallel between
Constantine and Christ, portraying the emperor even more explicitly as a mimetic
messiah. The Christian Christ and the first Christian emperor shared important
functions. As the Λόγος prepared the cosmos for God’s Kingdom, Constantine
prepared his subjects for the Kingdom (De laud. II.2). As the Λόγος opposed
demons, Constantine opposed the earthly ‘opponents of truth’ (De laud. II.3). As the

---

260 For dating, Barnes (2011), 120.
261 It is important to note that Julian was educated by those associated closely with Eusebius, and that
 Julian evidently knew Eusebius’ writings well. Julian’s education had been supervised by Eusebius,
bishop of Nicomedia and Constantinople, and George, later bishop of Alexandria, two figures chosen
by Constantine’s son Constantius II and broadly in sympathy with Eusebius’ theology. Since
Eusebius of Caesarea was a major writer of the previous generation, it is highly likely that Julian was
exposed to much of Eusebius’ work. We know for certain that Julian was familiar with one work of
Eusebius, as in Julian’s Contra Galilaeos (CG) he cited Eusebius’ large work Preparatio Evangelica.
Indeed, the nature of Julian’s assessment of Eusebius implies a familiarity with the author and his
overall work, as the young emperor, a rather harsh reviewer, titled him ‘the wretched Eusebius’ (C.
Gal. 222a, Prep. Evan. XI.5.5). Bouffartigue (1992), 385-6, has demonstrated the extent of Julian’s
‘direct consultation’ of the Preparatio Evangelica, showing that Julian followed Eusebius’s argument
in his own Contra Galilaeos.
262 Drake (1976), 75; Averil Cameron (1991), 56.
Λόγος implanted seeds in men allowing them the knowledge of God, Constantine was the interpreter and proclaimer calling men to that knowledge (De laud. II.4). As the Λόγος opened the gates of God’s kingdom, Constantine opened the imperial court to holy men (De laud. II.5). Like the Λόγος, Eusebius described Constantine as a ποιμένος ἄγαθον, ‘good shepherd’ (De laud. II.3; cf. II.5, Jn. 10), a charioteer (De laud. III.4, VI6.9), and οἶα μεγάλου βασιλέως ὑπάρχω, ‘a prefect of the great King’ (De laud. VII.13). While heaping praise upon emperors was nothing new, Eusebius’ intense and sustained Christological focus was different from both conventional emperor worship and panegyric. This cemented the relationship between Constantine and his God whom he mirrored, and reinforced his role as the earthly example for mankind to follow.

3. HERACLES, SON OF THE HIGH GOD AND THE VIRGIN MOTHER

Bowersock has argued that Julian ‘used the imperial cult for laughs’ in the Caesars, but while Julian may have used satire in relation to it, the general direction of evidence suggests this is a wrong emphasis. Julian responded to Constantine, whom he sought to supplant, and whose apostasy from Helios he saw as the root of the current troubles. As part of his plan to recapitulate the Constantinian revolution, Julian not only restored temples and wrote polemically against Christianity, but also wrote of himself as called to cleanse his ancestral house of impiety, to call men to knowledge of the gods, and to act as the chosen steward of the gods. While previous emperors such as Diocletian had frequently asserted an exalted relationship to a god,

263 Note the parallel to Julian as the ἐπίτροπος or ‘steward’ of the gods.
264 Bowersock (1973), 186.
this was a more subtle literary approach, with Julian not merely invoking the name of a god, but restructuring that god into a messianic model, portraying himself as a very Christ-like Heracles, the son of Zeus-Helios. Like Constantine, Julian moved beyond generally divine terminology and portrayed himself as the mimetic image of a deity, although a pagan one.

In his *Or. VII, To the Cynic Heraclius*, Julian re-crafted the divine hero Heracles into the image of Christ. Heracles was a significant choice, as the national god of Hellenism, and ‘the Roman hero par excellence’.\(^{265}\) The catalyst for Julian’s spring 362 oration in Constantinople was the Cynic philosopher Heraclius’ public oration, in which he cast himself as Zeus, chastising Julian as Pan (Julian, VII.234cd).\(^{266}\) In the work, Julian criticised Heraclius’ irreverent use of myth, and as a counter example provided his own myth, a thinly disguised version of his early life, in which he outlined his personal history and future plans in reaction to the Constantinian revolution. Prior to this, Julian addressed the understanding of myth regarding Heracles. In the original myths, Heracles had been presented as a half-god, half-man who was deified. He was fathered by Zeus upon the human woman Alcmene, and after a lifetime of heroic labors died and ascended to Olympus (*Iliad* XVIII.117-9). The reported site on Mount Oetia was a site where cult was performed quadrennially.\(^{267}\) Burkert sums up the appeal of Heracles: ‘Here the divine is close at hand in human form, not as an Apollonian antitype, but as an inspiring prototype’.\(^{268}\)

\(^{266}\) Cf. Smith (1995), 89. Julian mentions that Heraclius profaned Helios and wrote of someone (presumably himself) being cast as Phaethon, *Or. VII.208ab*. From this, Athanassiadi (1981), 131-2, plausibly reconstructs Heraclius’ allegory as a parody of Julian as the inept son of Helios trying to drive his father’s chariot.
\(^{268}\) Burkert (1985), 211.
Despite this established history, Julian’s revised version of Heracles had developed many Christ-like attributes (VII.219d-220a):

For instance, when in swaddling clothes he strangled the serpents, and then ranging himself against the natural elements, heat and cold, then to the most difficult and unconquerable circumstances, I mean in need of nourishment and in isolation. I think of his journey across the open sea in the golden cup, and this I think by the gods was not truly a cup, but I believe he walked on the sea as on dry land. For what was impossible to Heracles? What of the so-called elements enslaved to the creative and consummating power of his immaculate and pure mind did not hearken to his divine and most pure flesh? Him great Zeus through Athena who is forethought begat to be the
saviour of the world, and placed as guardian over him this goddess he had
brought forth whole from the whole of himself.269

Rochefort notes that this description of Heracles’ poverty and isolation are unique to Julian.270 While Nesselrath sees here a direct comparison to Jesus in the wilderness (Mk. 1/Mt. 4/Lk. 4), I think Wright was correct in noting Julian’s parallel to himself at VII.230b (see below).271 In Julian’s account, we see several new elements. Lucian (Philopseudes 13) reminds us that water-walking to pagans suggested magic, but instead Heracles was able to walk on water specifically because he commanded the elements owing to his divine creative nature. While Julian’s passage does not parallel any single Christian text, the components are all found in the Christian Scriptures. In a pericope recorded in three gospels (Mt. 14.22-33, Mk. 6.45-52, Jn. 6.16-21), Christ is seen walking on the water (περιπατο/uni1FEEντα ἐπί τής θαλάσσης) and demonstrating a command of the elements.272 This caused his disciples to worship him as divinity (Mt. 14.33), a divine recognition based on the recalling of God’s creative power over the elements (Gen. 1) and his control over the parting of the Red Sea (Ex. 14-15). The place of this pericope in the patristic period is demonstrated by the mural of Christ walking on water at the preserved church at Dura Europos.273

269 Zeus-Helios τῶν κόσμων σωτήρα φύτευσεν, “begat to be the saviour of the world” Heracles, whose physical nature was τὴν θεία καὶ καθαρωτάτη. Guido 2000, 156, points out that Athena in Julian’s hands is not extruded from Zeus’ head, but taken whole from the whole of him, in essence a replica (cf. Julian, XI.149b). Here, Zeus and Athena are presented as identical in substance and separate in person. Προνοίας Ἀθηνᾶ was the goddess’ cult title at Delphi and Delos: Liddell and Scott (1995), 1491.

270 Rochefort (1963), 63.

271 Nesselrath (2008), 213; Wright (1913), 139.


Heracles, originally the son of Alcmene and Zeus via sexual intercourse, in Julian’s hands became the son of Athena the virgin goddess and Zeus, whom Julian in Neoplatonic fashion equated with Helios. Julian wrote of Zeus and Helios as equivalent in a fairly typical Neoplatonic structure, with The One, Zeus, and Helios occupying the three hypostases or realities. Helios was the high god of the intelligible realm. Elsewhere, Julian equated Helios, Apollo, and Mithra. Julian ‘recognised that for philosophers and men of letters the old simple faith in the gods of Homer could never take the place of the monotheism that philosophy had been teaching for centuries’.

This new begetting for Heracles recalled Christ’s virgin birth in the gospels and the early third-century Roman Creed: τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου (Mt. 1.18-23, Lk. 1.26-35). Most significantly, Heracles was now begotten to be the saviour of the world. While the title σωτήρ, ‘saviour or deliverer’, was commonly used of the emperor, as in Augustus’ Priene Calendar Inscription (OGIS 458), the term had also become a fixed title for Christ by the close of the first century. The key differences in Christian theology were that Christ was a universal saviour whose saving beneficence was not limited to the citizens of one socio-political body, and was a restoring saviour of souls from sin, rather than a political saviour who restored order to a nation. These distinctions disappear when looking at Julian’s similar treatment

---

274 Wright (1896), 46; cf. Athanassiadi and Frede (1999), 191.
275 The Old Roman Creed or R was the ancestor of the Apostles’ Creed, and in the second clause Christ was born via the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary [qui natus est Spiritu sancto ex Maria virgine, τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου]. Kelly (1972), 100-30. While Hippolytus’ authorship of the Apostolic Traditions, primary source of R, has recently come under fire, this point regarding the Virgin Birth is also supported by the use of the ‘proto-creed’ or ‘Rule of Faith’ in other authors, e.g. Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. I.10.1 (c. A.D. 180); Tert., Praescr. 13 (c. A.D. 200); Origen, De Princ. I.4 (c. A.D. 220).
of Asclepius (see chapter five). Julian’s statement here that Heracles was begotten to be the saviour of the world is quite close to that found in 1 Jn. 4.14, which stated, ‘the Father has sent his son to be the saviour of the world’ (σωτήρα τοῦ κόσμου).²⁷⁷

Modern scholars are aware that Julian’s presentation here is unusual, although their comments are primarily in passing or a footnote. Wright dismissed this as a mere ‘sneer at the Christians’.²⁷⁸ Lacombrade concluded in a footnote that Julian positioned both Heracles and Asclepius as ‘saviours of the world’ and pagan counters to Christ.²⁷⁹ Simon and Bouffartigue see the Christian parallel, although both view Athena as equivalent to the Holy Spirit.²⁸⁰ In his work on Ammianus, Barnes mentions Heracles’ role as saviour, water-walker, and ‘the son of Athena, a virgin mother on the model of Mary, the mother of God’.²⁸¹ Nesselrath provides the most thorough summary, although he does not identify possible sources of Julian’s material.²⁸²

4. JULIAN, SON OF THE HIGH GOD AND THE VIRGIN MOTHER

In this myth, a rich man (manifestly Constantine) apostatized away from Helios, bringing consequences upon his people. When he died his nephew (described only as a boy but clearly Julian) ran afoul of one of the heirs, his cousin (Constantius II), who murdered his family and imprisoned him.²⁸³ The boy was revealed to be the son

²⁷⁷ Cf. Jn. 3.16-17.
²⁷⁸ Wright (1913), 111.
²⁷⁹ Lacombrade (1964), 131.
²⁸² Nesselrath (2008), 213-14.
²⁸³ These identifications are recognised by all commentators: Wright (1913), 137; Rochefort (1963), 76; Athanassiadi (1981), 172; Smith (1995), 185; Guido (2000), 153.
of Athena the virgin goddess and Helios, whom Julian equated with Zeus (Or. VII.229c-230a):

Λέγειν δὲ ὁ Ζεὺς ἀρχεῖ τρὸς τὸν Ἡλίου — Ἑλιοκρήνη, "Τούτι τὸ παιδίον;" ἔφη· ἐξηγεῖτο δὲ ἢν αὐτὸν ἄρα παρερριμένον που καὶ ἀμελούμενον, ἀδελφιδοὺς ἐκείνου τοῦ πλουσίου καὶ ἄνεσις τῶν κληρονόμων· «τούτῳ», ἔφη, «σὸν ἐστιν ἐκγονον. Ὅμοιον οὖν τὸ ἐμὸν τε καὶ σὸν σκηντρον. ἦ μὴ ἐπιμελῆςεθαι διαφερόντως αὐτοῦ καὶ ποιμανεῖν αὐτὸ καὶ θεραπεύσειν τῆς νόσου. Ὅρης γὰρ ὅπως οἶον ὑπὸ καπνὸς ῥύπου τε ἀναπέλησται καὶ λιγνύσς. κίνδυνός τε τὸ ὑπὸ σοῦ σπαρέν ἐν αὐτῷ πῦρ ἀποσβήναι, ἢ μὴ σὺ γε δύσεαι ἀλλήν. Σοὶ δὲ ἐγὼ τε ἐξηγοῦσοι καὶ οἱ Μοῖραι κομίζε οὖν αὐτὸ καὶ τρέφει. Ἀκούσας ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡλίου ἑφράνθη τε ὡς ἡθείς τῷ βρέφει, σωζόμενον ἐπὶ καθορῶν ἐν αὐτῷ σπευθηρα μικρὸν εἰς ἰατροῦ, καὶ τὸ ἐντεῦθεν ἔτρεφεν ἐκεῖνο τὸ παιδίον, ἐξαγαγὼν. 'Εκ θ' αἰματος ἐκ τε κυδοίμου ἐκ τ' ἀνδροκτασίης· ὁ πατήρ δὲ ὁ Ζεὺς ἐκέλευσε καὶ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν, τὴν ἀμήτορα τὴν παρθένον, ἢμα τῷ Ἡλίῳ τὸ παιδάριον ἐκτρέφειν.

And then Zeus started to speak to Helios, ‘This is the child,’ he said. And the child was a blood-relation of those, who had been cast out and uncared for, a nephew of that rich man and first cousin of the heirs. He said, ‘This is your offspring.284 Swear by my scepter and yours to shepherd him.

---

284 While ἐκγονος or ‘offspring’ is a frequently used word, it is worth noting its use regarding Heracles in Euripides, Heracles 876: ὁ Δίος ἐκγονος, “son of Zeus.”
especially and to heal him of his illness.\textsuperscript{285} For you see how he is as if stricken by smoke, filth, and soot, and [in] danger that the fire sowed in him by you will be extinguished, if you will not exert your strength.\textsuperscript{286} But the Fates and I will give place to you, therefore save and rear him.’ King Helios heard this and was cheered and took pleasure in the babe, seeing that in him a small spark of himself was saved. And from then he reared that child he had brought forth from the blood and tumult and slaughter of men. And Father Zeus commanded motherless Athena the virgin to rear the child together with Helios.

Julian’s representative relationship with the divine was strengthened, as he portrayed himself as not only the representative of the gods, but having a special relationship with his personal god, much as did Constantine. While Julian wrote elsewhere that Helios was ‘the common father of all mankind’ (\textit{Or.} XI.131c), his treatment in the myth in \textit{Or.} VII highlights a special and unique relationship between the god and himself. Julian reinforced this dichotomy, writing that Helios cared for the whole race in common, but created Julian’s soul from eternity and made him his follower (XI.157a). It is significant that Helios was not only Julian’s god, but also was the god from whom in Julian’s view, Constantine had apostatized. Julian strengthened this language of ‘rearing’ in a discourse he placed in the mouth of Athena, addressing the boy, shortly thereafter: Μάνθανε . . . ὃς λήστε, πατρὸς ἀγαθοῦ τούτου τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐμὸν βλάστημα, ‘Understand, dearest, offspring of myself and

\textsuperscript{285} While the immediate context for νόσος suggests physical ‘suffering’, Julian uses this term regularly in the sense of ‘illness’ to refer to his Christian upbringing, \textit{C. Gal.} 327b; \textit{Ep.} 61.424b; \textit{Ep.} 98.401c.

\textsuperscript{286} Literally, ‘if you will not put on strength’, Homer, \textit{Iliad} 9.231, in which Odysseus exhorts Achilles to return to the fight.
of this good god your father!’ (VII.232d). This further parallels the virgin mother of God in Christian theology. Julian’s associate Libanius responded specifically to the above excerpt when he described young Julian: ἦν γὰρ τις σπινθηρὸς μαντικὴς αὐτόθι κρυπτόμενος μόλις διαφυγὼν τὰς χεῖρας τῶν δυσσεβῶν, ‘There was hidden there a spark of prophetic fire that had barely escaped the hands of the disbelievers.’ (Or. XIII.11)

Those who knew Julian well reflected back his rhetoric in their own writings, repeatedly attributing characteristics of Heracles to Julian. Himerius was a Bithynian rhetorician educated at Athens, and an enthusiastic supporter of Julian (Him., Or. XLI.2; Eun., Vit. Soph. XIV.1). In his oration in Julian’s Constantinople given in December 361 or January 362, he claimed to have engaged in Mithraic ritual with the emperor in Constantine’s city, equating Mithra, Apollo, and Helios (Or. XLI.1). Himerius continued, equating Apollo and Helios in his thank-offering for all the initiates. This appears to be a claim to restoration of pagan cult, given Eusebius’ claim that Constantine had purified his new city of polluting pagan sacrifice (Vit. Const. III.48.2). Himerius’ synthesis here, first of Mithra and Helios, then of Apollo and Helios, is similar to Julian’s in his Or. XI. He wrote that due to Julian’s sharing his nature with Helios, he was able to enlighten people and show them a better way: ἔδει γὰρ αὐτὸν ἥλιον φύσιν συνάπτοντα ὁμοὶ τε λάμψαι καὶ φηναι βίον τὸν κρεῖττονα, ‘After all, one would have expected someone who links his nature with the Sun both to give light and to reveal a better life’ (Or. XLI.92-3).

The sophist Eunapius of Sardis wrote that he was sixteen during Julian’s reign (Vit. Soph. X.8.3.2). Despite this, his Lives of the Sophists, supplemented by the

---

287 Jones (1971), 436.
288 The text of Himerius is that of Colonna (1951), and the translation that of Penella (2007).
fragments that survive of his *Universal History*, provide information we would not otherwise have on Julian, as he made use of the ‘detailed memorandum’ of Julian’s personal physician Oribasius of Pergamon (Eunapius, *Exc. de Sent.* 5). Oribasius was Julian’s confidant from the beginning of his quest for the throne through to his death in Persia (Amm. XXV.5.1). Though exiled following Julian’s death, he provided Eunapius with the Julianic material for his *Universal History*, produced in various editions from perhaps as early as A.D. 380. Eunapius confirmed that Julian called the Sun (Helios) his own father, clarifying that Julian was by no means claiming that Helios had impregnated his mother Basilina, but was asserting divine ancestry, as numerous emperors had done before him (Eun., frag. 28.5 Blockley):

> ὁ Ἰουλιανὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς ἰδιὸν [πατέρα] ἀνακαλεῖ τὸν ἢλιον, οὐχ ὅσπερ Ἀλέξανδρος διαβάλλεται φάσκων πρὸς τὴν Ἡραν ὅτι Ὀλυμπιὰς αὐτὸν ἐκ Δίῳς ἀνελομένη τοῦτο οὐκ ἀπεκρύπτετο.

Julian in his letters calls the Sun his own father, not in the sense that Alexander made his false claim, saying to Hera that Olympias, having conceived him of Zeus, did not conceal the fact.

Unless we are to consider ἐπιστολαῖς as including Julian’s orations, this suggests that what Julian put forth in his public orations about his relationship with Helios also existed in private correspondence to which Oribasius or Eunapius had access.

---

290 The text of the fragments of Eunapius here is Boissevain (1906), and the translation that of Blockley (1983); Blockley 28.5 = Dindorf I.229.3-6.
Eunapius emphasized the divine recognition of this special claim to being the son of Helios, who rode his chariot across the heavens. He wrote (fr. 28.4 Blockley): 291

προσαγορεύων ὁ θεός τὸν Ἰουλιανόν φησιν

Ὡ τέκος ἀρμελάταο θεοῦ, μεδέοντος ἀπάντων

the god spoke thus to Julian:

‘Ο child of the charioteer god, who is ruler of all’

Eunapius also related that when Julian prayed and made sacrifice on his expedition in Persia, he received a prophecy of a glorious end that following glorious victory over the Persians he would be taken by fiery chariot to his ‘father’s halls of heavenly light’ on Olympus (fr. 28.6 Blockley). 292 Again, we see the reference to Julian’s heavenly father Helios, familiar from the emperor’s pen in VII.230a and 232d. While a single instance of such language could be easily dismissed as rhetorical excess for a beloved figure, the entire pattern of such indicates a motif of ‘Julian as Heracles,’ the deity whom he had crafted into a counterweight to Christ.

291 Blockley fr. 28.4 = Dindorf I.229.1-2 = Müller fr. 24. The quote is in hexameter.
292 Blockley fr. 28.6 = Dindorf I.229.25-230.2 = Müller fr. 26. The passage, again in hexameter: ἀλλ’ ὅποτε σκήπτροισι τεοίς Περσῆον αίμα / ἄρην Σελευκείης κλονέον ἐξεύρεσσι δαμάσσῃ, / δῆ τότε σὲ πρὸς Ὀλυμπὸν ἀγα παραλαμβάνει στῆμα / ἀμφί θυλλείσῃ κυκώμενον ἐν στροφάλγῳ, / λυσάμενον βροτῶν πολύτλητον ἀνήν. / ἡμέρας δ’ αἰθερίου φάεος πατρώιον αὐλήν, / ἐνθεν ἀποπλασθείς μεροπήιον ἐς δέμας ἠλθες. But having driven the Persian race headlong with your sceptre / Back to Seleucia conquered by your sword, A fire-bright chariot whirled amidst storm clouds / Shall take you to Olympus freed from your body / And the much-enduring misery of man / Then you shall come to your father’s halls / of heavenly light, from which you wandered / Into a human frame of mortality.
To ensure that literate readers did not miss the relationship between the recrafted Heracles and himself, Julian had ‘the youth’ enact the part of Heracles in Prodicus’ myth of Heracles at the crossroads (VII.230cd). Hermes told him:


‘Come, I shall be your guide to a smoother and leveler road when you have gone up to the crooked and steep place where you see all failing and hence heading back.’ And grieving, the young man went off with much caution, having with him a sword, shield, and spear, but for the time his head was bare. Therefore, obeying him, he went on by a road smooth, unbroken, and very bright, with heavily laden fruit trees and many lovely blossoms; all that is dear to the gods, and trees of ivy, laurel, and myrtle.
Prodicus’ myth focused upon Heracles’ choice between Virtue and Vice, personified by two women, but also metaphorically represented by two paths.\textsuperscript{293} Prodicus’ myth is preserved in Xenophon’s paraphrase (\textit{Memorabilia} II.21-33). In Julian’s myth, the divine messenger Hermes provided the youth guidance at a crossroad where, like Heracles, he had to choose between the easy and the virtuous paths. Therefore, Julian’s identification with the newly Christ-like Heracles is not due only to the birth of both to Athena the virgin goddess and Zeus/Helios, but also Julian’s role as the new Heracles who would be the champion of a reinvigorated paganism.\textsuperscript{294} As the panegyricist said about the role of Herculius during Diocletian’s reign, Hercules was Jupiter’s champion, fulfilling his chosen tasks (\textit{Pan. Lat.} III.6-9). As ‘the youth,’ Julian was returned to earth by Helios to fulfill his divine mission of cleansing the \textit{αἰσχροσύνη} or ‘impiety’ of Christianity (VII.231d).\textsuperscript{295}

The writings of the rhetorician Libanius of Antioch performed the same function for Julian as those of Eusebius for Constantine. Libanius taught in Nicomedia c. 343-8, at the end of which period Julian moved to that city and sent someone to transcribe his lectures beginning a relationship which would last until his death, although the two only became closely associated after Julian’s move to Antioch in summer 362.\textsuperscript{296} Despite the brevity of their closer association, Libanius was an enthusiastic supporter of Julian’s revival, and in July 362 delivered his \textit{Or. XIII, An Address to Julian}, and wrote of Julian’s nature in an unusual way that

\textsuperscript{293} The tale of Heracles at the crossroads is also discussed approvingly by Julian’s schoolmate, Basil of Caesarea in his \textit{On the Value of Greek Literature} V.55-77; cf. Stafford (2012), 202-3.

\textsuperscript{294} Wright (1913), 70, also sees Julian in this oration as a ‘second Heracles’, Athanassiadi (1981), 133 as ‘a second Heracles-Mithra’.

\textsuperscript{295} Julian frequently avoided using Christian terminology, but here paralleled Eusebius’ frequent references to \textit{αἰσχροσύνη}. For Eusebius, the members of the Tetrarchy except for Constantius I were exemplars of \textit{αἰσχροσύνη} (\textit{Vit. Const.} I.13.2, 47.2), a role which Constantine fulfilled for Julian (X.336b).

\textsuperscript{296} Jones 1971, 505; cf. Lib., \textit{Or.} 1.51.
reflected Julian’s mythology, claiming that Julian ἐγνατίζει σώμα μὲν ἄνθρωπον, ψυχή δὲ θεόν, ‘reigns, body of a man, soul of a god’ (Or. XIII.47). On the occasion of Julian’s taking office as consul on 1 January 363, Libanius described Julian’s period of servitude to Constantius II as Ἑρακλῆς τε χείρονος ἄνδρος ὑπακούων, ‘a Heracles obeying an inferior man’ (Or. XII.44). The orator went further and associated the young emperor with the myth of Heracles at the crossroads (Or. XII.28):

"ἀλλὰ ἐπειδὴ προῖον ὁ χρόνος τὰς μὲν τωμάς ἄναγκας ἔπαυσε, θεολής δὲ κύριον ἐποίησεν, ὥσπερ τὸν Ἑρακλέα, ὑπῆρχε δὲ καὶ διὰ τῆς λείας ἔρχεσθαι καὶ οὐκ ἦν οἱ κολύσαι εἰς οἶνον ἐκφερόμενον καὶ κύβους καὶ σωμάτων ἔρωτας, ἐπὶ τὸν ὀρθὸν καὶ τραχῶς οἶμον ὀρμᾶ, ποῖ φέρει, μᾶλλον σκοπήσας ἢ δι᾽ ὅσον χαλεπῶν.

But after that as the time went on, the constraints such as this ended, and made him master of will, even as Heracles. Though it was possible to take himself down the smooth way, and there was none to hinder from carrying himself away to wine, gaming, and flesh, upon the steep and jagged path he went. To the destination he endured, considering this more than his great hardships.

This is recognized by Norman as a reference to the Prodicus myth of Heracles, which was so widespread as to appear in the pages of Justin Martyr (2 Apol. XI.2-
The similarities between this and Julian’s myth in Or. VII are significant. Libanius reflected upon the same scenario, and drew the same conclusion, namely that Julian, the new Heracles, would make the proper and godly choice. Following Julian’s departure from Antioch for the Persian campaign in 363, Libanius authored his Or. XV, The Embassy to Julian, in which he wrote that men would sacrifice to Julian as they did to Heracles (Or. XV.36):

σοι δ’ ἔσται μὲν ὁτε θύσουσιν ἀνθρωποι καὶ βομβίους ιδρύσονται καὶ προσεύξονται, καθάπερ Ἡρακλῆ, τὸν γὰρ ἔργον τὸν ἐκεῖνον ζηλοτήν εἴκός τι καὶ τιμῶν τὸν ἐκεῖνον τεύξεσθαι.

At some time or other men will offer sacrifice and dedicate altars and pray to you, just as to Heracles, for the labours of the emulator, being like in action, will bring the same honours as that one.

The mode of sacrifice is important, as many sacrificed to the portrait of the emperor, but Libanius’ comparison here appears to be something more than typical emperor worship.299 Libanius’ comparisons found purchase with Julian’s opponents as well, as demonstrated in two orations by Julian's opponent Gregory Nazianzen in 363-5. Gregory referred to Libanius and those like him as (Or. IV.94):300

299 Contra Nock (1957), 122-3.
300 The text of Gregory is that of Bernardi (1983), and the translation is my own.
Those worshipping the speech of that man, and recasting him for us as the new god, pleasant and benevolent.

The parallel did not seem to have escaped the Antiochenes, either, as Gregory noted in several places that when they chose to mock Julian's excessive penchant for sacrifice, they labeled him with one of the epithets of Hercules, Καυσίταυρον or 'bull-burner' (Or. IV.77; cf. IV.103, 122) Gregory sustained this veiled mockery in the conclusion of his Or. V, a stelographia or proclamation detailing Julian's failures.301 Gregory's assertion that his stelae would be τῶν Ἑρακλείων στῆλῶν ὑψηλότερα τε καὶ περιφανέστερα, 'higher and more obvious than the Pillars of Hercules,' may be a subtle jab in the same vein (Or. V.42).

6. HERMES, CHRIST, AND JULIAN

Julian’s divine parallels are complicated further by subtly characterizing himself as Hermes. Hermes was Zeus’ messenger, an intercessor between the gods and humanity, and the divine διάκτορος or ‘guide’ (Iliad XXIV.339).302 Most importantly for our purposes here, Jean Bouffartgrie highlights that Hermes the ‘master of speech’ was associated with the concept of the logos.303 Julian himself

301 Elm (2012), 346-7.
302 Chittenden (1948), 28-30. The title is also used at Iliad II.103; XXI.497; XXIV.378, 389, 410, 432, 445; Odyssey I.84; V.43, 75, 94, 145; VIII.335, 338; XII.390; XV.319; and XXIV.99.
praised Hermes as the god of λόγιος, ‘eloquence’ (Ep. 191.383c; Ep. 188.377c; C. Gal. 235b). These attributes positioned Hermes, the son of Zeus and the nymph Maia, as a potential rival to Christ.

Following the dynastic murders of his family, Julian and his older half-brother Gallus had been initially removed to Nicomedia, then in A.D. 342 to remote Cappadocia (V.271c; Ep. 4.427c; cf. Amm. XV.2.7, 22.9.4; Lib., Or. XVIII.12; Soz. V.2). In Or. VII, Julian portrayed himself contemplating suicide upon understanding his family’s fate, using a carefully chosen quotation which opened a window onto Homeric myth (VII.230a; cf. V.89b 271b).³⁰⁴

But later, when he became a young man newly bearded, when youth is the most graceful, he understood the great number of the evil deeds, how much had happened to his relatives and cousins, and he was so shocked by the depth of the evil that he genuinely wanted to cast himself into the underworld.

It is possible that Julian’s description of himself as ‘newly bearded, with all the grace of youth’ accurately depicted him at the time he came to comprehend his family’s fate, but it was more likely coincidental, as he was 10 or at most 11 at the

³⁰⁴ The Greek text of Homer’s Iliad is that of M.L. West (2000), and of Homer’s Odyssey that of P. von der Mühll (2000).
time of the move to Cappadocia, with his half-brother Gallus older and presumably even more aware. What then was his purpose in this description? Julian’s writing is rich with literary allusions, and here he made use of Homer, his favourite author.

In *Iliad* XXIV.348, Zeus sent Hermes to Priam, where the god appeared in the likeness of a young prince.

βῆ δ’ ἵναι κοῦροι αἰσθηνητῆρι ἔοικός

πρῶτον ὑπηνήτη, τοῦ περ χαριεστάτη ἦβη.

and there took the likeness of a youth, a prince,
newly bearded, with all the grace of youth.

In *Odyssey* X.279, Hermes manifested to equip Odysseus for his confrontation with Circe. This was a particularly appropriate conjunction of the two tricksters, one Olympian, one Achaean.

ἐνθα μοι Ἐρμής χρυσόρραπος ἀντεβόλησεν

ἔρχομένω πρὸς δῶμα, νεηνίῃ ἄνδρι ἔοικός,

πρῶτον ὑπηνήτη, τοῦ περ χαριεστάτη ἦβη

there Hermes with his golden staff met me,
coming to the house, in the likeness of a young man,
newly bearded, with all the grace of youth.
In both epics, the clever Hermes was a representative of the gods sent to guide worthy characters and move the literary action forward. Past scholars have noted the obvious Homeric verbal parallels, but focusing on physical description, they have not addressed the significance of the function of Julian’s quotation within the passage. This was hardly a popular phrase, used by only four authors (aside from Homeric *scholia*) between Homer and Julian.\(^{305}\) The character described in both Homeric passages was Hermes the divine guide.

Shortly thereafter, Julian makes a play on words marking this identification for the audience, referring to Hermes as being ‘akin’ to himself. Helios and Athena diverted the despondent Julian by casting him into a trance, after which he wandered away into the wilderness. When he rested upon a stone, Hermes the divine guide came to him in auspicious form to lead him to the gods, picking up on Julian’s description at 230a.\(^{306}\)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Ἐρμῆς οὖν αὐτῷ, καὶ γὰρ ἐξευθεῖα ὁθεῖας πρὸς αὐτὸν, ὅσπερ ἡλικιωτῆς νεανίσκος φανείς ἠσπάσατό τε φιλοφρόνως καὶ, «Δεῦρο», εἶπεν, «ήγεμών σοι ἐγὼ ἠσμαί λείας καὶ ὀμαλεστέρας ὀδὸς τούτι [τό] μικρὸν ὑπερβάντι τὸ σκολιὸν καὶ ἀπότομον χωρίον, οὗ πάντας ὥρας προσπαθοῦντας καὶ ἀπιόντας ἐνεπίθετο ὀπίσω.»}
\end{align*}\]

Therefore, Hermes (and being akin to himself, appearing as a young man of the same age) greeted him kindly and said, ‘Come, I shall be your guide to a

\(^{305}\) This is a phrase without much afterlife, as searching *TLG* for \(\text{πρῶτον ὑπηνήτης}\) only turns up three uses between Homer and Julian: Plato, *Protagoras* 309b1; Claudius Aelianus, *Varia historia* X.18.8; Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus* III.3.23.2.4.

\(^{306}\) In X.336c, Julian claimed it was Hermes who granted him knowledge of his father Mithras (equated by Julian with Zeus and Helios). VII.230c=22.91-97.
smoother and leveler road as soon as you have scaled the crooked and steep place where you see all failing and hence heading back.’

In Julian’s portrayal of Hermes as οἰκείως to himself, Julian utilized a double meaning, having just deliberately described himself using Homer’s description of Hermes. 307 Hermes the ‘young prince’ of Iliad XXIV.348 appeared to the young prince of the house of the descendants of Constantine, and led him to his audience with Zeus/Helios with the admonition: ἔλοιο . . . τὰ βέλτιστα, ‘choose the best’ (VII.231a). To listeners with a classical education, Julian was subtly identifying himself with Hermes the divine guide or διάκτορος, and reinforcing his identification as both the ‘young prince’ and the chosen one of the Hellenic gods who received their messenger.

At the myth’s conclusion, Julian is confirmed in this role as divine guide, as Helios directs the gods to give Julian standards to bear as his symbols of their divine authority. Julian’s divine encounter ended with his receiving divine tokens from the gods: the gorgon’s breastplate from Athena, a torch from Helios, and most importantly a χρυσῆν ῥάβδον or ‘golden staff’ from Hermes (VII.234ab = 22.203-209):

\[ \text{ἡπιθὶ προσθαλβὼν ταύτην μὲν τὴν δάδα παρ’ ἐμοῖ, ἵνα σοι καὶ ἐν τῇ γῇ φῶς λάμπῃ μέγα καὶ μηθὲν ἐπιτοθῆς τῶν τῆς, ταύτης δὲ Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς καλῆς τὸ τε} \]

307 Wright (1913), 139, recognized the similarity Julian was drawing attention to, but evidently seeing this passage in isolation from the other two I cite, held that Hermes’ ‘affinity’ for Julian was because he was ‘the god of eloquence’.
Γοργόνειον καὶ τὸ κράνος· πολλὰ γὰρ, ὡρᾶς, ἐστὶν αὐτῇ, καὶ δίδωσιν οἷς ἂν ἔθελη. Δώσει δὲ σοι καὶ Ἑρμῆς χρυσὴν ράβδον.

You must receive this torch from me, in order that in the earth a great torch shines for you and that you may not yearn after this, and from good Athena here the gorgonion and helmet; for many, you see, are hers, and she gives them to those she will. But Hermes will give you a golden staff.

This χρυσὴν ράβδον of Hermes, sometimes known as the κηρύκειον or caduceus, was a significant component of Hermes’ identity, and the source of his title Argeiphontes, as he used it to slay the giant Argus.308 When Hermes, the herald of the gods and inventor of sacrifice, was given this rod by Apollo in the Homeric hymns, it was referred to as his ‘golden shepherd’s staff’ (Homer, Iliad I.333; Homeric Hymn to Hermes 125, 514). Thus, Julian reinforced his portrayal as the divine guide, and as Smith described him in this context, the ‘divine intermediary’.309

By making such an allusion for himself, Julian benefited by reinforcing his consistent presentation of himself elsewhere. In letters to his priests, Julian emphasized his role as ἀρχιερέα μέγιστον, or ‘high priest’ (Ep. 89b.298c; Ep. 88.451b) a term equivalent to the Latin pontifex maximus.310 In early 362, Julian also described himself as ‘having received the direct function of prophecy’ from Apollo (Ep. 88.451b). In July 362, Libanius praised Julian for disdaining to wait for oracles,

310 Liddell and Scott (1995), 252; cf. SIG 832.
but sitting in the place of the Pythia \((Or.\ XIII.48)\). Finally, Sozomen recorded that Julian appeared in public images with Hermes, as well as Ares and Zeus \((V.17.3)\). 

Julian’s allusive cleverness is meant to lead us to a Homeric framework, one in which he locates himself as a prophetic voice of Hellenism. In his role as guide, Hermes would have had appeal to Julian, called upon to guide his people back to pagan religion \((VII.231d)\). In fact, although using different terminology, Julian had Helios tasking the young prince with \(\gamma\gamma\omicron\mu\nu\omicron\nu\epsilon\zeta\ \varepsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\alpha\ \beta\epsilon\lambda\pi\sigma\tau\alpha\), ‘guiding [his subjects] to the best’ \((VII.234a)\). Hermes would also be the divine guide of Julian’s \textit{Caesares} \((Or. X)\), in which he gave the tale to Julian \((X.307a)\), directed emperors to look to their chosen gods, and directed Julian to follow his father Mithras \((X.336a)\), equated elsewhere with Zeus and Helios. This is a minor motif within a multi-layered myth, but it is a telling one, revealing Julian’s desire to portray himself as a divine guide to those ‘with an ear to hear.’

7. CONCLUSION

In this aspect of Julian’s effort to cleanse the impiety of Christianity, he utilized a long lineage of older traditions, combining elements of emperor worship, Sol Invictus worship, and Diocletian’s imperial theology. He responded to and recapitulated the Christianized mimetic ruler theology of Constantine, who had apostatized from Helios. The focus on Constantine and his heirs is clear, as in Julian’s myth, Helios told him that the desired cleansing was also of \(\tau\eta\nu\ \pi\rho\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu\omicron\kappa\iota\nu\nu\)}
οἰκίαν, ‘your ancestral house’ (VII.234c). Julian responded to this, first re-crafting Hercules into a likeness of Christ, then casting himself in the image of Heracles. Julian made use of this literary construct in his campaign to reverse the Constantinian revolution, having Helios give Julian, the new Heracles, a divine commission to purge the impiety instituted by Constantine, the mimetic messiah. Julian positioned himself as an emperor with a divine lineage, made himself the son of a god, and specifically Helios, thereby redressing Constantine’s apostasy. While Julian’s actions are evidence enough, statements from his contemporaries provide further support, responding as they did to his presentations of Heracles and of himself, portraying Julian as the son of Helios with a human/divine nature, sent to earth by Helios as the healer of the world and recalled to Helios’ halls at the end of his life. Coming before his planned invasion of Persia, this was particularly pertinent given Julian’s connection between Alexander the conqueror of the East and Heracles (X.325a). Julian’s premature death on the Persian campaign in 363 forestalled further development of his theme, which, had it borne fruit, would have redefined the apologetic battles between Christianity and paganism in the fourth century. Moving beyond Lacombrade’s assessment that Julian used Heracles as a pagan counter to Christ, Julian not only presented Hercules as a pagan alternative to Christ, but presented himself as a divine avatar, the alternate mimetic ruler diametrically opposed to Constantine.312

311 Compare to Constantine’s house-cleaning above (VC 2.55.2). Julian’s mission to cleanse the empire of impiety is also an echo of his earlier letter to Themistius, in which he wrote of Heracles and Dionysus who purged the earth of evil (VI.253d-254a).
312 Lacombrade (1964), 131, drew the conclusion that Julian’s use of Heracles paralleled his use of Asclepius, as he positioned both as ‘saviours of the world’ and pagan counters to Christ.
CHAPTER FIVE:
ASCLEPIUS, CHRIST, AND JULIAN

1. INTRODUCTION

In his fourth oration, *Hymn to King Helios*, written to commemorate the festival of Sol Invictus on 25 December 362, Julian began outlining a new portrayal of Asclepius, presenting him as the pre-existent, incarnate saviour. Asclepius, originally the ‘blameless physician’ of the *Iliad* (II.729-32; IV.193-94; IV.204; IV.218-19; XI.517-18; XI.613-14; XIV.2), was later described as the son of Apollo and the human woman Coronis, and a healing divinity in his own right (*Homerica* Hymns XVI.2-4; Diodorus, *Bibliotheca Historica*, V.74.6; Ovid, *Metamorphoses* II.542-648). At this stage, Walton evaluates the evidence and finds, ‘no hint of the intervention of a healing god... purely natural methods are in use’. By the second century A.D., Asclepius is referred to as ‘the god who holds Epidauris’ (Aelius Aristides, *Or.* II.153). Several modern scholars have noted Julian’s unique presentation of Asclepius, as McKenzie: ‘One cannot help noticing certain phrases which we are accustomed to apply to Christ’. Wright mused that Asclepius ‘may have been intentionally opposed, as the son of Helios-Mithras and the “saviour of the world”, to Jesus Christ’, and later noted that Julian used ‘almost the language of the Christians’ regarding Asclepius. Lacombrade wrote, ‘Asclepius, visible emanation of Mithra-Helios, will, like Heracles, be described as “the savior of the

---

314 Walton (1965), 3.
315 McKenzie (1958), 156.
316 Wright (1913), 419 n.1; (1923), 315.
world”, the pagan antagonist of Christ’.317 Athanassiadi suggests that in response to Christ, ‘the pagan emperor clearly had to oppose some analogous figure in the Hellenic tradition. Julian chose Asclepius, the healer of humanity’s body and soul, the saviour par excellence’.318 I intend to demonstrate that this is a case where the evidence supports verbal transference from Christian texts. While recognition of Julian’s portrayal exists, his sources and the extent to which he made use of this opportunity have not been recognised.

2. ASCLEPIUS AND CHRIST IN OR. IV

Midway through his Hymn to King Helios, Julian inserted his explanation of the special relationship between Helios and Asclepius (Or. XI.144b).319

Πάσας δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ περιέχειν ὁ θεὸς ὁ δὲ τὰς ἀρχὰς τῆς καλλίστης νοερᾶς συγκράσεως ὁ Ἡλίως Ἀπόλλων ἐστὶ Μουσηγέτης. Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ ὅλην ἡμῖν τὴν τῆς εὐταξίας ζωὴν συμπληροὶ, γεγυνὸς μὲν ἐν κόσμῳ τὸν Ἀσκληπιόν, ἔχει δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ πρὸ τοῦ κόσμου παρ’ ἑαυτῷ.

Moreover, since he contains in himself all the principles of the finest intellectual synthesis, this god Helios-Apollo is the leader of the Muses. And since he fills the whole of our existence with good order, he begets Asclepius in the world, though before the world he has him beside himself.

319 The text of Julian’s Or. XI is that of Lacombrade (1964), and the translation is my own.
Helios’ begetting of Asclepius had a definite purpose, to bring order to his creation, calling to mind the Christian utilization of the concept of the λόγος, God’s begotten Son who brought order to creation and was made flesh. Like Asclepius, the Christ of John’s Gospel was pre-existent (Ἐν ἄρξῃ ἦν ὁ λόγος), and was described as both ‘in the world’ (ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ) and the ‘only begotten’ or ‘unique’ (μονογενοῦς) son of the Father (John 1.1, 10, 14). Julian’s use of the concept of begetting suggested a special relationship between Helios and Asclepius, as Julian did not describe the pre-existent Asclepius’ origins as stemming from a general emanation. This new relationship of divine sonship for both Heracles and Asclepius is intriguing, as the literary creator of these sons of God in the mould of Jesus θεοῦ was himself divi filius. This was a potent combination for the ‘son of Helios’ seeking to supplant Jesus the son of God, for, as Gaston Halsberghe points out, ‘the cult of Deus Sol Invictus was a serious, if not the most important, rival of early Christianity’.

Julian continued, writing of Helios as the common Lord of the gods and colleague of Apollo the provider of oracular wisdom, then turned again to Helios and Asclepius (Or. XI.153b, tr. Wright mod.):

'Ετι σοι λέγω πώς τής ύγιείας καὶ σωτηρίας πάντων προύνόησε τὸν σωθήρα τὸν ὅλων ἄπογεννήσας Ἀσκληπιόν

---

320 Recent research has highlighted the tangible nature of worshipping the emperor, divi filius, e.g. Hopkins (1978); Price (1984); Gradel (2002); Ando (2008).
321 Halsberghe (1972), 168.
Shall I say to you how Helios planned for the health and salvation of all by begetting Asclepius to be the saviour of the whole world?

This title of ‘saviour’ or σωτήρ for Asclepius was not new, but clearly referenced his physical healing capacity, indicating a distinction in Julian’s meaning. Walton sheds light on this by reporting on the usage of the appellation ‘Paian’. Paian was the healing attendant of the gods, the divine physician in the Homeric Epic. Both men and gods such as Asclepius, Dionysius, and Thanatos were referred to as ‘Paian’, used in the sense of ‘healer’. Over time, the term came to mean ‘saviour’, but again in a physical sense.322 A quote from the tenth-century Suidas regarding the fifth-century physician Jacob illuminates the typical sense of Asclepius as saviour, ‘Practically everybody he liberated from the sufferings that beset them, either immediately or after a little while. Wherefore people called Jacob saviour, just as once they called Asclepius that’ (The Suda: s.v. Ἰάκωβος).323 Regarding the function of Asclepius in Julian’s revised pantheon, Julian first addressed the scope of the work of Asclepius. Julian wrote of the universal scope of Asclepius’ salvation, but introduced a change to the intent of the work of Asclepius, in which the Hellenic god of healing was the saviour of the world. The soteriological language used by Julian of Asclepius echoes the language of John’s gospel: ‘For God so loved the world that he gave his only (µονογενή) Son, that everyone (πᾶς) who believes in him may not perish, but may have eternal life. Indeed, God did not send the Son into the world to condemn the world, but in order that the world might be saved (σωθῆ ὁ

322 Walton (1965), 1.
323 The text of The Suda is that of Adler in the Teubner series (1931), and the translation that of Clift in Edelstein and Edelstein (1945), 265, no. 465.
κόσμος) through him’ (Jn. 3:16-17 (NRSV); cf. 1 Jn. 4:14). The evidence suggests that Julian linked the two concepts of universal saviour and saviour from sin together for Asclepius in similar fashion as Christians did regarding Christ. By the 360s, astute readers would surely have recognized the Christian sense in Julian’s language.

3. ASCLEPIUS AND CHRIST IN C. GAL.

Sometime during the winter of 362-3 in Antioch, Julian put Christianity on trial in his lengthy polemic Contra Galilaeos (Lib., Or. XVIII.178). In it, he critiqued the idea that Christ could be god incarnate (C. Gal. 253c-e, 262d, 290e), or that he could save anyone else (C. Gal. 213c). Yet in this same work, the same emperor who ridiculed Christ’s incarnation as irrationabilitatem (Ep. 90), continued his parallel between Asclepius and Christ (C.Gal. 200ab):^324

ό γάρ τοι Ζεύς ἐν μὲν τοῖς νοητοῖς ἐξ ἐαυτοῦ τὸν Ἀσκληπιόν ἐγέννησεν, εἰς δὲ τὴν γῆν διὰ τῆς Ἡλίου γονίμου ζωῆς ἐξέφηνεν. οὕτος ἑπὶ γῆς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ποιησάμενος <τὴν> πρόοδον, ἐνοείδες μὲν ἐν ἀνθρώπου μορφῇ περὶ τὴν Ἐπίδαυρον ἀνεφάνη, πληθυνόμενος δὲ ἐντεύθεν ταῖς προοδοῖς ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ὀρέξε τὴν γῆν τὴν σωτηρίου ἐαυτοῦ δεξιάν. ἤλθεν εἰς Πέργαμον, εἰς Ἰωνίαν, εἰς Τάραντα μετὰ ταῦθ’, ὡστερον ἤλθεν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην. ὅχετο εἰς Κῶν, ἐνθένδε εἰς Αἴγας. ἔτα πανταχοῦ γῆς ἐστὶ καὶ θαλάσσης, οὐ καθ’

^324 The text of Julian’s C.Gal. is Masaracchia (1990), and the translation is my own.
For in truth as Zeus begat Asclepius from himself among the noetics, he also revealed him to the earth through the life of productive Helios. He made his appearance from heaven on earth, first appearing singly in the form of a man at Epidaurus, then multiplying himself by his appearances, he reached out his saving right hand over all the earth. He came to Pergamum, Ionia, and Tarentum after this, then later came to Rome. He was going to Kos, then to Aegae. He is then everywhere in earth and sea. He comes regularly, not to each of us alone, but equally he restores the souls that are sinful and bodies having sickness.

Julian’s parallel was both incarnational and soteriological. His presentation is suggestive of the Nicene Creed, which described Christ as follows:

\[
\text{τὸν δὲ ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα}
\]

who for us men, and for our salvation, came down and was incarnate and was made man.

\[325\] Julian’s reference to the ‘noetics’ refers to the emanated intelligible gods of the noetic realm.
\[326\] Kelly (1972), 216-7.
Emmanuela Masaracchia notes that Julian cited two other brief portions of the Nicene Creed in this work (C. Gal. 261e, 276e). While this creed is conceptually similar, other sources can offer more exact parallels. The reference to Asclepius’ descent into human form recalls the Christological hymn embedded in the Epistle to the Philippians, which refers to Christ (Phil 2:7):

\[
\text{μορφήν δούλου λαβών, ἐν ὀμοίωματι ἀνθρώπον γενόμενον καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεῖς ὡς ἀνθρώπος}
\]

taking the form of a slave, being born in human likeness. And being found in human form...

Julian’s reference to Asclepius’ σωτήριον ᾧ τοῦ δεξιάν, ‘saving right hand’ (C. Gal. 200b) is similar to texts such as Ps. 20.6 (LXX), ‘Now I know that the LORD saves His anointed; He will answer him from His holy heaven with the saving strength of His right hand’ (δυναστείαις ἡ σωτηρία τῆς δεξιᾶς αὐτοῦ). In fact, this may have been mediated through the writings of Eusebius of Caesarea, who had portrayed Constantine and Crispus as father and son collectively ‘stretching out the saving right hand to all who were perishing’ (Hist. Eccl. X.9.4, tr. Oulton). Doctors used ἐπανορθοῦται or ‘restores’ as a medical term (as Julian also does in Ep. 75b), but it was also used theologically (Eus., Prep. Evan. VI.6.74.3). Most importantly, here we see Asclepius’ portfolio significantly expanded to include being the saviour

---

327 Masaracchia (1990), 11
328 Meredith (1980), 1124, notes that Iamb., Vit. Pyth. VI.30 paralleled this same passage.
329 The text of the Septuagint is Rahlfs and Hanhart (2006), and the translation is that of Pietersma and Wright (2007).
of human souls that were sinful or πληµµελής. While άµωρτία was the more common term for ‘sin’ in Christian literature, πληµµελής, which more typically referred to a musical mistake or false note, was also used to refer to sin, particularly in the Greek Old Testament.330 ‘Sin offerings’ in the Greek Old Testament are πληµµέλειαν (Lev. 5.18; 6.5). When the men of Israel were repenting of their sin of disobeying God by marrying non-Jewish women, it was phrased, καὶ ἔδωκαν χεῖρα αὐτῶν τοῦ ἐξενέγκαι γυναῖκας αὐτῶν καὶ πληµµελής κριὼν ἐκ προβάτων περὶ πληµµελήσεως αὐτῶν, ‘and they gave their hand to put away their wives and errors – a ram of the flock for their error’ (2 Esdras 10.19 LXX; cf. Lev. 7.37; 1 Clem. 41.2). While this may strike some as an idiosyncratic modification of Wright’s translation, this is also how the three previous English translators handled πληµµελής in this context.331 In this passage, Julian had redefined the mission of salvation to include only those saving sinful human souls, namely Christ and the recrafted Asclepius.

4. JULIAN’S USE OF ASCLEPIUS

Julian therefore used Asclepius to parallel Christ the human/divine saviour, co-opting his theological attributes. Beyond that, as Constantine portrayed himself as the mimetic equivalent of the Son of God, Julian did the same with Asclepius. Julian was not the first emperor whose annalists associated him with healing, as Vespasian was written of having healed a lame man and a blind man while in Egypt (Cassius

331 Wright (1923), 375; Athanassiadi (1981), 168; and Hoffmann (2004), 115.
However, the way that Julian’s contemporaries reflected his meaning back was unique. As Athanassiadi has written, ‘his panegyricists had not ceased to proclaim in him Asclepios incarnate, greeting him as the superhuman healer who had come to resurrect not just one man, but the whole oikoumene’. Libanius made a number of statements referring to Julian as the divine healer. Libanius wrote in 362 that Julian was as to their world as Asclepius was for Hippolytus (Lib., Or. XIII.42):

ôper γὰρ Ἀσκληπιόν φασιν Ἰππολύτῳ γενέσθαι, τούτ’ αὐτὸς ἐγένετο τῷ τῆς οἰκουμένης σώματι. τεθνεότας τε ἁνέστησας καὶ βασιλείας ὄνομα νῦν, εἴπερ ποτέ, προσέλαβεν ἔργον.

You were, for the body of our world, what in legend Asclepius was for Hippolytus. You restored the dead to life, and now at last the title of emperor has gained fulfillment.

During Julian’s reign, after he had left for Persia, Libanius asked, ‘Why now do we call the world happy? Simply because an expert physician (ἰατρὸς ἅγρος) has come to tend it’ (Lib., Or. XV.69). Upon Julian’s death, Libanius mourned the end of the emperor’s Hellenic revival, ‘Alas for the bereavement that has afflicted the whole world. You cured it of its ills like a good physician (ἰατρὸς ἁγαθὸς), and then delivered it up once more to fever and its earlier ailments’ (Lib., Or. XVII.36).

334 The text of Libanius is that of Foerster (1904), and the translation is that of Norman (1969).
Rhetorically asking the gods why Julian was not allowed to live, Libanius catalogued the actions that would have met with their approval. As part of this long list, he adds that Julian ‘restored to health a world that lay sick unto death’ (οὗ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἄσπερ λειποψυχοῦσαν ἔρρωσεν) (Lib., Or. XVIII.281). This is particularly interesting in light of the emphasis in Christian theology on creation needing redemption. This healing aspect extended beyond physical healing, much as Julian had expanded Asclepius’ role from physical healer to savior from sin. Libanius also cast Julian’s giving priority to religious matters in medical terms, writing, ‘So he proceeded first to the cure of souls (ιάτρευσιν τῶν ψυχῶν), leading men to the recognition of the real lords of heaven’ (Lib., Or. XVIII.124-25). This theme was also picked up by Himerius, who wrote quite early in Julian’s sole reign that in his religious revival, Julian ‘did not heal everything gradually, as those with human skills heal the sick, but all at once with benefits of [spiritual] health that took immediate effect’ (Him., Or. XLI.8, tr. Penella). Finally, as previously noted, a number of authors wrote that Julian was divine and called Helios his father (Him. Or. XLI.8; Lib., Or. XIII.47; Eun., frags. 27-29). Eunapius reported that Julian called the Sun (Helios) his own father (Eun., fr. 28.5 Blockley): 

ο Ἰουλιανὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς ἰδίων [πατέρα] ἀνακαλεῖ τὸν ἥλιον, οὐχ άσπερ Ἀλέξανδρος διαβάλλεται φάσκων πρὸς τὴν Ἰθαν ὁτι Ὁλυμπιᾶς αὐτὸν ἐκ Διὸς ἀνελομένη τοῦτο οὐκ ἀπεκρύπτετο.

335 In Chapter four, part four.
336 The text of the fragments of Eunapius here is Boissevain (1906), and the translation that of Blockley (1983); Blockley fr. 28.5 = Dindorf I.229.3-6.
Julian in his letters calls the Sun his own father, not in the sense that Alexander made his false claim, saying to Hera that Olympias, having conceived him of Zeus, did not conceal the fact.

Paschoud has suggested this is an allusion drawing upon Julian’s *Hymn to King Helios* (XI.131bc).³³⁷ As discussed in the last chapter, this claim to being the son of Helios, who rode his chariot across the heavens was divinely recognised (Eun., fr. 28.4 Blockley):³³⁸

\[ \text{προσαγορεύων \ θεός τόν Ἱουλιανόν φησιν} \]
\[ \text{Ὡς τέκος ἄρμελάταο θεοῦ, μεδέοντος ἄπάντων} \]

the god spoke thus to Julian:

‘O child of the charioteer god, who is ruler of all’

Eunapius also related that when Julian prayed and made sacrifice on his expedition in Persia, he received a prophecy of a glorious end that following glorious victory over the Persians he would be taken by fiery chariot to his ‘father’s halls of heavenly light’ on Olympus (Eun., fr. 28.6 Blockley).³³⁹ Célérier connects this to Julian’s autobiographical myth (VII.232d).³⁴⁰

³³⁷ Paschoud (2006), 520, n. 37.
³⁴⁰ Célérier (2010), 564-5.
5. CONCLUSION

It is no surprise that Julian’s intimates such as Libanius and Oribasius should eulogize their departed friend, but to do so in such as fashion is rather remarkable. This dovetails with Julian’s unique presentation of Asclepius as a counter to Christ, using allusions to the New Testament and the Creeds. In the Nicene Creed, Christ was the pre-existent ‘Son of God’, who ‘came down’ to earth on his divine mission by his Father. Christ was ‘incarnate and was made man’. The significance of God’s clothing himself in flesh was enshrined in the Nicene Creed, which professed belief in Christ σαρκωθ/υτα και ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, ‘incarnate, and made man’. Christ the saviour’s divine mission related to God’s creatures, as he was sent by his Father ‘for us men, and for our salvation’. Upon the completion of his divine mission, he ‘ascended to heaven’, returning to his rightful place with his Father.

Bringing together all of this evidence highlights how close the relationship is between the various components. Comparing the Christian presentation of Jesus, the Son of God, Julian’s presentation of Asclepius the son of Helios, and Julian and his associates’ presentation of himself as the son of Helios shows a strong correlation. The complete picture militates against interpreting pieces as mere rhetorical flourishes. A pattern exists, and reinforces its constituent parts. While the internal beliefs of Julian, Libanius, Oribasius, and Eunapius may be beyond our reckoning, their rhetoric painted a picture of Julian as Asclepius, and in particular an Asclepius crafted to parallel Christ. Like Constantine, this positioned Julian as an earthly avatar of the heavenly god he served, specifically Helios from whom Constantine apostatized. Eusebius had presented Constantine as almost a secular messianic
figure, and here Julian and his compatriots had done the same, recapitulating both Constantine and his Christ. Julian’s portrayal of Asclepius reveals a use of Christian concepts. He supplanted Christ as the healer and saviour of souls with his revised version of Asclepius. Further, he and his associates tied this into his existing efforts to portray himself in a divine sense, as an earthly avatar of the divine. As Julian mimetically portrayed himself as the new heroic saviour Hercules and the divine guide Hermes, so he cast himself in the role of Asclepius the healer of souls. In so doing, Julian not only co-opted potent features of Christ for his pagan revival: in a sense he played the earthly role of the counter to Christ himself.
CHAPTER SIX: 
JULIAN’S ‘PAGAN TRINITY’

1. INTRODUCTION

In his classic 1930 *La Vie de l’Empereur Julien*, Joseph Bidez wrote that Julian’s triadic presentation of God uniquely contained ‘des réminiscences de la trinité chrétienne’.\(^{341}\) This established something of a trend in studies of Julian, and is reflected in Chadwick’s discussion of Julian’s Neoplatonist triadic language in which he concludes, ‘Some Christian influence may reasonably be discerned here’.\(^ {342}\) This sentiment is echoed by Susanna Elm, who refers to Helios as the focal point of that ‘Trinity’ of Zeus-Helios, Attis, and Cybele, and summarizes Julian’s triadic representation of Helios as an engagement of Christian theology.\(^ {343}\) The implication is that Julian was borrowing from Christianity to co-opt the concept of the Trinity. These authors are absolutely correct that Julian altered existing theology and crafted his writings to confront or co-opt Christianity, but I believe that the comparison regarding Trinitarian use of Helios breaks down at certain points. I have argued that in his writings the pagan emperor Julian strove to recapitulate the Christianising gains of the Constantinian revolution, responding not only by physically countering his uncle Constantine’s inscriptions and building programs, but theologically confronting Christianity by crafting Heracles and Asclepius into rival saviours.\(^ {344}\) It is tempting to see Julian’s use of Helios in the same vein, as a

---

\(^{341}\) Bidez (1930), 253.  
\(^{342}\) Chadwick (2001), 175.  
\(^{343}\) Elm (2012), 288, 299-300.  
\(^{344}\) Greenwood (forthcoming 2013).
deliberate paralleling of the Christian Trinity, but I believe that the evidence suggests otherwise in all but one case, and that even there caution is called for. Although some writers have suggested Trinitarian parallels for many individual Julianic texts, the comparison works more plausibly in the aggregate, as when examined individually many of the passages appear to be incidental, not intentional, parallels to the Christian Trinity.

I should like to be very clear about the terminology used herein. When I refer to *Trinitarian* thought in Christianity, I make reference to the concept of a God existing in three ὑποστάσεις: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In this relational framework, each person plays a different role in the economic Trinity, in which the Son is begotten by the Father and incarnates in the world. In contrast, I refer to monotheistic or henotheistic Neoplatonic thought as *triadic*, describing God as existing in three ὑποστάσεις on three levels of reality. In Julian’s unique variation on the Neoplatonic structure, either Zeus or Helios begot a son (Heracles or Asclepius) who incarnated in the world, but significantly, was outside the Neoplatonic triad. I therefore distinguish Julian’s presentation of Zeus-Helios the Father and either Heracles or Asclepius the Son as *binitarian*, reflecting Julian’s attempt to supplant Christ without being bothered to provide a complete Trinity with a pagan Holy Spirit analogue. Julian does not claim equality and identity between Helios and Asclepius in the Christian fashion. As Smith points out, ‘One of the chief complaints of all anti-Christian polemic is the identification of Christ as God’. 345

345 A. Smith (2009), 43.
2. JULIAN’S EDUCATION

It is important to understand where Julian’s exposure to Christian theology came from, as modern scholars must look back from the other side of the writings of the Cappadocian fathers and the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. Julian was educated under the oversight of Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and George, later bishop of Alexandria, and under the authority of Constantius II (Julian, Ep. 106, 107; Amm. XXII.9.4). All three of these men rejected the Nicene definition. Julian’s most influential teacher was his pagan tutor Mardonius (XII.352c), who was followed by men of similar background like the pagan Nicocles and the apostate Hecebolius (Lib., Or. XV.27; XVIII.12), and later the pagan Themistius (VI.257d, 258a-d). Although Constantine had supported and contributed to the Nicene settlement in 325, from that point until after Julian’s death in 363, those rejecting Nicaea were in the political ascendancy, with the conflict not truly subsiding until after the formulation of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed in 381. Prior to becoming sole ruler, Julian supported the Catholic Christians in 360-1 in the West, not from conviction, but for political expediency. He realised that the Nicene and non-Nicene parties were committed enemies, and offered an amnesty to the exiled Nicenes as a means of sowing dissent. He continued stirring this pot with his exhortation to Photinus the non-Nicene Christian (Ep. 90). The conflict during Julian’s lifetime focused on the nature and origination of Christ, and with minor exceptions, debates on the Holy Spirit were not on the agenda until well after Julian. This means that the Christian tradition Julian was most familiar with and reacted against did not

emphasise the concept of the Trinity. Given this, it is only reasonable to expect that Julian’s ‘mental furniture’ was the product of a binitarian Christian theology. Indeed, despite Julian’s scathing attacks on Christianity and particular aspects such as the Incarnation in his *Contra Galilaeos*, one can search the surviving remnants of the work in vain for any overt criticism of the Trinity. Julian’s exposure to and interest in engaging Christian Trinitarian concepts should not be overstated.

3. NEOPLATONIC LANGUAGE

Evaluating authorial intent in Julian’s passages at hand is made more difficult by virtue of Julian’s frequent presentation of gods in threes, which suggests to some readers a connection with the Christian concept of the Trinity. As an example, Hoffmann cites Julian’s late 361 letter to his spiritual advisor Maximus as invoking a ‘trinity of powers’:\(^{347}\) Ἱστο το Ζεύς, ἰστομεγας Ἡλιος, ἰστο Αθηνας κράτος και πάντες θεοι, ‘Zeus, great Helios, and powerful Athena be my witnesses, and all the gods’ (*Ep.* 26.415a). However, mere citing of gods in threes does not justify a Trinitarian reference, especially when it consists of three named gods invoked amidst a host of others. It is important to recall the triadic nature of Neo-Platonism’s reality. As far back as 1877, Naville warned that Julian’s triad originated from Neoplatonism, not Nicaea.\(^ {348}\)

---

\(^{347}\) Hoffmann (2004), 67.

\(^{348}\) Naville (1877), 103. Bidez (1930), 253, offers a paragraph with remarkably similar wording to Naville’s, but excludes Naville’s caveat regarding Neoplatonism as the font rather than Nicaea. Bidez: ‘Il y a de la parenté entre son Roi-Soleil et le dieu secondaire, auteur de la creation, que les Pères au deuxième siècle avaient défini sous le nom de Logos, puis au concile de Nicée sous le nom de Fils consubstantiel. Julien esperait peut-être substituer dans l’adoration populaire son démiurge médiateur au Verbe-Jésus’. Naville (1877), 104-5: ‘Il y a une parenté évidente entre son Roi Soleil et ce dieu secondaire, organe de la creation, que les Pères du deuxième siècle avaient proclamé sous le nom de
The seminal Neoplatonist thinker Plotinus divided reality into three hypostases, the first being τὸ  ἕν or ‘the One’, the second νοῦς or Intelligence, and the third, ψυχή or the Soul.\(^{349}\) The combination of monotheistic religion and three levels of reality suggests a god existing in some sense on three levels. The *Chaldean Oracles* outline a divine triad of the πατήρ or Father, his δύναμις or power, and his νοῦς or intellect (*Chald. Or.,* fr. 4 Majercik).\(^{350}\) Porphyry further developed a triad within the hypostasis of the νοῦς that consisted of Being, Life, and Intellect proper (*Tim. Comm.,* fr. 79), one which Dillon points out most closely resembles the Christian Trinity with its co-ordinate, rather than hierarchical structure.\(^{351}\) While that creates some interesting coincidences, it does not demonstrate intentional paralleling of Christian theology on Julian’s part, as his writings reflect more of the Neoplatonic triad than the Nicene Trinity. Andrew Smith notes: ‘Now this grouping of three realities or hypostases was sufficiently similar to the Christian Trinity to be exploited by Christian theologians. But it differed, of course, fundamentally in that the Neoplatonic hypostases were subordinate to each other and not co-ordinate as orthodox Trinitarian doctrine eventually demanded’.\(^{352}\) Both Dillon and Wright recognise Julian’s triadic framework as normative.\(^{353}\) Wright wrote, ‘Julian follows him [Iamblichus] in the main with his trinity of the κόσμος ὑπαρτής or visible universe, the κόσμος νοερός, its model, relieved from the imperfections of matter,
and represented in the ὀρατὸν by the planets, and, thirdly, the κόσμος νοητός, over which rules the supreme principle of the Good, or the One (τὸ ἕν) not to be grasped by the intelligence’.

Along these lines, Wright’s 1896 doctoral dissertation identified a number of technical Neoplatonist terms used by Julian, including: θεουργός, ‘performer of sacramental rites’ (Julian, VIII.173a, Iamblichus, Myst. III.18); ἀποπληρωσίς, ‘filling, satisfying’ (Julian, XI.144d, Porphyry, Abst. III.18, Iamblichus, Myst. V.26); ἀειγενεσία, ‘perpetual generation’ (Julian, Or. VI.185c, Iamblichus. ap. Stob. I.49.38); ἀποπληρωτής, ‘one who completes or fulfills’ (Julian, III.90c, Plato, Rep. 620e, Iamblichus, Myst. V.10); ἀποπληρωτικός, ‘completing or fulfilling’ (Julian, XI.137b, Iamblichus, Myst. V.26); ἐνοειδές / ἐνοειδῆς, ‘resembling, having the form of unity’ (Julian, XI.139b, Plotinus, Enn. VI.9.5); περικόσμιος, ‘mundane’ (Julian, XI.138d, 145d, Iamblichus, Myst. II.1, 4); and αὐτοψυχή, ‘absolute soul’ (Julian, Ep. 89b; Plotinus, Enn. V.9.13). The use of such vocabulary demonstrates the thoroughgoing Neoplatonist strain permeating Julian’s writings.

Julian’s language of begetting, procession, and sonship has definite affinities to Christian writings, but is not radically different in principle from other writings within Neo-Platonism. This filial language has some parallels in the Chaldean Oracles (late second-century), and the writings of Proclus (412-85), and Damascius (c. 458-after 538). The Chaldean Oracles refer to the Supreme Deity as the ‘Father’ (eg. fr. 7). Proclus, in arguing against Iamblichus’ redefinition of the One as ‘God and the gods’, also refers to the first god as ‘father’ (Parmenides comm.

354 Wright (1896), 52.
355 Wright (1896), 90.
Damascius, commenting on Porphyry, wrote of the ‘Father of the Noetic triad’ (De princ. 43, I.86.8-15 Ruelle). These are examples of passages in which Julian might be drawing upon either Christian or Neoplatonic thought. Nevertheless, if Julian was attempting to draw a Christian inference, the emphasis was on paralleling Christ, not the Trinity. Julian provided an example in his Letter to the Alexandrians of late 362, where he chided the Alexandrians for their recalcitrant attachment to Christ and compared him with Helios (Ep. 111.434d):

τὸν μέγαν Ἡλίων λέγω, τὸ ζῶν ἀγαλμα καὶ ἐμψυχον καὶ ἐννοιν καὶ ἀγαθοεργόν τοῦ νοητοῦ πατρός

I speak of great Helios, his intelligible father’s living image, endowed with soul and intelligence, maker of all good...

Julian referred to Helios as his father’s living image, which is interesting in light of the fact that Christ, whom Julian is comparing Helios to, is described similarly in Col. 1.15-16, albeit in different language, as ‘the image (εἰκόν) of the invisible God... in him all things in heaven and on earth were created’ (ἐκτίσθη). Here Helios is cast in the role of the Son, as opposed to the other passages in which he plays the role of the Father and is the begetter of Heracles and Asclepius (VII.220a; XI.144a). If Julian both portrayed Zeus-Helios as the father of the gods and compared him...
directly to Christ, this suggests he was not trying to formulate a consistent ‘pagan trinitarian theology’, but responding *ad hoc* for specific purposes, which suggests uniqueness for *Or. VII.228d*. This sort of language also appears in Julian’s *Hymn to King Helios*, in which he wrote that Helios was begotten in the likeness of the Good (XI.133a), and proceeded from the Good in eternity past (XI.142a, 146b, 156c). Julian reinforced this by repeatedly writing that Helios was the son of the Good (XI.133a, 144d; VII.228d).\(^{361}\) While it is indeed suggestive language that recalls Christian theological writings, much of Julian’s terminology here may be properly categorised as interested in engaging Christ, rather than the concept of the Trinity.

4. POSSIBLE TRINITARIAN PARALLELS

There are four remaining possible parallels, examples drawn from two of Julian’s orations. Julian presented *Or. VII* in Spring 362 in Constantinople, for the upcoming festival of Cybele in March (*Lib., Or. XVIII.157*). While Julian was ostensibly responding to a disrespectful oration by the Cynic Heraclius (Julian, VII.234cd), he used that opportunity as a vehicle for his criticisms of Constantine, Constantius II, and Christianity. In it, Julian recalled in mythic format his upbringing and the horrific realisation that his cousin Constantius II was behind the deaths of his father and most of his siblings, and laid out a response in which he was divinely commissioned to redress these grievances. We have first the passage regarding Julian’s unique portrayal of Heracles, which one scholar describes as containing a

---

\(^{361}\) This of course sets up an interesting conflict by Julian’s casting both Asclepius (XI.144b, 153b; *C. Gal. 200ab*) and Helios (VII.228d; XI.133a, 144d) in the role of pre-existent begotten son, but such inconsistencies did not overly trouble Julian.
pagan Trinity unmistakably borrowed from Christianity. In the discourse from the Hymn to King Helios discussed previously, Julian wrote (VII.219d-220a):

βαδίσαι δὲ αὐτὸν ὡς ἐπὶ ξηρᾶς τῆς θαλάττης νενόμικα. Τι γὰρ ἀπορον ἦν Ἦρακλεῖ; Τί δ’ οὐχ ὑπήκουσέν αὐτοῦ τῷ θείῳ καὶ καθαρωτάτῳ σώματι, τῶν λεγομένων τούτων στοιχείων δουλευόντον αὐτοῦ τῇ δημιουργικῇ καὶ τελεσιουργῇ τοῦ ἀχράντου καὶ καθαροῦ νοῦ δυνάμει; Ὁν ὁ μέγας Ζεὺς διὰ τῆς Προνοίας Ἀθηνᾶς, ἐπιστήσας αὐτῷ φύλακα τὴν θείον ταύτην ὅλην ἐξ ὅλου προέμενος αὐτοῦ, τῷ κόσμῳ σωτῆρα ἐφύτευσεν.

I believe he walked on the sea as upon dry land. For what was impossible to Heracles? What of the so-called elements enslaved to the creative and consummating power of his immaculate and pure mind did not hearken to his divine and most pure flesh? Him great Zeus through foreseeing Athena begat to be the saviour of the world, and assigned to him as guardian this goddess he had brought forth whole from the whole of himself.

Julian’s presentation of the origin and parentage of Heracles is unique. Julian is indeed supplanting Christian theology with an analogue of his own, but the key question here is whether he is using Athena to parallel the Holy Spirit in the Christian Trinity. Marcel Simon writes that ‘the divine triad thus sketched out closely resembles a Trinity’, while Jean Bouffartigue is even more adamant

---

362 Nesselrath (2008), 214. ‘Herakles hier nicht als christusgleiche Figur dargestellt zu sehen, die noch dazu in eine Art *paganer Trinität* (Zeus – Athena – Herakles) eingebaut wird, deren Inspiration durch die christliche unverkennbar ist’.

363 The Greek text of Julian’s *Or. VII* is that of Rochefort (1963), and the translation is my own.
regarding Athena’s role as analogous to the third person of the Christian Trinity.\textsuperscript{364} Rosanna Guido suggests that as Athena in Julian’s hands was not extruded from Zeus’ head but rather taken whole from the whole of him, she was in essence an identical replica.\textsuperscript{365} This ‘whole from whole’ language was used in A.D. 341 in the Second Arian Confession of Antioch (Ath., \textit{De Synodis} 23). Despite Nesselrath’s assertion of an ‘unmistakeable’ inspiration from the Christian Trinity for this passage, I believe that caution is still appropriate. Julian posits no overt equality between Athena and the other two gods, leaving the Trinitarian parallel somewhat incomplete, as Athena fulfils no role similar to that of the Holy Spirit in Christian theology. Instead, Athena is a ‘virgin mother’ analogue,\textsuperscript{366} borrowing elements from Christianity to draw a triple parallel with Heracles the saviour of the world and child of Zeus-Helios and the virgin goddess Athena (VII.219d-220a), Jesus the saviour of the world and child of God and the virgin mother Mary, and Julian himself as the divinely chosen saviour of the empire and child of Zeus-Helios and the virgin goddess Athena (VII.229c-230a; 232d).\textsuperscript{367} While there is no specific Biblical textual parallel, it is not necessary for Julian to have copied a text, rather than a concept. Dependence upon strict verbal parallels to exact passages will only take us so far, and as Bouffartigue notes, the bulk of Julian’s material lacks such.\textsuperscript{368} The specific focus in this passage on Christ sets it apart from the others cited below from \textit{Or. XI} and \textit{C. Gal.}

\textsuperscript{364} Simon (1973), 398; Bouffartigue (1992), 167: ‘Comme le Saint-Esprit, Athena intervient en tiers pour réaliser la procréation d’un fils dont la mère est une femme et le père un principe transcendant’.  
\textsuperscript{365} Guido (2000), 156: ‘Secondo la sua opinione Atena è stata generata, nella sua interezza, non dalla parte superiore, ma dalla totalità di Helios re. Infatti non vi è nessuna differenza fra Helios e Zeus’.  
\textsuperscript{366} As noted by Barnes (1998), 147-8 in an aside in his work on Ammianus Marcellinus.  
\textsuperscript{367} The following authors recognise the parallel between Christ and Heracles in this passage: Wright (1913), 111 n.4; Lacombrade (1964), 131 n.3; Simon (1973), 398; Athanassiadi (1981), 133, 197; Barnes (1998), 147-8; Nesselrath (2008), 213-4.  
\textsuperscript{368} Bouffartigue (1992), 113: ‘Les allusions exprès aux textes scripturaires sont évidemment constantes dans le traité \textit{Contre les Galiléens}. Elles sont quasi-inexistantes dans le reste de l’œuvre’.
Another modern scholar finds ‘la trinité chrétienne’ in the passage recalling Julian’s rescue from the disease of Christianity (VII.229c-230a):³⁶⁹

Λέγειν δὲ ὁ Ζεύς ἀρχεῖαι πρὸς τὸν Ἡλίον: »Τούτι τὸ παιδίον» ἔφη· ἔγγενές δὲ ἦν αὐτὸν ἀρα παρερριμένον που καὶ ἀμελούμενον, ἀδελφιδοὺς ἐκείνου τοῦ πλουσίου καὶ ἀνεψιός τὸν κληρονόμον· «τούτο», ἔφη, «σὸν ἐστίν ἐκγονον. Ὄμοσον οὖν τὸ ἐμὸν τε καὶ σὸν σκήπτρον, ἦ μὴν ἐπιμελήσεσθαι διαφερόντως αὐτὸν καὶ ποιμανεῖν αὐτὸ καὶ θεραπεύσειν τὴς νόσου. Ὅρης γὰρ ὅπως οἶον ὑπὸ καπνοῦ ρύπου τε ἀναπέλησται καὶ λεπίδος, κίνδυνος τε τὸ ὑπὸ σοῦ σπαρέν ἐν αὐτῷ πῦρ ἀποσβῆναι, ἤ μὴ σὺ γε δύσεαι ἄλκην». Σοὶ δὲ ἐγὼ τε ἄνδρος καὶ αἱ Μοῖραι κόμιζε οὖν αὐτὸ καὶ τρέφε.» Ταῦτα ἀκούσας ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡλίος ηὐφράνθη τε ἥσθεῖς τῷ βρέφει, σωζόμενον ἔτι καθὸρόν ἐν αὐτῷ σπινθήρα μικρὸν ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἐντεύθεν ἐτρεφεν ἐκεῖνο το παιδίον, ἐξαγαγὼν »Έκ τὸ οἶματος ἐκ τό κυδομοῦ ἐκ τ’ ἀνδροκτασίης»· ὁ πατήρ δὲ ὁ Ζεύς ἐκέλευσε καὶ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν, τὴν ἀμήτορα τὴν παρθένον, ἅμα τῷ Ἡλίῳ τὸ παιδάριον ἐκτρέφειν.

And then Zeus started to speak to Helios, ‘This is the child’, he said. And the child was a blood-relation of theirs, who had been cast out and uncared for, a nephew of that rich man and first cousin of the heirs. He said, ‘This is your offspring. Swear by my sceptre and yours to take care of him, to shepherd him, and to heal him of his illness. For you see how he is as if stricken by smoke, filth, and soot, and there is a danger that the fire sowed in him by you

³⁶⁹ Allisson (2002), 35. This passage was closely examined closely in chapter four, part four, but for a different purpose.
will be extinguished, "if you will not exert your strength". But the Fates and I will give place to you, therefore save and rear him’. King Helios heard this and was cheered and took pleasure in the babe, seeing that in him a small spark of himself was saved. And from then he reared that child he had brought forth from the blood and tumult and slaughter of men. And Father Zeus commanded motherless Athena the virgin to rear the child together with Helios.

As the overriding purpose of this passage appears to be depicting Julian as the son of God in parallel with both Heracles and Christ, that suggests to me other solutions than Allisson’s. While this passage does indeed name three gods, Zeus, Helios, and Athena, Allisson instead finds the Trinity in the three elements Julian described his being stricken with, namely καπνός, ῥύπος and λιγνύς.\(^{370}\) The passage is certainly rich with metaphoric use of language, as for example Julian primarily uses νόσος in his writings to refer to his Christian upbringing (C. Gal. 327b; Ep. 61.424b; Ep. 98.401c) in the sense of ‘illness’ or ‘disease’. However, metaphor does not excuse the extent to which Allisson reads theological meaning into the passage without textual warrant.\(^{371}\) In Or. VII, Julian was very definitely playing with Christian-

---

\(^{370}\) Allisson (2002), 35. ‘La fumée, la crasse et la suie, c’est le christianisme dans lequel Julien a été élevé et auquel il a voulu montrer sa fidélité jusqu’à l’âge de vingt ans; peut-être faut-il voir dans cette utilisation de trois termes une critique de la trinité chrétienne, concept qui a fait beaucoup parler de lui dans les querelles théologiques contemporaines de Julien’.

\(^{371}\) The Homeric phrase ‘if you will not exert your strength’, or literally, ‘if you will not put on strength’ (Iliad IX.231) suggests another possible provenance for the καπνός, ῥύπος and λιγνύς. This phrase is far more likely drawn from Julian’s favourite source of allusion, the Iliad. In the opening of Iliad XVIII, Antilochus informed Achilles of the death of his beloved Patroclus (XVIII.22-25): ὁς φάτο, τόν δ᾽ ἄχεσι νεφέλῃ ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα: ἀμφοτέρῃς δὲ χροῖν ἐλὼν κόνι αἰθαλῶσαν χεύσας κάκε κεφαλῆς, χαρίς δ᾽ ἔσχες πρόσωπον: νεκταρέω δὲ χιτονι μέλαιν᾽ ἀμφίζανε τέφρη. ‘He spoke, and the black cloud of sorrow closed on Achilleus. In both hands he caught up the grimy dust, and poured it over his head and face, and fouled his handsome countenance, and the black ashes were scattered over his immortal tunic’. The text of the Iliad is that of M. L. West (1998-2000), and the
oriented metaphor in the passages cited. In his attempt to present Heracles as a parallel to Christ and himself as a second Heracles, he altered not only Heracles, but Helios and Athena as well. Drawing Athena from Zeus’ substance, and making Heracles their (virgin-born) son, indeed suggests equality of substance. However, Athena’s role as the ‘virgin mother’ rather than as the Holy Spirit dictates that caution be used in presenting even this closest passage as an ‘unmistakable’ pagan trinity. Julian’s overt binitarian purpose makes it ultimately less likely that Julian is making an allusion to the Trinity here.

The next alleged Trinitarian parallels are found in the Hymn to King Helios, which Wilmer Wright introduced by writing that in it, Julian’s ‘aim was to provide the Hellenic counterpart of the positive revealed religion of Christianity’. Julian’s triad in Or. XI includes the One, Helios-Mithras, and the physical sun (XI.132cd). Dillon evaluates Julian’s Neoplatonic triad as ‘a pretty simple scenario’. Julian composed this for the festival of Sol Invictus on 25 December 362. The Hymn is Julian’s exposition for a Hellenic audience of the monotheistic or henotheistic pagan

---

translation that of Lattimore (1961). Achilles, sitting amidst the Achaian ships and the smoke and fire of battle, was overwhelmed and utterly grief-stricken at the death of Patroclus. It is expressed in slightly different terms, as Achilles is stricken with a ‘black cloud’ instead of ‘smoke’, with ‘grimy dust’, the filthy nature of which is revealed when Achilles used it to ‘befoul’ his face, and ‘black ashes’ rather than ‘soot’. Despite the different vocabulary, the imagery and word order strongly suggest an allusion to Iliad XVIII.20-22. Julian had already cast himself as the New Achilles in his Or. III, composed in 358 while he was Caesar under his cousin Constantius II. Julian hinted at future unrest when he opened his panegyric to Constantius II with King Agamemnon’s failure to treat his general Achilles well (III.49c-50a). With this new allusion to himself as Achilles in A.D. 362, Julian conveyed the depth of his grief at the loss of his family to his audience. Simultaneously, he cast himself again in the role of the new Achilles, whose deep sorrow was paralleled by a terrible wrath. The actions of Constantius II’s soldiers in A.D. 337 created an implacable enemy, whose vengeance would be complete.

372 Wright (1913), 351; cf. 351: Julian ‘contrives that all the more important gods of Greece, Egypt and Persia shall play their parts as manifestations of Helios’.
373 Dillon (1999), 109.
374 Dillon (1999), 107.
faith he offered. In this oration, Julian cited an oracle of Apollo declaring the kinship of Helios and Zeus (XI.135d-136a):\(^{375}\)

\[\text{εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν αὐτῷ κοινὸν πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους ἔξω τῆς ἀγαθοεργίας, ἥς καὶ αὐτῆς μεταδίδοσι τοῖς πάσι, μαρτυράμενοι τοὺς τε Κυπρίουν ἱερέας, οἱ κοινοὺς ἀποφαίνουσι βεβομοῦς Ἡλίῳ καὶ Δί, πρὸ τούτων δὲ ἔτι τὸν Ἀπόλλωνον συνεδρεύοντα τῷ θεῷ τὸ δὲ παρακαλέσαντες μάρτυρα (φησί γὰρ ὁ θεὸς οὗτος· Εἰς Ζεὺς, εἰς Ἀιὼντας, εἰς Ἡλίῳς ἐστὶ Σάραπις), κοινὴν ὑπολάβωμεν, μᾶλλον δὲ μίαν Ἡλίου καὶ Διὸς ἐν τοῖς νοεροῖς θεοῖς δυναστεύουν.}

But if he has nothing in common with those others beyond his beneficial power, and of this he gives a part to all, we invoke the priests of Cyprus, who produce common altars to Helios and Zeus, but yet before this call to witness Apollo, sitting in council with this god. For this god declares: ‘One Zeus, One Hades, One Helios Serapis’. Let us receive then, truly one power in common of Helios and Zeus among the intellectual gods.

The original oracle referred to Zeus, Hades, and Dionysus (Macrobius, *Saturnalia* I.18.18).\(^{376}\) Although Serapis was associated with Dionysus, if Julian was trying to assemble a ‘pagan Trinity’ from an established oracle, it would have been to his benefit to stay with a more consistent triad.\(^{377}\) Further, the modern history of interpretation may have been influenced by the standard English translation’s more

\(^{375}\) The Greek text of *Or. XI* is that of Lacombrade (1964), and the translation is my own.

\(^{376}\) See discussion in Wright (1913), 369; Lacombrade (1964), 108.

\(^{377}\) See discussion in Wright (1913), 369 for background on Serapis=Osiris=Dionysus.
suggestive ‘Zeus, Hades, and Helios Serapis, three gods in one godhead!’ This is somewhat misleading, suggesting a parallel textual connection to Christian theological writings which is not evident. Lacombrade described this passage as containing Julian’s ‘conception d’une divinité trinitaire’, but sensibly attributed the impulse behind it solely to Iamblichean Neoplatonism. Julian discussed the νοερός ἡλιος, and concluded with language that, as two scholars point out, echoed the Nicene creed. ‘King Helios is one and proceeds (προῆλθε) from one god . . . he gathers together the last and the first’ (τὰ τελευταῖα τοῖς πρῶτοις) (XI.141d-142a). Here Helios προῆλθε, or ‘proceeds’ from the One much as does the Holy Spirit ἐκπορεύεται, or ‘proceeds from’ the Father in Jn. 15.26 and the third clause of the Nicene Creed. The last and the first recalls the statement attributed to Christ: ‘I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end’ (Rev. 22.13, NRSV). Julian himself explained this passage as plural gods of like substance who sum up Helios, but in him are one (XI.143b). The emperor thereafter posited another three in one unity of Helios, Apollo, and Dionysus (XI.144a):

Αλλὰ καὶ τὴν Διονύσου μεριστὴν δημιουργίαν οὐδαμοῦ φαίνεται χωρίζων ὁ θεὸς Ἡλίου τοῦτο δὲ αὐτὴν ύποτάττων ἀεὶ καὶ ἀποφαίνων σύνθρονον, ἐξηγητὴς ἦμιν ἐστὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ θεοῦ καλλίστων διανοημάτων. Πάσας δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ περιέχων ὁ θεὸς δὲ ἀρχῆς τῆς καλλίστης νοερᾶς συγκράσεως Ἡλίος Ἀπόλλων ἐστὶ Μουσηγήτης. Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ ὀλην ἦμιν τὴν τῆς εὐταξίας

378 Wright (1913), 369.
379 Lacombrade (1964), 93: ‘La thèse majeure de son propos: sa division ternaire de l’univers, ne l’a-t-il pas tirée du théosophe syrien? De même, sa conception d’une divinité trinitaire n’a pas d’autre origine’.
380 Naville (1877), 104-5, compared XI.141-2 to the Nicene Creed and wrote that Julian’s Helios shared an ‘obvious kinship’ with the Son, and speculated that perhaps Julian was hoping ‘to replace the Word-Son with the Sun King’; cf. Athanassiadi (1975), 366.
And Apollo too never appears to distinguish the divided creativity of Dionysus from Helios. Always subordinating Dionysus to this one [Helios] and declaring him enthroned with him, Apollo is interpreter for us of the most beautiful thoughts of God. Moreover, since he contains in himself all the principles of the finest intellectual synthesis, he is known as Helios-Apollo, who leads the Muses. And since he fills the whole of our existence with good order, he begat Asclepius in the world, though before the world he had him beside himself.

The last sentence bears a resemblance to a common proof-text used in the Arian controversy, in which ‘wisdom’ was claimed as a pre-incarnate Christ: ‘The Lord created me at the beginning of his work, the first of his acts of long ago. Ages ago I was set up, at the first, before the beginning of the earth’ (Prov. 8.22-3). Yet, again, the Neoplatonic triad is evident, a concept not unique to Julian, and yet the distinguishing characteristics of the Christian Trinity are not present. As the ‘son’ in this case appears not to be a member of the ‘three in one’ triad, that places the focus on binitarian parallels. This emphasis on the begotten Asclepius as Christ is recognised by some modern scholars, although not usually in extensive detail.  

The references in *Or. XI* taken by some as deliberate parallels of the Christian Trinity turn out to be more revealing of Neoplatonism’s triadic framework of reality,

---

381 Wright (1913), 419 n.1; (1923), 315; McKenzie (1958), 156; Lacombrade (1964), 131; Athanassiadi (1981), 167; Bouffartigue (1995), 649; Dillon (1999), 113-4.
a structure shared with other Neoplatonists not attempting to parallel Christianity. Within this framework, Julian made reference to multiple gods sharing the substance of Helios, specifically mentioning in this oration Zeus, Hades, Helios, Serapis, Apollo, Asclepius, and Dionysus. I would suggest that in these passages, Julian reveals his intention at points to mimic Christ with pagan alternatives such as Asclepius, but expends little or no effort to co-opt the Christian concept of the Trinity.

5. CONCLUSION

Given Julian’s interest in co-opting Christian theology, it sounds quite reasonable that he would want to do so in regards to the Christian Trinity as well. However, that founders when examining the individual passages it has been applied to. Even if Julian was attempting to compose a consistent Trinitarian parallel on a broad level, combining elements from different documents, he produced a distinctly wobbly Trinity. At various points, Helios is the Son and ‘living image’ of the One (Ep. 111.434cd), the Spirit who ‘proceeds’ from the One (XI.141d-142a; cf. 146b, 156c), and the Father who ‘begets’ his son Asclepius (XI.144a), language which, again, is not inconsistent with Neo-Platonism. It is worth noting that when Julian drew his deliberate parallels between Heracles and Christ (VII.219d-220a) and Asclepius and Christ (XI.144b, 153b; C.Gal. 200ab), he did so with much clearer intention than this. Crucially, it is possible to find contemporary literary reaction to Julian’s binitarian motif of the Father God and his incarnate divine son, but such contemporary reaction to supposed Trinitarian themes in Julian’s writing remains
elusive. A superior explanation would be that Julian wrote of his existing triadic Neoplatonic structure, while making various binitarian allusions, thereby creating incidental similarities to, rather than deliberate parallels of, the Christian Trinity.

382 Him., Or. XLI.92-3; Eun. fr. 28.5, 28.6 (Blockley); Lib. Or. XII.28, 44; XIII.42; XV.36, 69; XVII.36; Greg. Naz., Or. IV.94.
In this section, I will treat evidence of Julian’s construction and inscriptions as components of his campaign to overwrite Constantine and his Christianity. In this first chapter of the section, I shall discuss Julian’s recapitulation of Constantine’s use of space generally, the stated intentions of both emperors, and their pattern of desecration and consecration. In chapters eight through ten, I shall closely examine Julian’s recapitulation in Constantinople, Jerusalem, and Antioch. The nature of our evidence precludes a purely chronological or geographical treatment, and requires occasionally returning to evidence previously discussed.

Religious space is one of a culture’s most potent avenues for unity. Structure and symbolism create not only shared public meeting space, but a shared narrative which can reflect a culture’s values or shape them. Both Constantine and Julian understood the value of space, structure, and art in shaping or obliterating a narrative, and both used this concept as part of their religious and political programs. Constantine’s building program provided a narrative of Christianisation, the story of dramatic Christian victory. This broader narrative also reinforced his portrayal as the divinely chosen victor, the secular leader of the Christian church, and the greatest builder since Augustus. His building program focused on Rome, Constantinople, and
Jerusalem, making use of key locations from which to best convey his narrative. Under the reign of his son Constantius II, this was extended to Antioch. Some cities that preoccupied Constantine also preoccupied Julian. He attempted to recapitulate Constantine’s campaign by using space to emphasise his status as the divinely chosen victor over Christ and Christendom, as well as the leader of his restored and restructured Hellenism. Julian’s building program focused on Constantinople, Jerusalem, and Antioch, although he never travelled to Jerusalem himself. No response to Constantine was necessary in Rome, which had an impressive pagan past undiluted by Constantine’s efforts there.

This chapter will focus on the general theme of physical recapitulation especially in locations other than Constantinople, Jerusalem, and Antioch. As a foundation, I will first examine the intentions which both emperors made clear in their writings, providing historians a glimpse of intention as well as result. In the next sections, I will demonstrate the pattern of Constantine’s desecration and occasional destruction of the pagan past in material culture. I will move from there to examine Constantine’s initial foray into overwriting in the eternal city of Rome. I will then lay out the evidence for Julian’s following this same pattern of desecration and re-consecration. Only then will the foundation be clearly laid for an examination of Constantine’s and Julian’s battle to construct their own narratives on the canvases of Constantinople, Jerusalem, and Antioch.
1. INTRODUCTION

In 324, Constantine wrote to the provincials of Palestine that he had been chosen by God following persecutions of Christians to restore both the state and his religion (Eus., Vit. Const. II.28.1-29.1).\(^{383}\) The outworking of this is seen in two laws recorded in Eusebius’ Life of Constantine, which despite its apologetic orientation, can be carefully and critically mined for historical evidence.\(^{384}\) The anti-sacrifice laws themselves do not survive in the Codex Theodosianus, although in his law of 341 Constans does make reference to an anti-sacrificial ‘law of our sainted father’ (C.Th. XVI.10.2). In keeping with the Christian abhorrence of idol worship, the first law ‘restricted the pollutions of idolatry’ (τά μοσαρά) and banned pagan sacrifice, though this may not have been strictly or universally enforced (Eus., Vit. Const. II.45.1).\(^{385}\) Concurrently issued, Constantine’s other law ‘dealt with erecting buildings as places of worship and extending in breadth and length the churches of God’ (Eus., Vit. Const. II.45.1). In line with this law, Constantine gave state funds and instructions to build, restore, or add on to churches. Constantine wrote that the situation at Mamre where pagan worship took place at a site with Christian significance was ‘alien to our times’ (Eus., Vit. Const. III.52-3). While these laws were evidently enforced in Constantinople, Bradbury notes that the bark of these laws was commonly worse than their bite, written with a ‘moralizing ideology and

\(^{383}\) For dating, see Cameron and Hall (1999), 16-8.

\(^{384}\) Barnes (2011), 9-13; Cameron and Hall (1999), 1-3.

\(^{385}\) The Old Testament view of idolatry reacted against the idea of images being polluting (Deut. 12.32-13.18; Judg 17.1-6; 1 Sam. 7.3-4, Job 12.6; Is. 44.9-20, 57.1-13; Jer. 10.1-16, 19.3-15; Ez. 8.16-18, 14.1-11; Hos. 13.1-3; Zeph. 1.2-6). The Christian view in the pastristic period used ‘pollution language’ to argue that it was the cult that was the problem, with the images being furniture.
operative clauses indicating what was actually to be done’. 386 Such aggressive-sounding but inconsistently enforced constructions allowed the emperor to mollify rigorists and at the same time proclaim that the new paradigm for the empire was Christianity. While the emphases of Constantine’s key churches described universal virtues such as peace, wisdom (Constantinople), concord (Antioch), and victory (Nicomedia), they have also been identified as qualities of Christ. 387 All the above proclaimed, as Armstrong notes, ‘a new order whose importance even the commonest citizen could sense’. 388

The previous chapters discussed in some detail Julian’s claim in Or. VII that he was sent by the gods to cleanse the empire of impiety. As Rosen writes, close observers would have understood that this was Julian’s government program embedded in autobiographical narrative, and that his primary goal was the struggle against Christianity. 389 Julian also demonstrated that this sentiment was both early and genuine in private correspondence, writing (Ep. 26.415cd):

I worship the gods openly, and the whole mass of the troops who are returning with me worship the gods. I sacrifice oxen in public. I have offered to the gods many hecatombs as thank-offerings. The gods command me to restore their worship in its utmost purity, and I obey them, yes, and with a good will. For they promise me great rewards for my labors, if only I am not remiss.

387 Armstrong (1967), 8-10.
388 Armstrong (1967), 8-10.
Julian wrote this letter in 361, when he had paused at Naissus in his march through Illyricum. In practical terms, the Succi pass was held against Julian, but Naissus also possessed material advantages including its role as a strategic transport hub, an arms manufacturing center, and a recruitment base.\textsuperscript{390} The well-known city also provided Julian with something of a propaganda advantage vis-à-vis Constantius II, who had received the abdication of Vetranio and his army there in 350. More importantly to Julian, it featured in the story of the House of Constantius I, and it was birthplace of his hated uncle Constantine (Stephanus of Byzantium I:309; Firmicus Maternus, \textit{Math.} I.10, 13; Anonymus Valesianus, \textit{Origo Constantini Imperatoris} II.2). Indeed, Constantine had periodically resided at the city as emperor, as seen from the laws issued there.\textsuperscript{391} We are also informed that Constantine had adorned the city, but while we do not know much in the way of detail, a bronze bust of Constantine found there suggests that in typical Constantinan style, his imprint was both visual and personal (Anonymous Valesianus, \textit{Origo Constantini Imperatoris} II.2).\textsuperscript{392} It is also important to note the significance of Naissus in relation to Julian and Constantine. As Kaegi points out, such a location served as a catalyst for Julian’s hatred of Constantine and Constantius II.\textsuperscript{393} This is not to agree with Rosen, however, who claims that Julian was so overcome by visiting Naissus and receiving word of Constantius’ death there that he converted to paganism in 361, a theory that

\textsuperscript{390} Kaegi (1975), 163.  
\textsuperscript{391} Seeck (1919), 168-82: \textit{C.Th.} II.15.1, II.16.2 (25 July 319); XI.39.1 (17 September 325); XI.27.1 (13 May 329); XI.39.3 (25 August 334).  
\textsuperscript{392} Anon.: \textit{quod postea magnifice ornavit.} Delbrueck (1933), Tables 35-6.  
\textsuperscript{393} Kaegi (1975), 166: ‘Possibly no other city in the empire, not even Constantinople herself, could have brought back to Julian such bitter memories of the contrasting fortunes of his own family’s tragedy (the slaying of his father and his half-brother Gallus) and the spectacular success of Constantine I and his descendants’.
requires Julian’s deliberate falsification of his own accounts elsewhere for little gain.\textsuperscript{394}

From Naissus, Julian sent several public letters to cities detailing his family’s ruin at the hands of Constantius II (\textit{Or. V}; cf. Amm. XXI.10.7). At around this time, although not necessarily before Constantius’ death, Julian also sent a similar private letter to the theurgist Maximus, his confidant and Neoplatonic spiritual advisor (\textit{Ep. 28.382c}). In the letter, Julian discussed the open pagan worship performed by him and his troops while on the march, emphasizing the sacrifices which had been banned by his predecessors. This open worship may have in fact been incited by his visit to the Constantinian city of Naissus. Julian’s above statement regarding restoration of worship ‘in its utmost purity’ makes clear that his restoration of pagan worship would include ritual sacrifice, which logically demanded the restoration of temples dedicated to pagan deities. This was a major component of his religious program responding to Constantine’s historical actions. Julian responded to Constantine’s and Constantius II’s plunder and replacement of the temples. Worse yet, Julian’s immediate predecessors sometimes destroyed temples and had built Christian churches instead, including a very few on the same sites. While this was rare, especially if we allow for some inflation on the part of the fifth-century historians, it was of great symbolic importance.

\textsuperscript{394} Rosen (2006), 229: ‘Nicht das Ephesos des Maximus, nicht das Paris der aufrührerischen gallischen Truppen, sondern Naïssus die Wiege seines Geschlechts wurde Julians Damascus’ (‘not the Ephesus of Maximus, not the Paris of the mutinous Gallic troops, but Naissus, the cradle of his family, became Julian’s Damascus’).
Part of Constantine’s campaign against pagan sacrifice involved the desecration of some and the plundering of many pagan holy sites. Eusebius wrote that Constantine’s agents had desecrated temples throughout the empire, invading the innermost sanctuaries while removing valuable articles (Eus., Vit. Const. III.54.6, 57.4). Constantine achieved his aim, as he ‘confuted the superstitious error of the heathen in all sorts of ways’ (Eus., Vit. Const. III.54.1). Julian, as we have already seen, wrote about Constantine and his sons’ desecration of temples and their sacred contents: ‘The sons demolished their forefathers’ temples which their father first despised and denuded of the offerings (ἀναθηµάτων) donated by many others (not least by his forefathers)’ (VII.228b-d). The emperor had metal doors and roofing stripped from the temples (Eus., Vit. Const. III.54). He removed bronze statues to Constantinople, which Eusebius held was done to ridicule paganism (Eus., Vit. Const. III.54.2-3). Statues made of gold were removed and melted down for the precious metal (Eus., Vit. Const. III.54.4-6). Pagans would surely have been angered by the account of the humiliation of the priests by Constantine’s agents from his ‘familiar circle’: they exposed the long-standing error, ordering the consecrated officials themselves to bring out their gods with much mockery and contempt from their dark recesses into daylight’ (Eus., Vit. Const. III.54.5-6). Eusebius’ account also stressed the desecration of the temples, as he described ‘forbidden innermost sanctuaries of temples were trodden by soldiers’ feet’ (Eus., Vit. Const. III.57.4). Awareness of these activities and the later anti-pagan laws of the sons of

---

395 Some modern scholars hold that pagan cult continued unabated in the city, e.g. Krautheimer (1981), 47; Mitchell (2007), 313. I will expand upon this in chapter eight on Constantinople.
Constantine motivated Julian’s condemnation of them for denuding and demolishing the temples.\(^{396}\)

3. CONSTANTINE’S DESTRUCTION

Moving beyond desecration, Constantine also demolished temples in three locations: Aphaca, Heliopolis in Phoenicia, and Aigai in Cilicia (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.55-8). While the few occurrences may reflect a lack of evidence, it is more likely that they were simply unusual, as each of these appears to have been motivated by specific circumstances. The Shrine of Aphrodite at Aphaca was described by Eusebius as a ‘school of vice for all dissolute persons’, where the rites included ‘unlawful intercourse ... stolen and corrupt sexual relations, and unspeakable, infamous practices’ (ἀρρητοί τε καὶ ἐπίρρητοι πράξεις) (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.55.3). On Constantine’s orders, the temple was destroyed and the site cleared by soldiers (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.55.4-5). The Cilician Temple of Asclepius in Aigai was completely razed, again by a military detachment (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.56.2-3). Here the motivation appeared to be due to the role similar to Christ’s played by Asclepius in the pagan pantheon. Eusebius described this rationale: ‘countless people got excited about him as a saviour and a healer ... though when it came to souls he was a destroyer, drawing the gullible away from the true Saviour’ (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.55.1). The temple of Asclepius was also associated with Apollonius of Tyana,

who was used by Hierocles as a Christ-parallel against the Christians during the Great Persecution.\textsuperscript{397} Eusebius also described the destruction of the shrine of Aphrodite at Heliopolis, where the behavior of worshippers who ‘allowed their wives and daughters without restraint to act as prostitutes’ drew a personal letter from the emperor (Eus., \textit{Vit. Const.} III.58.1-2). While Eusebius’ account does not specify the mode of destruction of the temple, he does record that Constantine erected a church and installed a bishop, presbyters, and deacons, which Sozomen followed, adding that the church was built on the site of the demolished temple (Eus., \textit{Vit. Const.} III.58.3; Soz., \textit{Hist. eccl.} V.10). However symbolically important these desecrations were, it is important to note that they only happened in a minority of cases.

\section*{4. CONSTANTINE’S CONSTRUCTION}

Constantine buttressed this reduction of paganism’s status with a monumental elevation of Christianity’s status, ordering the consecration of new churches throughout the empire. As shown by Eusebius’ discussion of procedure in the \textit{Life of Constantine}, these churches could be ordered and funded by Constantine, even if he was not living when they were completed by his successors. Constantine’s primary form of construction was the basilica, meeting halls which were frequently the site of loyalty oaths to the image of the emperor and therefore ‘combined religious connotations with the criteria of official building’.\textsuperscript{398} Christian examples were typified by an oblong plan, longitudinal axis, and vaulted ceilings, a framework with

\textsuperscript{397} Cameron and Hall (1999), 301-4; Fox (1988), 671-2.
\textsuperscript{398} Krautheimer and Ćurčić (1986), 41.
variations dictated by local needs. Constantine inherited a tradition of great imperial builders, such as Augustus, Trajan, and Hadrian, but Constantine’s construction transformed the tradition. As discussed in the previous chapter, Constantine had established a pattern of both building over other parties’ construction and giving Christianity a monumental presence in cities such as Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, Nicomedia, and Jerusalem/Aelia Capitolina. Constantine exercised oversight over this new construction, preserved in the writings of Eusebius (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.25-40). Churches which Constantine planned, funded, or constructed included examples in central locations in his new city, in non-threatening locations in Rome, and at the historic landmarks of the Christian faith. Throughout the empire, the Christian story was being written over the millennia-long story and traditions of pagan religion. Julian’s perceptions of Constantine’s actions in this area, specifically, Constantine’s and Constantius’ pattern of building over temple sites, were influential upon his later thought and action.

Constantine began this pattern of behavior in Rome after the defeat of his rival Maxentius in 312. Following standard imperial practice, he had Maxentius’ many public buildings rededicated to himself, including his rival’s basilica, which soon sported a statue of Constantine holding the *labarum* (Aur. Vict., *De Caes.* 26). Constantine also continued this monumental narrative with three basilicas which conveniently obliterated physical traces of his opponents. As discussed in chapter seven, part two, Constantine constructed the Basilica Constantina on top of the camp

---

399 Krautheimer and Ćurčić (1986), 43.
400 Constantine: S. Eirene, S. Sophia, Holy Apostles; Rome: S. John Lateran, S. Peter, S. Paul, S. Laurence, Ss. Marcellinus and Peter; Palestine: Bethlehem (Nativity), Mamre, Holy Sepulchre, Mount of Olives (Eleona); Barnes (2011), 86-8; Bowersock (2005), 5-15.
401 This was paralleled in Constantine’s and his sons’ legislation re. sacrifice and divination, for which see chapter 1.
of Maxentius’ horse guards, and a basilica on the Via Labicana over a graveyard dedicated to Maxentius’ horse guards, utilising and laundering an estate of the departed Fausta. 403 Similarly, the Praetorian guards also suffered a sort of abolitio in the form of a church built over their dedicated cemetery. 404 An inscription on the San Sebastiano or Basilica Apostolorum states that it was started by Constantine and finished by Constans (ICUR 2 (1888), 248 no. 17 = ICUR, N.S. 1 (1922), no. 3900). In addition, while Constantine did not apparently construct Old St. Peter’s on the Vatican, he likely chose the site and initiated the clearing of the Phrygianum it was built over. 405 Johnson estimates the date for this decision at A.D. 320. 406 Julian had no need to recapitulate Constantine’s actions in Rome. While Constantine’s efforts were significant and demonstrate his pattern of behaviour, they were comparatively dwarfed by Rome’s cultural, historical and monumental heritage.

Constantine continued his interest in overwriting the narrative of the past in Nicomedia, the capital of Bithynia, the tetrarchic capital, and starting point of the Great Persecution. Diocletian had decided to inaugurate his persecution on the Festival of the Terminalia (Lact., De mort. X.7; Eus., Praep. evan. IV.2.1; Vit. Const. II.50). 407 He ordered the church in Nicomedia, which could be seen from the palace, plundered and burned on 23 February 303 (Lact., De mort. XII.2-3; Eus., Hist. eccl. VIII.1.3-5.1). 408 Constantine responded by rebuilding the church, an act

405 Bowersock (2005), 5-15; Curran (2000), 100-1. The Basilica of Old St. Peter’s was replaced in the sixteenth century by the current Papal Basilica of St. Peter’s, part of the Vatican City complex.
408 Barnes (1981), 19, 22.
which Cameron and Hall agree ‘was thus an appropriate demonstration of
Constantine’s triumph’ (Eus., Tric. Or. IX.14; Vit. Const. III.50).  

Trier had been the capital of Constantius I during the tetrarchy and Constantine
from A.D. 306 to 312. The imperial palace was demolished in approximately 326
and a double basilica, Trier Cathedral, was built over it, possibly due to
uncomfortable associations with the empress Fausta, who died under mysterious
circumstances in 326.  
The southern portion was completed shortly by
incorporating a wall of the palace, but the northern portion was not completed until
Constans’ reign.

After Fausta’s death in 326, Constantine’s mother Helena traveled to Palestine
and was instrumental in arranging for church construction at Mamre, Bethlehem,
and the Mount of Olives. Upon receiving a report from Helena, Constantine
rebuked the bishop of Jerusalem for letting pagan sacrifice pollute Mamre, where
Christ had revealed himself to Abraham (Eus., Vit. Const. III.51.1). In A.D. 130, the
emperor Hadrian had ordered the compound enclosing the altar, well, and market
rebuilt and dedicated to Mercury. Constantine revealed his focus on desecration in
the statement, ‘It is certainly a monstrous evil that the holy sites should be marred by
sacrilegious abominations’ (ἀνοσίων μιασμάτων) (Eus., Vit. Const. III.52, tr.
Cameron and Hall; cf. Soz., Hist. eccl. II.4.6). Constantine instructed Macarius
and the other bishops to build a basilica at the site, ‘as soon as you learn that all the

409 Cameron and Hall (1998), 299.
411 Bowder (1978), 60.
412 Hunt (1997), 416-7. For the date of Helena’s journey, see Barnes (2011), 149; (1982), 77.
413 Negev and Gibson (2001), 313.
414 Eusebius used the same language at De laud. 8, SC 13. Eusebius also wrote on the theophany at
Dem. evan. V.9.5-8; Hist. eccl. I.2.7-8; cf. Justin, Dialogue 56. This harks back to Ezekiel 14.6,
‘Repent and turn away from your idols; and turn away your faces from all your abominations’
(NRSV).
defilements (τὰ μυσαρά) there have been completely removed’ (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.53.2). Prior to 330, the basilica was built against one wall of the old enclosure, apparently with a floor plan similar to the Lateran basilica.  

At a cave in Bethlehem, Helena consecrated a *martyrium* at the supposed site of Christ’s birth, at which pagans also celebrated the death of Adonis (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.43.1).  

Both Helena and Constantine enriched the site with monuments, treasures, artwork, and curtains (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.41.1, III.43.2). The site included an octagonal *martyrium* connected to a two-aisled basilica to the West by a colonnaded atrium. While the Church of the Nativity was replaced in the sixth century, excavations of the original structure reveal a 30 meter long forecourt and 45 meter long atrium, culminating in an octagonal sanctuary with several rooms.  

On the Mount of Olives, where Christ was reported to have ascended to heaven, Helena also ‘raised the sacred house of the church’ (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.43.3). Constantine’s significant church construction in Jerusalem will be treated more fully in chapter nine. While Libanius’ bias must be kept in mind, he blamed Constantius for destruction of temples and insisted that he gave temples to his courtiers (Lib., *Or.* XVII.7, XXX.38, LXII.8). Sozomen supported this, writing that some temples were given to the church for building materials or the sites (Soz., *Hist. eccl.* III.17). While our focus in on Constantine’s replacement of temples with churches, he did encourage a broader construction campaign, in which other churches were built, likely by local

---

415 Krautheimer and Ćurčić (1993), 59.
416 Bowder (1978), 63; Grant (1993), 206.
417 Krautheimer and Ćurčić (1993), 60.
authorities, in the early fourth century.\textsuperscript{418} Tafha in Syria is one example, which was built over the site of a temple which had likely fallen into disuse.\textsuperscript{419}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Constantine’s ‘overwriting’ construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. PAGAN REACTION

These actions produced what could be described as a ‘chilling effect’ for pagans. Looking back in summer 362, Julian summarized the mood of the times during Constantine’s and Constantius’ reigns as follows (Ep. 61c.423c):

It is true that, until now, there were many excuses for not attending the temples, and the terror that threatened on all sides absolved men for concealing the truest beliefs about the gods.

\textsuperscript{418} Butler, (1910), 19-24: Anz, Sammeh, Nimre and Tahfa.
At approximately the turn of the fifth century, Eunapius wrote that Christians warred against the temples and subsequently boasted that they had ‘overcome the gods’ (Eunapius, *Vit. soph.* VI.11.5). Public pagan sacrifice during the reign of Constantius was characterized as ‘daring’ by Libanius and ‘bold’ by Eunapius (Lib., *Or.* I.27; *Or.* XXX.17-9; *Ep.* 1351.3; Eun., *Vit. soph.* XX.6.8). Although one claim of Libanius that temple sacrifice proceeded as normal through the reign of Constantine is frequently used as evidence for Constantine’s toleration, the orator contradicted himself. In the 380s, Libanius disingenuously claimed that Constantine ‘made no alteration in the traditional forms of worship, but, though poverty reigned in the temples, one could see that all the rest of the ritual was fulfilled.’ (Lib., *Or.* XXX.6, tr. Norman). Yet in his *Funeral Oration over Julian* two decades earlier, Libanius himself described the situation for paganism in the 340s-50s quite differently, with ‘their temples in ruins, their ritual banned, their altars overturned, their sacrifices suppressed’ (Lib., *Or.* XVIII.22-3, tr. Norman). Libanius was, of course, writing in a different time, and countering Theodosius’ heavy-handed support of Christianity with the claim that Constantine had handled the issue differently. This evidence suggests that Constantine was perceived as having fundamentally changed the religious complexion of the empire. The desecration and occasional destruction of temples undoubtedly contributed to an atmosphere of hostility between the two religions, and felt like persecution.

Julian thought that he could suppress or overwrite Constantine’s Christianisation. In his 361 satire *The Caesars*, Julian mocked Constantine’s ephemeral accomplishments (X.329cd). This was the task which Julian claimed under cover of

---

420 Eunapius’ *Vit. Soph.* is usually dated 399, but sometimes in the fifth century.
myth in 362 that he had been tasked with by the gods at some point between 342 and 348 (VII.231d, 232c, 234c). Julian wrote revealingly in two places about this motivation. As cited above, Julian confirmed his intent by privately writing to his uncle in 361: ‘The gods command me to restore their worship in its utmost purity’ (Ep. 28.415cd, tr. Wright). Julian also wrote more officially to one of his priests, ‘we must maintain such rituals of the temples as ancestral custom prescribes’ (Ep. 89b).

Julian also described Constantine as the desecrator and Constantius as the destroyer of the temples, and added ominously that they would need the tombs since they disregarded their pagan heritage (VII.b-d, my translation):

The sons demolished their forefathers’ temples which their father first despised and denuded of the offerings (ἀναθήματον) donated by many others (not least by his forefathers). But demolishing the ancient temples they built new tombs (μνήματα), driven to this mindlessly and by fate, since they thought so little of the gods they would soon need many such tombs.

As Gibbon wrote, ‘The names of Christ and Constantius . . . were soon associated in a youthful imagination’. Following Julian’s framework of VII.228b-d, Libanius wrote that it was issues like the destruction of the temples that initially motivated Julian’s desire to depose Constantius (Lib. Or. XVIII.22-3, tr. Norman):
It arose from a longing not for luxury, power or the imperial purple, but for the restoration by his own efforts of the worship of the gods in particular to the empire whence it had been expelled. It was this that shook him to the core, as he saw their temples in ruins, their ritual banned, their altars overturned, their sacrifices suppressed, their priests sent packing, and their property divided between a crew of rascals.

Ammianus recorded Julian’s dismissal of numerous palace officials whom he described as ‘those creatures’ of the court that had been ‘fattened on the robbery of temples’ (Amm. XXII.4.3).

Julian responded by facilitating, or at least signalling he would not object to, the desecration of Christian churches, or as he called them, ‘tombs’. In accordance with longstanding Roman tradition, Julian found the proximity of Christian worship and the bodies of the dead appalling. We know from inscriptions that pagans believed the presence of dead bodies was polluting and required purification (LSCG 154 B 17-32; IG II-III 2nd ed., 659 = LSCG 39, Kos and Athens). Eunapius described the collection of martyr’s relics, and how Christians ‘haunted their sepulchers (µνήµασι), and thought that they became better by defiling (µολυνόµενοι) themselves at their graves’ as churches were frequently built over martyr’s remains (Eun., Vit. soph. VI.11.5.6). Eusebius attributed many martyr shrines to Constantine, and the later historians Socrates and Sozomen specify two, St. Mocius, and St. Acacia (Eus., Vit. Const. III.47; Soz., Hist. eccl. VIII.17; Soc., Hist. eccl. VI.23). Julian also described Christian churches as τάφων και µνηµάτων, ‘tombs and

424 Barnes (1981), 222.
sepulchres’, and attempted to end the transportation of relics by outlawing tomb violation (C. Gal. 335c; C. Th. IX.17.5). 425 Ironically, this followed Constantius II’s similar prohibition of A.D. 357, at roughly the same time as his translation of the relics of Timothy, Andrew and Luke to Constantinople (C. Th. IX.17.4; Jerome, Chron. 322d, s.a. 356).

6. DESECRATION UNDER JULIAN

Regarding churches, as opposed to Constantine, Julian seemed to generally prefer an indirect approach to church desecration, encouraging his subjects rather than sending troops to do it. Julian officially wrote that he disapproved of persecution and physical mistreatment of the Christians, distancing himself from any potential anti-imperial reaction in support of official martyrs. In his mid-362 Rescript on Christian Teachers, Julian proclaimed (Ep. 61c.424, tr. Wright; cf. Ep. 83.376c; Ep. 114.438bc):

Though indeed it might be proper to cure these, even against their will, as one cures the insane, except that we concede indulgence to all for this sort of disease. For we ought, I think, to teach, but not punish, the demented.

However, his refusal to punish the mob that killed bishop George of Alexandria in 361 had demonstrated a clear lack of interest in protecting Christians under the

425 Julian equated Christian martyr veneration with polytheism, C. Gal. 201c.
law. Julian wrote that the Alexandrians were ‘justly provoked’ as soldiers under George’s direction had plundered local temples (Ep. 60.379b). Ammianus attributes George’s demise to his unwisely asking his companions in front of a crowd of pagans, ‘How long will this sepulchre (sepulcrum) stand?’, following which the Alexandrians had taken the law into their own hands by dismembering George (Amm. XXII.11.8). Julian, however, would likely have seized upon the propaganda value of such an event, but instead chastised an apparently pagan audience in his letter, while adding that George likely deserved even worse, an admonishment which Bowder aptly describes as ‘a model of how to condemn an action while really, and obviously, approving of it’ (Ep. 60.380a). In this atmosphere, further local rioting and murder also broke out in Heliopolis, Askalon, Gaza, Arethusa, Emesa, Sebaste Samaria, Caesarea Paneas, and Berytus, attested in sources of varying quality (Soz., Hist. eccl. V.9-11; Theodoret, Hist. eccl. III.3; IV.22; Chronicon Paschale 546-7; Mark the Deacon, Life of Porphyry; Philost., Hist. eccl. VII.3). The historian Sozomen connected the rioting in Heliopolis, specifically the pagan violation and murder of consecrated virgins, to Constantine’s destruction of the shrine of Aphrodite at Heliopolis as discussed earlier. He wrote (Soz., Hist. eccl. V.10, tr. NPNF):

I am convinced that the citizens of Heliopolis perpetrated this barbarity against the holy virgins on account of the prohibition of the ancient custom of yielding up virgins to prostitution with any chance comer before being united

---

426 The scholarly debate over dating is discussed more fully in the introduction, part three.
in marriage to their betrothed. This custom was prohibited by a law enacted by Constantine, after he had destroyed the temple of Venus at Heliopolis, and erected a church upon its ruins.

The events in Gaza and Emesa won praise instead of punishment from the emperor, with Julian hinting to the Antiochenes that church burnings in Emesa could be repeated in Antioch as well (XII.357c; cf. Greg. Naz., Or. IV.93). In early 363, Julian wrote that those attacking churches in the area of Antioch did so at his signal, and with great vigour (XII.361a). Sozomen described the numerous local persecutions that broke out despite Julian’s official disapproval (Soz., Hist. Eccl. V.15):

The blame of these transactions may be justly imputed to the ruler; for he did not bring under the force of law the transgressors of law, but out of his hatred to the Christian religion, he only visited the perpetrators of such deeds with verbal rebukes, while, by his actions, he urged them on in the same course.

Sozomen also reported that his grandfather was forced to flee local persecution of this sort during Julian’s reign (Soz., Hist. Eccl. V.15). This position of official toleration and unofficial encouragement of persecution allowed Julian the advantages of both sides.
Julian came to power desiring to be seen as the restorer of the empire. While Caesar in Gaul, he had been thanked in an inscription in Beneventum, Apulia ‘for the care of the Res Publica’ (*CIL* IX.1562). He was praised for restoring a great many cities to life by Claudius Mamertinus in January 362 (*Panegyrici Latini XI* (3) 9.4), and praised by the council of Aceruntia, Apulia in an inscription as the ‘Repairer of the World’ (*CIL* IX.417). Restoring the cities was also tied to the restoration of the empire’s religion, and Julian responded to Constantine’s robbery of the sacred contents of the temples with building works of his own (VII.228b-d). Julian made the rebuilding of temples a priority, for which he was recognized by the provincial assembly of Phoenicia as the *templorun [re]stauratori* or ‘Restorer of the Temples’ (*AE* 1969/70 631; cf. Amm. XXII.5.2). This priority was demonstrated by a law of 29 June 362 which did survive in the *Codex Theodosianus*, showing that Julian made temple construction the top priority of public works throughout the Empire (*C.Th. XV.1.3*):

> We direct that judges of the provinces shall be admonished that they must know that they shall not arrange for any new work until they have completed those works which were commenced by their predecessors, excepting only the construction of temples.

Ammianus confirmed these laws and seemed to place Julian’s movement in this direction early in his sole reign (Amm. XXII.5.2, tr. Hamilton):
Now, however, that this fear was removed and he saw that the time had come when he could do as he liked, he revealed what was in his heart and directed in plain unvarnished terms that the temples should be opened, sacrifices brought to their altars, and the worship of the old gods restored.

As the only such example of this kind of evidence, at Deir el-Meshkuk we find a small second-century pagan temple that Julian restored and reconsecrated in early 362.\textsuperscript{429} The inscription reads,

\begin{verbatim}
ἐπὶ κρατήσεως Φλ(αβίου) Κλ(αυδίου) ᾽Ιουλιανοῦ
ἀυτοκράτορος Αὐγοῦστου
ἀνίθη τὰ ἱερὰ, καὶ ἀνοικοδομή=
μήθη καὶ ἀφιερώθη ὁ ναό=
ὅς ἐν ἔτ(ει)σεν Ἔυς(τ)ρου ἔ
\end{verbatim}

Under the rule of the Emperor Fl[avius] Cl[audius] Julianus Augustus the rites were restored, and the temple was rebuilt and consecrated in the year 256, on the 5\textsuperscript{th} of Dystrus [19 February 362].\textsuperscript{430}

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{429} Deir el-Meshkuk is at lat. 32.20, long. 36.40, not near a modern landmark.
\end{footnotes}
This inscription was found by the Princeton Archaeological Expedition of 1904-5, led by Henry Butler. Amidst dramatic accounts of dodging Druse raiding parties, the expedition related that they came across an inscription at Deir el-Meshkuk:

which proved on examination to be of great interest. There are the remains of a second century pagan temple, which was converted into a church in early Christian times, apparently restored to pagan use under Julian, once more turned into a church, and finally in the middle ages changed so as to be available for living purposes. Inscriptions carried away by the Druses to neighboring villages help to give the history of this ruin.\footnote{Butler (1910), 31.}

Hard evidence for the restoration of these temples and Julian’s very public role in restoring the sacrifices is important, as he resolutely pursued the ideal of restoration, but also made use of the temples pragmatically.

Julian resolutely pursued this ideal, but also made use of the temples pragmatically. Julian held audiences in pagan sanctuaries beside cult statues, intimidating Christians who sought the emperor’s audience (Lib., \textit{Or.} XVIII.121, 161-3, 167-8). For such actions, Libanius eulogized Julian as ‘he that restored the temples to the gods, the author of deeds unforgettable, himself unforgettable’ (Lib., \textit{Or.} XXX.41).

Like Constantine, Julian forced his opponents to pay for the construction of his religious edifices. Julian’s edict is also supported by Libanius, who confirmed that
Julian built, restored, and refurbished temples, and that those who had plundered the temples were having to contribute money (Lib., Or. XVIII.126).

Some temples he built, others he restored, while he furnished others with statues. People who had built houses for themselves from the stones of the temples began to contribute money.

This is backed by the later statement of Zonaras, who reported that at Tarsus, Julian ordered that the Christians at Aigai who had stolen the columns from the Asklepiion there were to restore them at their expense (Zon., XIII.12). Julian also had priests oversee such cases, indicated by Libanius’ letter on behalf of an Antiochene whose fine villa built from a temple was on the verge of being dismantled to repair the temple (Lib., Ep. 724). Libanius defended the man’s legal purchase of building material that was legal at the time, and counseled moderation and reason to the priest Hesychius overseeing the case (Lib., Ep. 724).

8. CHRISTIAN REACTION

Julian’s escalating engagement of the Christian church towards the end of his reign did not escape his opponents. Their analyses of his strategy are reasonable and fair. In 377-78, John Chrysostom categorized Julian’s strategy as three-pronged: rebuilding the Jewish Temple, rescinding the depositions of non-Nicene bishops, and changing the debate by renaming the Christians ‘Galileans’ (Chrysostom,

432 Lib., Ep. 724 (Foerster)=182b (Bradbury).
Babylas 21). Later, Sozomen identified three different key points in Julian’s strategy relating to co-opting the structure of the Christian church: teachers for exhortation, monasteries for philosophical reflection, and hospitals for charitable work (Soz., Hist. eccl. V.16). Moving beyond strategy to projections of future conflict, many argued that the church had been providentially spared from Julian’s intentions. Shortly after Julian’s death, Gregory Nazianzen wrote that Julian’s plan was to ultimately deprive Christians of all rights of speech and assembly (Greg. Naz., Or. IV.96). Chrysostom wrote that during Julian’s time in Antioch, he ‘prepared for war against the churches’ (Chrysostom, Babylas 119). Chrysostom also claimed that ‘those privy to his plans’ related statements that after Julian’s return from Persia he would destroy the church completely (Chrysostom, Babylas 121). In 402-3, after recording his interview with the young man tortured by Julian’s prefect, Rufinus related that Julian made a statement to intimidate the Christians, threatening to do a better job of subduing the Christians after his victory over the Persians (Rufinus X.37). Other authors with no indication that their work is based on contemporary accounts express similar sentiment (Jerome, Chron. 325b, s.a. 363; Orosius VII.30). While later responses with no apparent first hand knowledge need not be taken as factual, they do indicate the seriousness with which Christian writers took Julian’s pagan revival.

Julian’s response recapitulated Constantine’s building program. He built or attempted to build a competing set of structures relating the pagan narrative instead of Constantine’s Christian one. The evidence may not be sufficient to extrapolate from these cases to a regular policy for all cases of desecration and consecration

---

433 This topic will be treated more fully in chapter eleven.
involving these two rulers. But what we do have illuminates religious conflict in the fourth century. More specifically, the stated intentions of the two rulers reveal Julian’s similar efforts as not mere coincidence, but a direct attempt to reverse his hated uncle’s Christianization. Julian’s actions in this regard highlight the contrast he drew between Constantine, ‘the forsaker of Helios’ and failed representative of his people, and himself as the chosen ‘child of Helios’ who would set things right, and suggest other lines of inquiry into Julian’s thought and action (Or. VII.229c, 228d). Julian additionally undertook a ‘structural recapitulation’ in locations key to the Christian narrative such as Constantinople, Jerusalem, and Antioch.

9. CONCLUSION

To conclude our overview of this comparison of the reigns of Constantine and Julian, the public narratives of the two emperors followed a similar pattern regarding intent, practice, and methodology. Julian made the aspect of similitudo quite clear. As Constantine was chosen by God to restore and foster the growth of his religion, so Julian was chosen by the gods to restore their religion and cleanse the empire of ‘impiety’ (Eus., Vit. Const. II.28.1-29.1, 45; Julian, VII.231d, 234c). Julian’s actions also fit the description of iteratio. As Constantine desecrated temples and demolished several, Julian encouraged the destruction of churches (Eus., Vit. Const. III.54.2, 55-8; Julian, XII.357c, 361a). Constantine built a cross in the palace and

---

434 Cochrane (1940), 263: ‘Indeed, it might almost be said that the policy of Julian was modeled upon that of his predecessor, whose actions he endeavored, in a spirit of slavish imitation, to reverse’. Smith (1995), 210 writes: ‘The Christianity he set himself against was not an abstraction. It was intimately linked in his mind to members of his own family’.

435 Smith (1995), 187, notes in a broader context: ‘in his writings his hatred of Christianity is manifestly linked to his hatred of members of the Second Flavian dynasty’.
Julian responded with a temple (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.49; Lib., *Or.* XVIII.127; *Or.* XII.80-1). Constantine built many new churches, including several at pagan sites, and Julian responded by restoring and reconsecrating temples, while making temples the first priority of state construction (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.26-40, 43.1, 3, 47.4, 50.1, 51.1; Soz., *Hist. eccl.* VIII.17.5; *C.Th.* XV.1.3; *Hist. Aceph.* IX; Amm. XXII.12.8). Finally, as Constantine forced pagans to fund their own destruction by plundering temples, Julian made Christians pay to rebuild temples (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.26-40, 51.1; Soz., *Hist. eccl.* VIII.17.5; *Hist. Aceph.* IX; Libanius, *Or.* XVIII.126, *Ep.* 182b). This overall picture of Julian’s program highlights the aspects of *similitudo* and *iteratio*, but did not bring *restitutio* in reach. For that, we must examine Julian’s specific efforts in the strategic cities of Constantinople, Jerusalem, and Antioch, where the stakes for the future of the empire were much higher.
CHAPTER EIGHT:
RECAPITULATION OF SPACE AT CONSTANTINOPLE

1. INTRODUCTION

Following his new understanding of the heavenly sign he had witnessed, Constantine became the first Roman emperor to embrace Christianity. He had announced legal protection for Christians in his realm in the West, then pressured the eastern ruler to do the same for eastern Christians. In slightly more than a decade, he had defeated his rivals to become sole ruler of the Roman Empire. Seeking ways to build on his recent victory over Licinius and support Christianity, he decided to build a new city that would rival Rome in wealth and institutions, and I will argue that he did so in a distinctively Christian fashion. A key step in evaluating Julian’s reaction against Christianity in terms of his recapitulation of place involves Constantine’s foundation of Constantinople, and Julian’s reaction to that event. I will argue that following Julian’s entrance into Constantine’s city on 11 December 361 as the sole Augustus, he took significant steps to recapitulate the Constantinian revolution in a material sense (Amm. XXII.2.4; Soc., Hist. eccl. III.1.2). He did this by reintroducing pagan worship in Constantine’s city which had been free of pagan cult, and by building a pagan chapel in the palace which Constantine had erected a cross to act as a talisman for the empire. Our sources specific to this chapter include orations of Himerius (Or. XLI), and of Libanius (Or.

436 Constantine’s conversion is discussed more fully in chapter two, where I explain the reasoning behind a date of 312 for his conversion.
437 Seeck (1919), 209.
XVIII), which shed light upon the restoration of pagan worship, and Julian’s construction of a private temple at the palace.

In Julian’s first oration to his cousin Constantius II, the reigning Augustus, he mentioned the relationship between Rome and Constantinople, beginning with Constantine’s founding of the city: ‘In not even ten entire years, he founded and gave his name to a city so much greater than all others, as it is less than Rome. I at least think that to come second to Rome is better than being named first of all the others’ (I.8c, my translation). Later in the same oration, he wrote of Constantinople again, shifting the historical context to the reign of Constantius II, and his contribution to Constantine’s city. He praised Constantius II for continuing the wall which Constantine began, and restoring the unsafe buildings (I.41a). Julian’s meaning in these two brief passages is not difficult to discern. He acknowledged the unavoidable historical importance of Constantine’s new city, a city which was associated almost exclusively not with its history as Byzantium, but with Constantine and Constantius II. Julian also acknowledged the role of Constantius II, who had continued the massive building project of his father. He praised the new city of Constantine, allowing its greatness in comparison to other cities, except for Rome, which surpassed it by an equal order of magnitude. Julian lavished praise on the city, but even though Constantinople’s dominance was not yet assured by this time, it was already a phenomenon drawing nobles and scholars alike. When Julian complimented Constantius for the restoration of unsound buildings, this was a way to praise his cousin while avoiding direct criticism of Constantine, many of whose buildings went up so quickly that they were ready to fall down a mere generation later (Zos. II.35.2). Julian’s actions regarding Constantinople must be interpreted in
light of his view of the city’s relationship to Constantius II and especially the city’s founder, Constantine. Julian’s actions regarding Constantinople were driven by his reaction to it as Constantine’s city as well as its status as an exemplar of a Christian city.

2. CONSTANTINE’S FOUNDING OF CONSTANTINOPLE

The founding of Constantinople was a venture on a staggering scale. As a site, Constantinople had ‘some serious drawbacks’, namely a lack of any natural landward defenses, exposed agricultural area, and lack of water supply. Its original economy was based on the Greek colonies of the Black Sea north shore whose trade bottlenecked through the Strait, colonies which died in the third century A.D. With all the drawbacks inherent in the site, ‘an elaborate and costly infrastructure’ would be required to support a great city. Yet these longer-term considerations did not dissuade Constantine from his initial goal of ‘establishing an extensive ritual space, a city-sized stage’. It was common by the fourth century for an emperor to rule from other cities besides Rome, or to found new cities to commemorate victories or family members. However, Constantinople has since become invested with greater meaning because of its portrayal as the ‘New Rome’, and as the Christian city in contrast to Rome, the pagan one. The emperor’s motives are obscured by late and disingenuous attempts to rewrite the story of the city by Eunapius and Zosimus, as well as modern authors such as Burckhardt, who view
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Constantine through the lens of Napoleon to a radically distorting extent. Yet despite one scholar’s statement that ‘Constantine has left no record of his motives in founding his new capital save one phrase in one of his constitutions – that he acted “on the command of God”’, we can to an extent reconstruct motive from evidence regarding the way in which Constantine founded the city. As ambiguous evidence abounds, that research should focus on what we can know and render a historical judgment from.

Constantine chose the site for his new city at Byzantium, which Septimius Severus had sacked in A.D. 196. A new hippodrome and baths were attributed to Septimius Severus himself, but in 240 Herodian noted that the city walls were still not rebuilt (Herodian, History III.6.9-10; cf. Cassius Dio, Roman History LXXV.14.4-6). Stephenson offers an attractive theory, noting that someone rebuilt the city after 240, the most likely candidate being Licinius, who had retreated to Byzantium in 317, and again in 324 after his loss to Constantine at Adrianople. If Byzantium was seen as ‘Licinius’ city’, this may have contributed to Constantine’s decision to build there as a ‘trophy of victory’ over Licinius. This fits well with his pattern of overwriting construction elsewhere.

Once the decision was made, Constantine promptly embarked on the building of his new city and on 8 November, 324, work began at the site of his new city which he ‘consecrated … to the martyrs’ God’ (Eus., Vit. Const. III.48.1; Them., Or. IV; Eun., Vit. soph. VI.1.1-12). This date is significant for its association with the founding of Rome. The subterranean mundus marking the earliest known settlement

\[442\] Burckhardt (1853), 281.
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of Rome was opened three times yearly, on 24 August, 5 October, and 8 November. While this does not particularly resonate in the modern era, it surely would have with Constantine’s intended audience. Constantine’s choice of dates may have been either long-planned or an afterthought once practical considerations had determined the general time of completion, but coincidence seems unlikely. This symbolic use of dates is similar to Diocletian’s opening his Great Persecution on the festival of the *Terminalia*, 23 February 303, especially significant when considered with Constantine’s apparent responses to Diocletian’s actions in regards to building projects (Lact., *De mort.* XIII; Eus., *Hist. eccl.* VIII.2.4; Mart. Pal. Praef. 1, IV.8).

In the sixth century, Lydus claimed that in Constantine’s traditional act of tracing the city walls, he was assisted by Sopatros the astrologer and Praetextatus the hierophant, both non-Christians (John the Lydian, *Liber de Mensibus* 4.2). Although Mango and others have given this credence and claimed that ‘the foundation of Constantinople was accompanied by purely pagan rites’, this late information cannot be reconciled with the contemporary account of Eusebius (*Vit. Const.* III.48.1-2), which should be given weight here. In addition, Praetextatus was born in 324, and was therefore unable to perform any ambulatory, let alone religiously significant, role in the *consecratio*. On this same date, Constantine’s son Constantius II was invested as Caesar.

The message sent by Constantine’s choice of date for the founding was matched in the date for the dedication. The official dedication of the city was on 11 May, 330. This date is significant as it marked the feast of St. Mocius, martyred under

---

448 Alan Cameron (2011), 273-309, 612. Cracco Ruggini (1980), 610, asserts that the busy lad Praetextatus officiated at all the pagan ceremonies between A.D. 328 and 330.
Diocletian in Byzantium.\textsuperscript{449} Constantine’s awareness of and interest in Mocius, who he may have known in Nicomedia, is confirmed by his building of a church at his grave dedicated to him.\textsuperscript{450} The location of that church in his new city is unfortunately unknown, lost ‘without trace’.\textsuperscript{451} Wilken notes the obvious symbolism reinforcing the idea that Diocletian’s pagan deities would not be honoured in Constantine’s city.\textsuperscript{452} It is highly unlikely that the choice of these two key dates with their cultural associations could be merely coincidental. These parallels support Stephenson’s assessment that Constantine was ‘closely involved in all aspects of the city’s construction from foundation to dedication’.\textsuperscript{453}

3. CHRISTIANISING CONSTANTINOPLE

Eusebius’ description of the religious nature of the new city has also sparked debate. Eusebius wrote (Eus., \textit{Vit. Const.} III.48.2, tr. Cameron/Hall):

\begin{quote}
Being full of the breath of God’s wisdom, which he reckoned a city bearing his own name should display, he saw fit to purge it of all idol-worship, so that nowhere in it appeared those images of the supposed gods which are worshipped in temples, nor altars foul with bloody slaughter, nor sacrifice offered as holocaust in fire, nor feasts of demons, nor any of the other customs of the superstitious.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{449} I recognise the alternate possibility that as time passed, S. Mocius came to be commemorated on the anniversary of the city’s founding.

\textsuperscript{450} Delehaye (1933), 235; Barnes (1981), 222; \textit{Acta Sanctorum}, Propylaeum ad Nov. (1902), 673.

\textsuperscript{451} Ward-Perkins (2012), 74.
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Key to understanding this text is the Christian view of idolatry in this period, which did not demand elimination of buildings or statues, but rather the sacrifice associated with them. A number of modern scholars suggest that Constantine allowed pagan sacrifice to continue in his city.\(^{454}\) Elsner categorises Constantine’s use of the surviving pagan statues as gestures which readers should not ‘exaggerate the Christianity of’.\(^{455}\) In sharp contrast, Barnes asserts based on Eusebius’ writings that Constantine razed Byzantium to the ground to re-found his new city with its new religion.\(^{456}\) While the inference Barnes draws is not supportable from available evidence, the scale of construction in Constantinople as demonstrated by territory enclosed within the new city walls completed in 328 meant that at the very least in practical terms Constantine supplantedy Byzantium, rather than supplementing it.

In addition, Eusebius’ interpretation of Constantine’s actions is supported by several key pieces of evidence. As discussed in detail in the previous chapter, Constantine did outlaw pagan sacrifice, and further, built many churches and installed a cross in the palace (Eus., Vit. Const., III.48.1, 49). Key to this is the evidence of the pagan poet Palladas, recently and convincingly re-dated to the first half of the fourth century by Kevin Wilkinson.\(^{457}\) Wilkinson supports his claim that Constantine’s subjects perceived the city to be Christian from the beginning by citing Palladas’ mocking allusion to Constantine’s victory coinage and description of Constantinople as ‘the Christ-loving (φιλοχρίστος) city’.\(^{458}\) He also refers to the ‘twelve newer gods’ which penitent sinners can turn to, an apparent reference to

\(^{455}\) Elsner (2006), 266.
\(^{457}\) Wilkinson (2009), 36-60; (2010), 94.
Constantine’s mausoleum with the tombs set aside for twelve apostles.\textsuperscript{459} This approach was echoed in Julian’s mocking Jesus’ indiscriminate absolution of sinners time and again for heinous crimes (X.336ab).

Each point related to this complex issue must be qualified by other evidence, as Eusebius was essentially correct, but Constantine’s religious intent for his city should be understood in a non-rigorist sense. Constantine demonstrated a willingness to forbear with the pagans he opposed, writing, ‘Those who hold themselves back, let them keep if they wish their sanctuaries of falsehood. To us belongs the shining house of your truth’ (Eus., \textit{Vit. Const.} II.56.2; cf. Const., \textit{Oration} 11). While Constantine would have had access to ‘speech writers’, and so one must still admit that there is a potential gap in what we can know of his thought, Fergus Millar reminds us that the available evidence portrays Constantine writing his speeches in Latin for translation into Greek.\textsuperscript{460} Constantine’s continued forbearance coincides with Lactantius’ earlier attitude in the \textit{Divine Institutes}, assessed by Edwards as a ‘provisional indulgence of the false cults’.\textsuperscript{461} This statement does indicate a certain toleration for those Constantine disagreed with, but one should not extrapolate from that to a long-term acceptance of what Constantine considered to be grievous error. Drake and Digeser are correct to a point to note Constantine’s forbearance towards paganism, but both assume his acceptance of a permanent status quo.\textsuperscript{462} Constantine’s tolerance was a temporary forbearance only, and communicated his belief in the long-term incompatibility of Christianity and paganism. This was a message clearly confirmed by Constantine’s despoiling of the

\textsuperscript{459} Wilkinson (2010), 189-91.
\textsuperscript{460} Millar (1977), 205-6.
\textsuperscript{461} Edwards (2006), 154.
\textsuperscript{462} Thoroughly permeating Drake (2000); Digeser (2000).
‘sanctuaries of falsehood’, and the prevention of the pagan sacrifice within that was the purpose of those sanctuaries. Despite any qualifications in this assessment of Constantine, Julian reacted to all of Constantine’s acts in this area at their face value, and viewed Constantine as a consistent supporter of Christianity.

Despite these laws, Constantine reinforced the dominance of his new city by populating it with statuary, paintings, and artifacts of pagan provenance. This was focused in three areas: the Baths of Zeuxippos, the Hippodrome, and the Forum of Constantine.\(^{463}\) This coherent display coupled with the rapid collection in Constantinople suggests design and purpose; a deliberate crafting of ‘a unique Constantinopolitan identity that made the city the last link in a chain of destiny that stretched from Troy to Rome’.\(^{464}\) The pieces with religious significance included statuary from Hellenic sanctuaries: Apollo (Delphi), Museion (Mt. Helikon), Apollo Smintheos (Chryse in the Troad), as well as a statue of Hercules from Rome, a statue of a wolf suckling Romulus and Remus, the twin sons of Mars, and an Egyptian obelisk of Thutmose III (Eus., Vit. Const. III.54; cf. Livy I.30.10).\(^{465}\) While Zosimus later claimed that Constantine had left the temple of the Dioscuri intact and built sanctuaries for Tyche and Rhea (Zos. II.30-31), no evidence exists of pagan cult use, and Zosimus may in fact be describing architectural features with statues of Roma and Constantinopolis.\(^{466}\) Monumental city centers provided civic identity and pride, as well as status for city leaders, regardless of the provenance of the works contained therein. Libanius connected the emperor’s raiding pagan temples with the

\(^{463}\) Bassett (2004), 51; Stephenson (2009), 197-200.


construction of Constantinople, writing that Constantine ‘employed the sacred treasures on the building of the city upon which his heart was set’ (Lib., Or. XXX.6).\textsuperscript{467} Jerome wrote that Constantine had denuded almost all other cities to enrich Constantinople (Jerome, Chron. 314g, s.a. 330).\textsuperscript{468} The writings of Libanius and Eunapius likely reflect pagan frustration at the drain of the New Rome (Lib., Or. I.74-80; Eun., Vit. soph. VI.2.9).\textsuperscript{469} All parties understood that such a program ‘was the expression of a power relationship in which the ability to commandeer sculpture expressed the dominance of one party over another’.\textsuperscript{470} Plunder and reuse highlighted continuity with tradition, the power of the plunderer, and dominance vis-à-vis the plundered. While there were statues remaining in the city, Eusebius was correct that the unattended statues no longer served a cultic purpose.\textsuperscript{471} This is confirmed by Himerius’ statement during Julian’s reign, that in his revival Julian had re-established pagan rites, strongly suggesting that Constantinople had, indeed, been free of pagan cult (Him., Or. XLI.8).\textsuperscript{472} The lack of sacrifice suggests that Constantine the Christian emperor was making a significant break with the past, although this does not mandate a rigorist Constantine any more than allowing solar-image coins to continue being minted necessitates a cynic Constantine. Eusebius attempted to deflect criticism on the point of the statuary by explaining that Constantine ‘used these very toys for the laughter and amusement of the spectators’ (Eus., Vit. Const. III.54), but Constantine’s pragmatic employment of the pagan
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\textsuperscript{472} Himerius’ Or. XLI was previously discussed more fully in chapter four, part four.
Nicagoras of Athens, the hierophant of the Eleusinian mysteries, to procure such art suggests that ridiculing paganism was not Constantine’s apparent priority.\textsuperscript{473}

Constantine’s new city displayed his religion in a number of ways. Eusebius wrote of an image on the city walls that portrayed the Emperor Constantine with the \textit{Chi-Rho} emblem on his helmet, his foot on a serpent, holding the spear he pierced it with, representing Constantine’s victory over Satan (Eus., \textit{Vit. Const.} III.3.1-3). There were coins with the same imagery, although for years after his conversion, Constantine’s mints continued to produce traditional coinage honoring Sol Invictus, the ‘unconquered sun.’\textsuperscript{474} As coinage was not always instant propaganda, but was rather slow-moving and delegated to others, we should be careful not to expect an immediate and complete overhaul of coinage for things explicitly Christian. Work was started in 326 on what would after a convoluted process become the Church of the Holy Apostles.\textsuperscript{475} It is likely that Constantine initially built a mausoleum intending to have the twelve apostles buried with him (Eus., \textit{Vit. Const.} IV.60), following which Constantius II procured apostles in 356-7 (Jerome, \textit{Chron.} 322d, \textit{s.a.} 356; Philost. II.2; \textit{Chron. Paschale} p. 542), but compromised and placed them next door in a church, which was dedicated in 370.\textsuperscript{476} The structure contained the future tomb of the emperor, as well as twelve other tombs, intended for the remains of the apostles, which would signify Constantine’s apostolic status. I believe this symbolism was similar to his claim to be the \textit{ἐπίσκοπος} of those outside the church (Eus., \textit{Vit. Const.} IV.24). By this date, the dominant meaning was the ecclesiastical

\textsuperscript{473} Millar (1969), 17; Barnes (1981), 72, 322 n. 103; Fowden (1987), 56; Potter (2004), 384, n. 102; (2012), 265; Bassett (2004), 43; although Potter and Bassett make too much of Nicagoras’ participation.
\textsuperscript{474} Bruun (1966), 61.
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use of the title ἑπίσκοπος for ‘bishop’. However, Constantine may have been less asserting his status as a bishop and more reassuring the bishops that he did not intend to encroach upon the church. Timothy’s remains were transported to the mausoleum on 1 June 356 and Andrew and Luke on 3 March 357.\(^{477}\) Mango sees this as a plan that ‘verged on the blasphemous. By placing his own tomb at the centre and those of the twelve apostles on either side of him, he was proclaiming in the language of iconography that he was the equal of Christ, just as earlier in life he had been the double of Sol Invictus’.\(^{478}\) While I maintain that Constantine was more likely proclaiming his apostlehood, it is certainly an interpretation which may have occurred to contemporaries, as well as to Julian. According to a tradition preserved by the fourteenth-century historian Nicephorus Callistus, the structure was built over the site of an altar of twelve gods of the pagan pantheon (Nicephorus Callistus, Hist. eccl. VIII.55 = PG 146.220).

On 11 May 330, Constantine also dedicated the martyr church of St. Mocius at Constantinople, and according to a much later tradition converted a temple of Jupiter to do so (Descripctio consulum 330; Soz., Hist. eccl. VIII.17.5; Consularia Constantinopolitana XIX.214).\(^{479}\) Mango locates the church outside old Byzantium, but inside Constantine’s new city.\(^{480}\) Sozomen also attributed the Church of St. Irene or ‘Holy Peace’ to Constantine (Soc., Hist. eccl. I.16, II.16).\(^{481}\) The high point of Constantine’s interest here is his consecration of the palace in Constantinople, as he placed the Saviour’s sign (likely the cross or labarum) over the palace gate (Eus., Vit. Const. III.2-3). In a move less obvious to the population, but revealing as to
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Constantine’s perspective, he symbolically placed a cross at the seat of his power, which Cameron and Hall note was ‘explicitly presented as a talisman’ (Eus., Vit. Const. III.49, tr. Cameron and Hall).\textsuperscript{482}

So great was the divine passion which had seized the Emperor's soul that in the royal quarters of the imperial palace itself, on the most eminent building of all, at the very middle of the gilded coffer adjoining the roof, in the centre of a very large wide panel, had been fixed the emblem of the saving Passion made up of a variety of precious stones and set in much gold. This appears to have been made by the Godbeloved as a protection for his Empire.

Not only was the Imperial palace dominated by the symbol of Constantine’s religion, the emperor during Julian’s older years was the more overtly Christianizing Constantius II. Constantius II resided primarily in Antioch (337-50, 360-1) and Sirmium (351-9), only visiting Constantinople from September to November 337, and autumn 359 to March 360, with apparently brief visits in 342, 343, and 350.\textsuperscript{483} Despite spending comparatively little time in Constantinople, he associated himself with the city by his construction. Constantinople’s rapid growth and increased prestige was also demonstrated by bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia’s official move there from Nicomedia, the former seat of Imperial power.

\textsuperscript{482} Cameron and Hall (1999), 299.
\textsuperscript{483} Barnes (1993), 219-24.
Stephenson has described Constantine’s apparent intentions for Constantinople, ‘It was to shine brighter than Rome in having the best of all things from across the Roman world, the old integrated with the new’. In a broad sense, Constantinople was a Constantinian overwriting of the narrative of the city of Rome. Certainly, Constantinople received overwhelming largesse from Constantine and subsequent emperors. Constantine built mansions to attract nobility to his new city, complete with bread rations attached to the properties in perpetuity. Constantine’s city grew rapidly, with modern estimates of its population at the end of his lifetime at 87,500-90,000. Mango does caution however, that reliance on population figures is fruitless as ‘we are unable to calculate with any degree of accuracy’. As a result, the city on a peninsula had to procure fresh water and food for a vast number of people that the immediate environs could not support. An aqueduct was brought in to increase the water supply, and a corn dole was instituted on 18 May 332. The corn shipments necessitated additional wharfs in the city’s two harbors, later expanded by Constantius II and Julian with a third harbor. This system of logistics produced results on the scales of prestige as well, as Constantinople joined Rome as only the second city with an Imperial grain dole. Constantine’s borrowed population demonstrated his power, as noted bitterly by Eunapius (Eun., Vit. soph. VI.2.9, tr. Wright; cf. Origo Constantini 30):
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But in our times neither the great fleet of merchant vessels from Egypt and from all Asia, nor the abundance of corn that is contributed from Syria and Phoenicia and the other nations as the payment of tribute, can suffice to satisfy the intoxicated multitude which Constantine transported to Byzantium by emptying other cities, and established near him because he loved to be applauded in the theatres by men so drunk that they could not hold their liquor.

Constantine’s city also paralleled Rome in its political institutions. From the Forum to the Hippodrome to the Palace, Constantinople was designed on a grand scale, as it was not a city adapted to Imperial use, but from the beginning had the administrative capacity to function as a permanent Imperial capital, though it did not do so until the 380s. Constantine apparently was instrumental in founding the Senate of Constantinople, a body secundi ordinis ‘of the second rank’ (Origo Constantini 30). Skinner argues compellingly for a ‘decisive creative moment’ in the immediate aftermath of the succession in A.D. 337. Under Constantius II, who appointed a city prefect on 11 December 359, the Senate approached the prestige of Rome’s (Consularia Constantinopolitana s.a.359). This suggests that Constantinople’s institutions had come to parallel Rome relatively quickly.

Constantinople, perceived as a direct challenge to Rome itself for grandeur, size, and importance, was seen in Constantine’s lifetime as ‘New Rome’. Very early, the city was referred to as ‘New Rome’, and in Latin fashion the name ‘Constantinople’

\[\text{ibi senatum constituit secundi ordinis, claros vocavit;}\] cf. Skinner, (2008), 140-6; Stephenson (2009), 205-6.\\text{Skinner (2008), 128.}
displaced ‘Byzantium’. Certainly Ammianus attempted to downplay the significance of Constantine’s new city, emphasizing its non-Constantinian origin by referring to it as *Constantinopolis, vetus Byzantium, Atticorum colonia*, ‘Constantinople, the ancient Byzantium, a colony of the Athenians’ (Amm. XXII.8.7). The relationship between the two giants Rome and Constantinople was reflected in the reported title for Constantine’s city of ‘New Rome’, as reflected in a number of ways. Between 324 and 326, Porphyrius wrote of Constantinople as *altera Roma*, ‘the second Rome’ (Porphyrius, *Carm. IV.6*). In the *Theodosian Code*, Constantine apparently drew a comparison between Rome and Constantinople. His law of 334 referred to Constantinople as *urbis, quam aeterno nomine iubente deo donavimus*, ‘the city which I have given an eternal name at God’s command’ (*C.Th. XIII.5.7*). Barnes appears to infer an official title from this usage, writing: ‘The emperor named it “New Rome,” but most of his subjects preferred to call it Constantinople after its founder’. 491 Admittedly, the evidence is somewhat conflicting, as pithily noted by Cameron. 492 This sort of language drawing upon the prestige and history of Rome could be applied to a number of cities. For example, in the third century, Herodian had written, ‘Rome is wherever the emperor is’ (Herodian I.6.5). In another sense, in 324 Constantine addressed Alexander of Alexandria as the ‘bishop of the New Rome’. 493 In a personal sense, Constantine reportedly used to call Serdica ‘my Rome’ (Petrus Patricius, *Excerpta Vaticana* 190; cf. Anon. Cont. Dio. fr. 15.1 [FHG 4:199]; Zon. XIII.3). 494 This evidence is not decisive because it shows general usage, but other evidence from significant locations and drawing upon material

491 Barnes (1981), 212.
492 Alan Cameron (2003), 380: ‘When he claimed to “bestow an eternal name”, he probably meant his own!’
494 Barnes (1982), 69 n. 99.
evidence demonstrate specific comparisons being made. In Rome itself, Themistius referred in 357 to Constantinople as ‘New Rome’ (Them., *Or.* III.41c, tr. Heather and Moncur):

The present circumstances offer both of you the opportunity to boast, you [Constantius] to the very heart of your empire, and the new Rome to the old; you – of the qualities of the city by which you have been enthralled, she – of the qualities of the man by whom she is courted.

Beginning in A.D. 343, coinage displaying Roma and Constantinopolis twinned had become common (*RIC* VIII.291). Writing between 438 and 443, Socrates claimed that Constantine referred to Constantinople as the ‘New Rome’ (*Soc.*, *Hist. eccl.* I.18). Decisively, this was not hearsay or fourth-century opinion, but a description of an inscription (*Soz.*, *Hist. eccl.* V.16, tr. NPNF):

having rendered it equal to imperial Rome, he named it Constantinople, establishing by law that it should be designated New Rome. This law was engraven on a pillar of stone erected in public view in the Strategium, near the emperor’s equestrian statue.

We can also corroborate this by considering the construction and privileges Constantine lavished on Constantinople, giving it a status as no other city besides

---

495 Grig (2012), 43-5.
Rome. These points suggest that within Constantine’s lifetime, Constantinople was seen as ‘New Rome’.

Eusebius wrote of the founding of Constantinople as a Christian city without any pagan religious cult. While there are no contemporary citations of Eusebius’ most relevant work for this investigation, the *Life of Constantine*, we do know that he was widely read by many including Julian. As discussed in chapter one, part two, Eusebius’ claim that Constantine prohibited pagan sacrifice in his city was borne out by edicts with a broader scope. Eusebius wrote of a law of Constantine that restricted idolatry by prohibiting divination, cult-objects, and sacrifice (Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* II.45.1). Constans’ law of 341 specifically mentioned that it followed upon a similarly-themed law of Constantine (*C.Th.* XVI.10.2). This edict was attributed to Constantius by the compilers of the *C.Th.* However, the edict was addressed to Madalianus, vicarius of Italy, making the issuer of the edict Constans. This ban on sacrifice is also seen in the context of the emperor cult. Barnes has shown it is likely that Constans also allowed a temple of the imperial cult to be dedicated to him at Hispellum on the grounds that no sacrifices take place there: ‘on the express condition that this temple dedicated to our name should not be defiled by the deceits of any contagious superstition’ (*CIL* 11.5265 = *ILS* 705). 496

Constantine’s city proclaimed his victory as uncontested ruler and the solidity of his dynasty. Its plundered statuary demonstrated his dominance over the other great cities of the empire. As construction continued over time, its monuments announced Constantine as the Christian emperor par excellence, fulfilling the role of an apostle. The city’s founding paralleled that of Rome, although in an explicitly Christian

---

sense. While Constantine’s actions suggest he wanted his city to be New Rome, he sought to avoid an overt challenge to the traditionally pagan aristocracy of Rome, although some modern scholars have categorized Constantine’s city as ‘founded as a Christian capital’. The significance of all this is suggested by the fact that while emperors did not spend much time in Constantinople or Rome in the fourth century, both nevertheless retained their status.

In summary, at Constantinople, Constantine was able to accomplish several things: he declared his personal victory, the victory of Christianity, and he did this on the largest possible scale by rivaling eternal Rome itself. He made his intentions clear with the founding and dedication dates he chose for the New Rome, and followed this symbolism through by purging his city of pagan cult, if not accoutrements, and restricting pagan cult. Constantine used his new city to reiterate his campaign of ‘overwriting’ or ‘reuse’. In 324, Constantine consecrated his city to the Christian God, on a holy day associated with the founding of Rome. Pagan sacrifice was banned in Constantine’s city at the site of pagan Byzantium (Eus., Vit. Const. III.48.2). In 326, he ordered building begun on the structure to house the tombs of himself and the twelve apostles, situated over the site of a pagan temple. In 330, he dedicated his city on feast day of a Christian martyred in Byzantium under Diocletian. He built the martyrium of St. Mocius inside the new city’s boundary at the site of the saint’s burial – reportedly using a pagan temple. Finally, he decorated the city with statuary plundered from cities and pagan temples.

497 Bowder (1978), 91.
The construction of Constantine’s city was continued by his son Constantius II, who began his relationship with Constantinople auspiciously, having been raised to the rank of Caesar in Constantinople on the day of the new city’s inauguration, 8 November 324 (Cons. Const. 324.3; Them., Or. IV.58b). In May 357, Themistius was part of a Constantinopolitan delegation to Rome, and addressed Constantius there, describing Constantinople as ‘her who takes her name from your father but is in reality yours rather than your father’s’ (Them., Or. III.40c, tr. Moncur). Constantius continued his father’s monumental contribution. As Hunt notes, ‘Constantius had nurtured and adorned his father’s fledgling foundation into a place fit for “both god and emperor”’ (Them., Or. III.48a). Although Constantine’s was the pivotal role, Constantius II continued on the trajectory begun by his father, and so in this sense, buildings not built by Constantine still reflected his intentions. Constantius had begun a new church, the first S. Sophia, in Constantinople in the 340s, which he attended the dedication of on 15 February 360 (Consularia Constantinopolitana s.a. 359, 360). As previously mentioned, the Apostles of God were collected for the city as well, with Andrew, Luke, and Timothy arriving to make their posthumous contribution in 356-7 (Passio Artemii 16). Constantine was given the apostolic treatment himself, as his entombed body was surrounded by the ‘other’ apostles. All of Constantine’s goals were continued on an increasingly confrontational trajectory during the reign of his son Constantius II.

501 Dagron (1984), 401; Mango (1990), 59.
finished his father’s building projects, adding more to them himself, increased the prestige of Constantinople’s senate, and tightened the legislative boundaries around an increasingly marginalized paganism. This is not to suggest that paganism was in drastic numerical decline, or that there were not pagans in positions of responsibility in government. However, the climate under Constantius was undeniably changing. If there was going to be a pagan reaction, the time for it was ripe when Julian came to the throne. Constantinople’s position as New Rome and reputation as a Christianised city demanded Julian’s attention.

6. JULIAN’S RESPONSE

Given all of this evidence, it is entirely understandable that Julian would respond to Constantinople as the ‘Christian city’ par excellence. Eusebius’ opinions regarding Constantine’s motives, prohibition of sacrifice, and ridicule of statuary would be persuasive, as would some of the Christian construction in the city. Julian responded to all of these factors in his recapitulation of Constantine’s actions. Julian responded to what he perceived as Constantine’s employment of the new city, and utilized Constantinople to advance his own pagan religious program. As we have seen, Constantinople was cast as the Christian ‘New Rome’, in contrast to the non-Christian ‘Old Rome’. Julian ‘recaptured’ Constantinople by reintroducing pagan religion there.

When Constantius died on 3 November, 361, Julian was already in Illyricum, praying to Helios, and engaging in pagan worship with his soldiers en route (Ep. 28.382b; Ep. 26.415c Bidez). He also wrote the openly pagan Letter to the Athenians
at this time (V.275d, 287d). Julian entered the city on 11 December, 361, and there in Constantine’s city made his religious commitment public, ordering the resumption of sacrificial temple worship (Amm. XXII.5.2).

Now, however, that this fear was removed and he saw that the time had come when he could do as he liked, he revealed what was in his heart and directed in plain unvarnished terms that the temples should be opened, sacrifices brought to their altars, and the worship of the old gods restored.

Julian was born in and had spent time as a boy in Constantine’s city, and identified the city as his ‘mother’, in contrast to Constantius II, who viewed it as ‘a sister’ (Ep. 59.443bc). Whatever youthful impressions he retained were probably outweighed by the perception, fostered by writings such as Eusebius, that Constantinople was the epitome of the ‘Christian city’. Like Constantine and Constantius, Julian was a builder and enhanced the city, although only physically present for five or six months. He made arrangements for the transport of the Egyptian obelisk to Constantinople, although this intention failed after his death. If Zosimus is correct here, Julian also initiated or participated in two long-term enhancements. He built a third harbor, six hundred metres wide, on the Marmara side of the city, and enlarged the city’s library, which given his interests was a significant gift (Zos., III.11.3). This was likely an enlargement of the library founded by Constantius in c. A.D. 357 (Them. Or. IV.59-61).

---

502 Seeck (1919), 209-10.
503 Mango (1986), 121.
504 Gamble (2005), 168.
of the library is typical of Roman re-use and rather similar to Constantine’s overwriting of Maximian’s basilica in Rome, as discussed earlier. Julian’s interest in encouraging civic participation in the cities also gave life to and further enhanced the status of the Senate.

Like Constantine, Julian also issued a statement of ‘religious toleration’, remitting the exile imposed by Constantius II due to τῆς τῶν Γαλιλαίων ἀπονοίας, or ‘the madness of the Galilaeans’ (Ep. 46.404b, my trans.). However, as noted earlier, much like Constantine’s communications it has been read out of context by many modern scholars who categorise it quite positively.\footnote{Bowder (1978), 108; Browning (1975), 135. Bowersock (1978), 81, 85, is under no such illusion, holding that Julian ‘never contemplated any other solution to the religious problem than total elimination’.} Julian’s tone and reference to ‘the folly of the Galilaeans’ made clear, as Constantine did, that he was not a disinterested party but an advocate who saw no value in the opposition religion. This trend is only reinforced by Julian’s treatment of Christianity in increasingly aggressive works such as The Caesars (December 361), Or. VII, To the Cynic Heracleios (March 362) and Against the Galileans (Winter 362-3). This idea of Julian viewing Christianity tolerantly is also deflated by his generally pro-Julian contemporary Ammianus Marcellinus, who wrote of Julian’s edict (Amm., XXII.5.4, tr. Hamilton, mod.):\footnote{Modified by adding ‘most’ for plerique.}

His motive in insisting on this was that he knew that toleration would intensify their divisions and that henceforth he would no longer have to fear a unanimous public opinion. Experience had taught him that no wild beasts are such dangerous enemies to man as most Christians are to one another.
7. JULIAN’S RESTORATION OF PAGAN WORSHIP

Julian came to power desiring to be seen as the restorer of the empire, specifically both its cities and its religion. In January 362, Claudius Mamertinus praised Julian: ‘It would take too long to list all the cities restored to life at the intervention of the emperor’ (*Panegyrici Latini* XI (III) 9.4), sentiment matched by local praises in inscriptions as the ‘Repairer of the World’ (*CIL* IX.417). As this was far too early for Julian to have achieved anything, it is apparent that this was the desired line. Julian responded to Constantine’s plunder of the sacred contents of the temples with building works of his own (VII.228b-d). He issued an edict that has unfortunately not been preserved in the *Codex Theodosianus*, but is preserved in the *Historia Acephala*, a work recording events in the life of Bishop Athanasius of Alexandria. It recorded that Julian issued a law which was subsequently published in Alexandria on 4 February 362, ‘commanding those things to be restored to the idols and temple attendants and the public account, which in former times had been taken away from them’ (*Historia Acephala* 9, tr. *NPNF*, cf. Soz., *Hist. eccl.* V.4-6). Julian demonstrated that this was a priority with a law that did survive in the *Codex Theodosianus*, making temple construction the top priority of public works throughout the Empire (*C.Th.* XV.1.3, 29 June 362). Ammianus confirmed these laws and seemed to place Julian’s movement in this direction early in his sole reign (Amm. XXII.5.2).

---

507 The two inscriptions are in Aceruntia, Apuleia: Conti (2004), 126, no. 96 = *CIL* IX, 417 = Arce (1986), 103, 126, no. 32; and Spoletium: Conti (2004), 144, no. 124; *CIL* XI, 4781; *ILS* 739; Arce (1986), 133-4.
To understand how Julian restored pagan worship in the former city of Byzantium, we can begin by looking at the evidence provided by a close contemporary who wrote in 361 or 362 concerning Julian’s revival. Julian invited Himerius to speak at Constantinople, and the Athenian delivered orations in Thessalonica and Philippi en route to Constantinople.\(^{508}\) This oration of December 361 or January 362 can be seen as the opening salvo in Julian’s campaign there, much as he had Libanius delivering orations of support when he moved into a new phase of the restoration in Antioch.\(^{509}\) In his oration delivered while Julian was in Constantinople, Himerius wrote (Himerius, \textit{Or. XLI.1}, tr. Penella):\(^{510}\)

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{Hier. Mithra psuchên kathárantes kai básiileî tò phílów theois ἡδη διὰ theón} \\
\text{syngevenómenoi . . . toîs dé ἑμετέροις mústaias lýgos prokeîsthô tâ} \\
\text{χαριστήρια, eîper ó autôs Apóllôn oîmai kai Ἔλλος, lýgoi dé paiôdeis} \\
\text{Apóllônos.}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

I have cleansed my soul through Mithra the Sun, and through the gods I have spent time with an emperor [Julian] who is a friend of the gods . . . But for our [fellow Mithraic] initiates let me propose an oration as a thank offering, since Apollo and the Sun, I think, are one and the same, and words are children of Apollo.

\(^{508}\) Barnes (1987), 221.  
\(^{509}\) Barnes (1987), 224 dates Himerius’ \textit{Or. XLI} to December 361.  
\(^{510}\) Him., \textit{Or. XLI.1} Penella = \textit{Or. XLI.2-8} Colonna.
Jullian was in the city, but not present, as Himerius closed by stating he needed to go and ‘set eyes upon the emperor’. Himerius thanked Julian for restoring pagan worship, using the phrase ‘thank offering’. He appeared to have engaged in Mithraic ritual with Julian in Constantine’s city, and to have been part of a group who shared the same sentiments. Himerius’ synthesis here, first of Mithra and Helios, then of Apollo and Helios, is similar to Julian’s in his *Hymn to King Helios* (XI.132cd, 144a). One modern scholar claims this passage as evidence that Julian initiated Himerius personally, but there is insufficient evidence to support this conclusion. Bidez and Cumont shaped much of the consensus regarding Julian as a thoroughgoing Mithraist, but that consensus began to unravel in the late twentieth century. The Christian-looking religion of faith and doctrine has been dismantled by the research of Roger Beck, who has demonstrated the lack of a coherent doctrinal basis in the extant evidence for Mithraism, writing of its membership ‘in terms of joining a club rather than of religious conversion’. Modern scholarship from Bidez to Athanassiadi had assumed a great deal of Mithraic influence in Julian’s thought, causing Athanassiadi to admit in a revised introduction to her monograph that she leaned too heavily upon Mithraism in her reconstruction. Smith points out that the *taurobolium* referred to by Gregory was also a rite of the Metroac mysteries of Cybele. Turcan assembles considerable evidence that weakens the case for Julian the thoroughgoing Mithraist, dismantling even the case for Julian’s initiation into Mithraism, which is suggested by Julian’s writing at the

---
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end of *The Caesars* of ‘his father Mithras’ (X.336a).\(^{517}\) There is no doubt that Julian knew of and honoured Mithras, but we should not repeat the mistakes of the early twentieth century and assume more without solid evidence.

Himerius went on to detail the initial progress made by Julian’s Hellenic revival (Him., *Or*. XLI.8, tr. Penella mod.):

\(^{518}\)

[Julian] has also washed away by his virtue the darkness that was preventing us from lifting our hands up to the Sun and has thereby given us the gift of raising us up to heaven as if from some Tartarus or lightless life. He has raised up temples to the gods, has established religious rites foreign to the city, and has made sacred the mysteries of the heavenly gods introduced into the city.

The reference to darkness is an interesting parallel to Julian’s use of the same word to describe his time under Christianity (V.174c). Himerius’ description of ‘foreign’ rites could refer to Mithraism, or perhaps any pagan rites, as Constantinople was

\(^{517}\) Turcan (1975), 105-28.

\(^{518}\) Him., *Or*. XLI.8 Penella = Him., *Or*. XVI.84-89 Colonna. I am indebted to Gavin Kelly regarding the modification to Penella’s ‘established religious rites from abroad in the city’.
generally perceived as Constantine’s ‘Christian’ city, as I have argued. We should not take it as an exclusive commitment on Julian’s part to the mystery religions.\(^{519}\) Himerius’ description matches Julian’s following pattern of action: he restored temple worship, imported outside religious practice, and participated in the mysteries, all of which was the easiest way to irritate the Christians. This provides a nice framework to further examine Julian’s response in detail.

8. JULIAN’S RECAPITULATION AT THE PALACE

Knowing that Christians found pagan ritual desecrating, Julian recapitulated Constantine’s placement of a massive cross within the palace (Eus., Vit. Const. III.49). Shortly after entering the city, Julian not only made his paganism public to the citizens, but built a temple in the palace.\(^{520}\) We begin with Julian’s somewhat opaque words on the subject from his *Hymn to King Helios*: Τούτου δὲ ἔχω μὲν οἶκοι παρ’ ἐμαυτῷ τὰς πίστεις ἀκριβεστέρας· ‘Indeed I am a devotee of King Helios; the most clear evidence I can produce for this is at home’ (XI.130c, tr. Athanassiadi).\(^{521}\) I believe that translating οἶκοι as ‘home’ is a more natural sense, and also dovetails with the other available evidence from Himerius and Libanius, *contra* Wright’s translation of ‘And of this fact I possess within me, known to myself alone, proofs more certain than I can give’. Libanius clarified matters when he wrote years later (Lib., Or. XVIII.127; cf. Lib., Or. XII.80-1; tr. Norman):

\(^{519}\) See part nine of this chapter, in which I deal with the Mithraism issue more thoroughly.

\(^{520}\) Hunt (1998b), 62.

\(^{521}\) Athanassiadi (1977), 362.
But since it was not easy for the emperor to go from the palace to the temples every day, and yet continued intercourse with the gods is a matter of the greatest moment, a temple to the god who governs the day was built in the middle of the palace, and he took part in his mysteries, initiated and in turn initiating.\textsuperscript{522}

This sort of ‘pagan chapel’ was a first, and a borrowing from Christianity that Libanius evidently thought unusual enough to comment on. While placing such a chapel in the palace could be interpreted as tactfulness, Julian was not sensitive to the feelings of others elsewhere in his public career. This temple may well have been the one referenced above in which Himerius and Julian engaged in Mithraic worship. In his \textit{Or.} VII (362), Julian wrote that among his other instructions he was tasked by the gods with cleansing the impiety of Christianity (VII.231d). In this case, he started at home. Gregory Nazianzen wrote somewhat obliquely in 363-65 of Julian’s apparent participation in the Mithraic rite of the \textit{taurobolium} (Gr. Naz., \textit{Or.} IV.52, tr. King):

the very first of his audacities, according to those who boast of his secret doings . . . with unhallowed blood he rids himself of his baptism, setting up the initiation of abomination against the initiation according to our rite.

\[\alphaɪματι \, μέν \, οὐχ \, όσίῳ \, τὸ \, λοιμρόν \, πορρύπτεται, \, τῇ \, καθ' \, ήμᾶς \, τελείωσε \, τὴν \, τελείωσιν \, τοῦ \, μύσου \, ἀντιτιθείς\]

\textsuperscript{522} Bidez (1930), 219, describes Julian as ‘le grand maître des conventicules mithraiques’, although Turcan (1975), 128 holds that Julian’s thoroughgoing Mithraism is only ‘une extrapolation des historiens modernes’.
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This reference to inside knowledge might seem hyperbolic, were it not for Gregory Nazianzen’s younger brother Caesarius being Julian’s ἀρχιαρχός or senior court physician, as discussed previously (Gr. Naz., Or. VII.9).

9. CONCLUSION

As Constantine made use of his city to further his religious ends, so did Julian, following a similar pattern. Julian’s recapitulation of Constantine in Constantinople took place in numerous ways. Both Constantine and then Julian made statements of ‘toleration’ that were arguably polemical, followed by actions demonstrating a lack of interest in tolerating rival religion (Eus., Vit. Const. II.56.2; Julian, Ep. 46.404b; Amm. XXII.5.4). Julian had reclaimed the city he grew up in through beneficences and construction, but his recapitulation centered on his religious activities at the palace. As Constantine had consecrated his city to the Christian God (Eus., Vit. Const. III.48.1), Julian initiated followers into the mysteries in his Mithraeum (Him., Or. XLI.8). As Constantine placed a cross or labarum over the palace gate, and built a cross in the imperial quarters in the palace, Julian built a pagan chapel in the palace (Eus., Vit. Const. III.49; Julian Or. XI; Lib., Or. XVIII.127). He built a temple in the imperial quarters where Constantine’s cross had guarded the empire. The new emperor fulfilled the command given him by Helios to return and be initiated in the palace temple dedicated to Helios/Mithra (VII.231d). Julian was initiated into several streams of the mysteries, and may also have been initiated into multiple levels of Mithraism. As Pontifex Maximus, Julian initiated others in the
mysteries in the palace as well. While we cannot know that he personally initiated Himerius, the two evidently participated together in the mysteries in some fashion, which Himerius disclosed to the city publicly in his oration. As Constantine had outlawed pagan sacrifice and purged his new city of pagan cult (Eus., Vit. Const. II.45.1, III.48.2; C.Th. XVI.10.2), Julian restored pagan sacrifice in Constantinople (Amm. XXII.5.2; Him., Or. XLI.8). This was accomplished by late spring, as Julian is last attested in the city on 12 May 362, and soon after left for Antioch.523

Julian’s attitude towards these cities seems to shift somewhat over time, possibly from an increase of ambition, but more likely from a recognition that Constantinople was not the most efficient place to introduce certain features of his pagan restoration. Outbuilding Constantine in his own city would not be economical, and would be an incremental solution anyway. The potential game-changers were the restoration of the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem, the only possible location, and the introduction of the ‘pagan church’ in Antioch, a more suitable location than the heavily Christianised Constantinople. Julian had left his mark in Constantinople, and could return later once strategic victories were won elsewhere.

523 Seeck (1919), 210.
CHAPTER NINE:
RECAPITULATION AT JERUSALEM

1. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I will argue that Julian responded directly to Constantine’s construction in the city of Jerusalem, specifically positioning his reconstruction of the Jewish Temple in opposition to Constantine’s Church of the Holy Sepulchre. This importance which both emperors attached to the city is ironic, as neither visited the city to oversee their construction plans. Constantine built a New Jerusalem to rival the old, symbolized in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. He built this church on the supposed site of the burial and resurrection of Christ, and on the site of a pagan temple which he demolished. Julian, the restaurator templorum, responded by attempting to rebuild the Jewish temple in Jerusalem, hoping to rejuvenate Jewish sacrificial worship and invalidate Christian prophetic claims. Ammianus XXIII.1.2-3 appears to contain the beginning and failure of this rebuilding plan within the time of Julian’s stay in Antioch, from July 362 to 5 March 363 (Amm. XXII.9.14, XXIII.2.6). While Julian did not seek to demolish the ‘New Jerusalem’ Constantine built, his recapitulation would have rendered its statement impotent. In the mid fifth century, Sozomen reflected on the high stakes involved in Julian’s attempt to rebuild the temple and rather unsurprisingly held that Julian, pagans, and Jews all viewed the Temple restoration as of prime importance (Soz., Hist. eccl. V.12). Simmons sets the Temple restoration attempt in the context of Julian’s

524 Seeck (1919), 210, 212.
campaign overall, writing: ‘It would certainly have required something monumental of this nature... to reverse the Constantinian revolution’.\textsuperscript{525}

Following the Bar-Kochba rebellion of A.D. 135, the Jews were barred from their former capital, which was renamed \textit{Colonia Aelia Capitolina}. Justin Martyr, who declared the Jews superseded, wrote that God foreknew the Jews’ expulsion and banishment from Jerusalem (Justin Martyr, \textit{Dial.} XCI.II.2; CXXIII.9). In approximately A.D. 245, Origen wrote of Jerusalem being ‘utterly destroyed’, due to God’s judgment against the Jews (Origen, \textit{C. Cels.} IV.22). By the fourth century its association with Judaism had become so remote that Eusebius could describe Aelia Capitolina as a city ‘of Greeks, foreigners, and idolators’ (Eus., \textit{Comm. Ps.} LXXXVI.2-4). Eusebius wrote of the fall of the Jews’ Temple due to ‘their disbelief and impiety towards Jesus Christ our Savior’ (Eus., \textit{Comm. Ps.} 126). Constantine translated the idea of the supersession of the Jews into legal action. Constantine enacted laws prohibiting Jews from owning Christian slaves, and from physically preventing conversions to Christianity (Eus., \textit{Vit. Const.} IV.27.1; cf. \textit{C.Th.} XVI.9.2; XVI.8.6.). Barnes points out that both of these laws are addressed to the praetorian prefect Evagrius and should therefore be dated to c. A.D. 329.\textsuperscript{526} Our sources for both the Constantinian period and for Julian’s reign are generally uncontested. A key question depends on Julian’s own epistles, of which the authorship of one is challenged, and the history of Ammianus. What is disputed are Julian’s intentions regarding the reconstruction of the temple, as well as its timing, and the relation of the enterprise to Constantine’s construction at the same location.

\textsuperscript{525} Simmons (2006), 106.
Julian did try in late 362 or possibly early 363 to have the Jewish Temple at Jerusalem rebuilt. Drijvers warns in understated fashion that ‘the chronology of the restoration of the Temple is hard to establish’. Julian’s Ep. 89b, Letter to a Priest is crucial to our interpretation of the events involved in the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple. Dating it by internal evidence is problematic, as the introduction and conclusion are missing, but Julian mentions that he ‘had intended’ to rebuild the Temple of the Jews, a statement which requires close philological attention. Previous commentators have asserted claims based on grammatical considerations relating to διενοήθην, the aorist form of the verb διανοεόµαι. Julian wrote (Ep. 89b.295c, my translation):

οι γὰρ ἡμῖν ὀνειδίζοντες τὰ τοιαῦτα, τῶν Ἰουδαίων οἱ προφήται, τί περὶ τοῦ νεῶ φήσουσι τοῦ παρ’ αὐτοῖς τρίτον ἀνατρισκομένον, ἐγειρομένου δὲ οὐδὲ νῦν; Ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπον οὐκ ὀνειδίζον ἐκεῖνοις, δὲ γε τοσοῦτος ὑπέρ τούτων χρόνος ἀναστήσασθαι διενοήθην αὐτῶν εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ κληθέντος ἐπ' αὐτῷ θεοῦ.

For such as these reproaching us, the prophets of the Jews, what do they say about their Temple which was thrice overthrown, and not even now being raised up? But I speak not as a reproach to them, who myself after so much time intended to raise it, in honour of the god it is named after.

527 Drijvers (2004), 134, holds it probable that the decision to move forward was in autumn 362, and the start under Alypius in beginning of 363.

528 The text of this passage is stable, and in fact neither Hertlein (1876) nor Bidez (1924) published textual variants.
While Jupiter was the high god associated with the new Roman colony of Aelia Capitolina, Julian was referring to the Jewish God, as shown by his letters to Jewish leaders. The proper dating for this endeavor hinges upon the tense of one word, διενοήθην, the aorist passive of διανοόμαι. There are several possible uses of and translations for the aorist in this passage. The first option is the simple aorist, which would be translated as ‘I had intended’, as indeed numerous scholars have done, most thoroughly defended by Bowersock. 529 The second option is the similar undefined aorist, ‘I intended’ as used by Wright. 530 However, others have noted that Julian could be using the aorist tense in its epistolary sense, describing an event contemporary to the writing, which would yield a meaning of ‘I have intended’, as utilised by Simmons. 531 With the epistolary aorist, ‘the writer of a letter or a book... may put himself in the position of the reader or beholder who views the action as past’ (eg. Thucydides 1.129; Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 577; Acts 23.30; Eph. 6.22; Phil. 2.28; Col. 4.8; Phm. 12). 532 Does the aorist mandate a particular view of the dating of this event? The standard Greek grammar in English, Smyth-Messing, states: ‘The aorist expresses the mere occurrence of an action in the past. The action is regarded as an event or single fact without reference to the length of time it occupied’. 533 In a more recent work focusing on the Greek of the Koine period, Fanning agrees that the aorist ‘presents an occurrence in summary, viewed as a whole from the outside, without regard for the internal make-up of the

529 Smyth and Messing (1956), 430-1, no. 1927; Drijvers (1994), 24 n. 28; Bidez (1924), 102 n.2; Vogt (1939), 47, 53; Bowersock (1978), 121; Phillips (1979), 168.
530 Smyth and Messing (1956), 429, no. 1923; Wright (1913), 313.
532 Smyth and Messing (1956), 433; cf. Jannaris (1897), 437; Turner (1963), 72-73.
533 Smyth-Messing (1956), 429.
Such an understanding of the aorist as a ‘snapshot’ tense allows treatment of διανοέοµαι which provides the historian the latitude to choose the date which best fits the external evidence.

The contemporary evidence begins at the end, with the destruction of the restoration project in the earthquake of May 363. The rebuilding project was deterred by what various commentators describe as fire, earthquake, and a collapse of the excavations (Amm. XXIII.1.2; Rufinus X.39; Philostorgius VII.9). This coincides with the major earthquake of 18/19 May 363.\(^{535}\) If Julian’s phrase ‘had intended’ referred to a finite point in time, as Bowersock claims, then the project had been started and abandoned prior to the writing of Ep. 89b.\(^{536}\) However, Julian had left Antioch on 5 March, and was already in Carrhae (modern-day Harran in eastern Turkey) and headed for Persia by 19 May. The idea that messengers could catch him inside Persia, when he was otherwise occupied, and that he would take time to issue general instructions to his clergy is less likely.

Julian had taken the time to issue written instructions to his high priests, but back in 362 prior to coming to Antioch and instituting his so-called ‘pagan church’. This is the logical point in time to place Ep. 89b, along with the other letters to high priests. The letter set forth Julian the sovereign pontiff’s plans to revitalize and restructure Hellenic religion which will be discussed in more detail in our final chapter (Ep. 89b.258c). It is important to establish clearly that Julian discussed with his own priest his plans for furthering his revival using Jerusalem within the context of this restoration of pagan religion. With these factors in mind, the external

\(^{534}\) Fanning (1990), 97.
\(^{536}\) Bowersock (1978), 121.
evidence strongly favours an early date for Ep. 89b, which is allowed for by contemporary usage of the aorist. I suggest a date of summer or perhaps autumn 362 for Ep. 89 and Julian’s other letters to his priests, and therefore for the initiation of the restoration project.

2. CONSTANTINE’S DESECRATION AND CONSECRATION

Constantine had likely passed through Palestine c. A.D. 300 travelling with the court of Diocletian, though the Roman colony of Aelia Capitolina would likely have held little interest for him at the time (Eus., Vit. Const. I.19). He returned to the eastern empire in triumph as a magnanimous supporter of the religion Diocletian had attempted to eliminate. Yet this triumph as the deliverer of God’s people and the victor over Licinius could be outstripped by another project: ‘even the foundation of Constantinople might seem to be eclipsed by the expectation of restoring the birthplace of Christianity and banishing paganism from the site’. In Jerusalem, Constantine built ‘the most important church’ of his ambitious building program, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Constantine wrote to Macarius, ‘above all else my concern is that that sacred place … should be adorned by us with beautiful buildings’ (Eus., Vit. Const. III.30.4). The location was perceived in such a fashion by Cyril of Jerusalem, who wrote that the rock of Golgotha within this basilica was the ‘very center of the world’ (Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechesis XIII.28). This edifice was constructed on the site of Hadrian’s Temple

538 Hunt (1997), 411.
540 Cf. Walker (1990), 236.
of Venus, which had in turn been built over the site of the holy sepulcher (Eus., Vit. Const. III.26). As Averil Cameron put it, ‘The church-building thus reclaimed Jerusalem from the pagan Aelia’. Eusebius avoided naming the emperor Hadrian, preferring instead to title the instigators of the construction of Aphrodite’s temple, ‘impious men’ (Eus., Vit. Const. III.26-7). Jerome describes Jupiter’s statue outside the temple, suggesting that the temple was possibly dedicated to Jupiter, but consideration should be given to Eusebius the contemporary observer (Jerome, Ep. 58.3; Comm. Isa. II.8; Comm. Matt. XXIV.15). Hadrian may not have built the temple there to deliberately obscure the Christian site: as several scholars note, the new city had the Roman Legion on the highest hill, and the next highest hill available for temple construction was Golgotha. Archaeology has verified a large Roman structure underneath the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, but exact identification is elusive. While some have claimed that Constantine chose the location for the pagan temple to build over, the City Archaeologist of Jerusalem holds that while moderns cannot be certain, there is no valid reason to reject the site, which has a better claim than anywhere else. Wharton argues that identification was impossible as the site had been ‘unknown for a long series of years’, yet Biddle points out that the ‘long hidden’ (πάλαι κρυπτόµενον) subject of Vit. Const. III.30 is τὸ γνώρισµα, likely the wood of the cross. Eusebius, who claimed that Constantine undertook the construction as directed by God, described Constantine’s view of the religious pollution of the site (Eus., Vit. Const. III.25, 29). The emperor

541 Averil Cameron (1998), 100.
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546 Wharton (1992), 321-2; Biddle (1994), 103.
ordered the removal of the temple and its remnants of ‘detestable oblations’ (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.25), and went a step beyond (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.27):

the Emperor gave further orders that all of the rubble of stones and timbers from the demolitions should be taken and dumped a long way from the site. This command also was soon effected. But not even this progress was by itself enough, but under divine inspiration once more the emperor gave instructions that the site should be excavated to a great depth and the pavement should be carried away with the rubble a long distance outside, because it was stained with demonic bloodshed.

At Jerusalem, Constantine restored the site of the Resurrection by demolishing the Temple of Aphrodite at the site with its ‘defiled and polluted altars’ (βεβήλων και ἐναγών βωμῶν), and removing the rubble & earth (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.25-7).

In place of this temple, work began in 328 on a basilica that Constantine instructed Bishop Macarius to build ‘that the world’s most miraculous place should be worthily embellished’ (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.31.3). His Church of the Holy Sepulchre was formally dedicated in September 335 for his *Tricennalia* celebration (Eus., *Vit. Const.* IV.43).547 The actual date for the *Tricennalia* should have been July 335, but the celebration was possibly delayed in order to get bishops there as participants. The complex included a five-aisled basilica and the Anastasis Rotunda, and enclosed the Holy Sepulcher and the Rock of Calvary.548 Eusebius described the resultant basilica over the supposed tomb of Jesus as ‘a manifest testimony of the

547 Drake (1976), 42-3.
548 Krautheimer and Ćurčić (1986), 63.
Saviour’s resurrection’ (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.40). This church was not only a theological testimony, but also spoke to Constantine’s building aspirations and Christianising narrative. Indeed, Dagron notes that in a sense Constantine’s building program centred on Jerusalem as the Christian capital more than Constantinople.\(^549\)

Eusebius cited Constantine’s new construction in Jerusalem as evidence of the Christian victory (Eus., *De laud.* IX.16). He wrote that Constantine’s construction constituted a new holy city contrasting with the old (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.33.1-2):

New Jerusalem was built at the very Testimony to the Saviour, facing the famous Jerusalem of old, which after the bloody murder of the Lord had been overthrown in utter devastation, and paid the penalty of its wicked inhabitants. Opposite this then the Emperor erected the victory of the Saviour over death with rich and abundant munificence, this being perhaps that fresh new Jerusalem proclaimed in prophetic oracles, about which long speeches recite innumerable praises as they utter words of divine inspiration.

As Cameron and Hall point out, the striking contrast that Eusebius draws explains why Constantine and subsequent Christian emperors did not build over the Temple site, but left it to add its testimony.\(^550\) Eusebius not only contrasted the condemned old city and the new city of Constantine, he held that this was perhaps the fulfillment of eschatological prophecies in John’s Apocalypse regarding the New Jerusalem (Rev. 21.1-3):

\(^549\) Dagron (1984), 389.
\(^550\) Dameron and Hall (1999), 285
And I saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride to be for her husband. And I heard a loud voice from the throne saying, ‘See, the home of God is among mortals. He will dwell with them; they will be his peoples, and God himself will be with them’.

The suggestion that God’s plan was finding fulfillment in Constantine’s construction was a powerful one. Eusebius also changed the tenor of the narrative, as his presentation of this prophetic fulfillment was neither Apocalyptic nor anti-Roman. Constantine’s earthly act was the New Jerusalem.

The issue of a supposed Jewish revolt against Constantine must be addressed. Constantine’s description of the Jews at the time of the Council of Nicaea had been inflammatory: ‘a people who have soiled their hands in a most terrible outrage, and have thus polluted their souls, and are now deservedly blind’ (Soc., Hist. eccl. I.9). Avi-Yonah cites John Chrysostom as support for a Jewish revolt against Constantine and attempt to rebuild the temple. However, Stemberger highlights the flaws in this scenario as Chrysostom’s statement that the Jews attacked under Constantine, failed and were led about with mutilated ears as an object lesson is not supported by any other evidence. (John Chrys., Adv. Jud. V.11). He further finds Aurelius Victor’s use of seditio illuminating, as it allows for unrest or terrorist activity rather than a war or revolt (Aur. Vict. XLII.11). On the other hand, In the early 350s, Jews in Palestine had revolted against Roman rule and been put down by Gallus Caesar (Soc., Hist. eccl. II.33; Soz., Hist. eccl. IV.7.5; Aur. Vict., Caes. XLII.11;
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Jerome, *Chron.* 320f s.a. 352).\(^{554}\) Jerome highlighted the connection that some Jews made between a passage in Daniel and their experiences with Gallus and Julian regarding Jerusalem (Jerome, *De Antichristo in Dan.* [IV] XI, 34/5). While Penella dismisses the image of Julian as a ‘philo-Semite’ attempting to mollify the Jews in this fashion, that does not remove this issue from consideration as a recapitulatory act.\(^{555}\)

3. JULIAN’S REACTION - THE TEMPLE RESTORATION

*Conception*

Julian was a frequent practitioner of animal sacrifice himself, as noted by Libanius, Ammianus, and Gregory (Lib., *Or.* XXIV.35; Amm. XXII.12.6, 14.3, XXV.4.17; Greg. *Naz.*, *Or.* IV.77). Julian was a devotee of the Iamblichean Neoplatonist stream of paganism, which emphasized sacrifice (Amm. XXV.4.17). Julian was also favorably impressed by the Jewish emphasis on animal sacrifice, praising them for their persistence despite their temporary lack of the Temple (C. *Gal.* 306). This was the assessment of Sozomen, who wrote that when Julian exhorted the Jews to resume sacrifices, they demurred without a temple, following which Julian funded them and directed them to rebuild it (Soz., *Hist. eccl.* V.12). Rebuilding the Temple at Jerusalem and restoring sacrifice would also validate the Old Covenant and suggest that Christ’s sacrifice of himself ‘once-for-all’ as claimed by the author of Hebrews 7.27 was a sham. Fourth-century Christian authors had suggested the destruction of the Temple was a fulfillment of Old Testament and

\(^{554}\) Stemberger (2000), 161-84.  
\(^{555}\) Penella (1999), 24.
New Testament prophecies and that the Temple would remain unreconstructed. Jerome held to this in his commentary on Daniel, relating the two following texts (Jerome, *Comm. Dan.* IX.24):\(^{556}\)

‘After the sixty-two weeks, an anointed one shall be cut off and shall have nothing, and the troops of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary’ (Dan. 9.26, *NRSV*).

‘As he came out of the temple, one of his disciples said to him, “Look, Teacher, what large stones and what large buildings!” Then Jesus asked him, “Do you see these great buildings? Not one stone will be left here upon another; all will be thrown down”’ (Mk. 13.1-2, *NRSV*, cf. Mt. 24.1-2).

The association of these two texts placed such weight on the impossibility of any reconstruction of the Jerusalem Temple, that a restoration would have been a severe blow to Christianity. This theology was evidently widely held throughout the fourth century. In the early fourth century, Athanasius wrote that the end of the period of Jewish kings, prophets, and Temple was proof of the coming of the Christ and that the teachings of Jesus were true (Ath., *De inc.* XL.12-24, 49-55).\(^{557}\) In 402-3, Rufinus confirmed that this theology was held in the 360s as well, writing that Bishop Cyril of Jerusalem had insisted the Jews could not rebuild the temple, based on these interpretations of the prophecies in Daniel and Matthew (Rufinus X.38).
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Stemberger notes the parallels to Constantine’s church building there in plans and proceedings: a state project, overseen by a civil servant, funded by the imperial treasury. Ammianus attributed this to Julian’s interest in posterity: ‘His desire to leave a great monument to perpetuate the memory of his reign led him to think in particular of restoring at excessive expense (sumptibus immodicis) the once magnificent temple at Jerusalem’ (Amm. XXII.1.2, tr. Hamilton, mod.). The excessive expense should be viewed in light of the financial woes of paganism. Bradbury has demonstrated the strong correlation between a decline in funding and the decline of blood sacrifice in the fourth century. As the pagan religion was proving itself dependent upon the munificence of the state, a pagan such as Ammianus who was not wedded to Julian’s anti-Christian campaign might well be disheartened at the expenditure. The attempt to rebuild the temple came at approximately the same time as Julian revealed both his greater capacity to tolerate persecution under his reign, and his Hellenic church program.

Julian’s restoration of the Jewish Temple at Jerusalem would undo Constantine’s use of space declaring Jerusalem to be a Christian city. The proclamation of ‘New Jerusalem’ by the presence of the church overlooking the city would be rendered impotent by such an endeavor. There is no need to assume that Julian must have acted from only one motivation or the other: the theological and spatial recapitulations would be complementary. While Ammianus may have seen this as a profligate expense, such an investment would have yielded significant return for

Julian. Drijvers refers to Julian’s ‘wish to counter Constantine’s policy of the christianization of Jerusalem’.  

*Initiation - Ep. 204*

Julian wrote to the Jewish leaders in a very conciliatory fashion, offering them his protection and the peace to pray to their God for his reign (*Ep. 204.397c*). Avi-Yonah claims that Julian’s letters to the Jewish leaders were modeled on those of Constantine to religious leaders (*Vit. Const. III.30-2, 52-3*).  

Style and content both indicate that the letter ‘To the Community of the Jews’ is almost certainly genuine. Although some critics dismiss *Ep. 204* as a forgery, it fits the historical context and uses the phraseology of God’s ‘immaculate right hand’, which it shares with *C. Gal. 200b*. It must be noted that Julian appears to equate the Jewish YHWH with the Neoplatonist demiurge in *Ep. 204* and *Ep. 89a*, while treating him as a mere regional god in his later *Contra Galilaeos*.  

Brodd’s thesis that Julian truly saw YHWH as a universal god and the ‘god of Moses’ as a separate *ethnarch* strikes me as untenable. Of course, this diplomatic overture did not necessarily guarantee Julian’s true feelings in the matter. In Julian’s letter to his high-priest Theodorus, we find a different perspective indeed. Along with his granting of Theodorus the supervision of all the temples in Asia, Julian criticized the Jews for the folly of failing to worship other gods besides their own (*Ep. 89a.454b*). Nevertheless, Julian’s syncretism included the god of the Jews, whom he viewed as one of many regional deities. He described the Jewish god to his fellow pagan Theodorus, writing
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that he was ‘truly most powerful and most good, and governs this world of sense, and, as I well know, is worshipped by us also under other names’ (*Ep. 89a.453d-454a*). The protective relationship that Julian offered the Jews included the rebuilding of their Temple at Jerusalem. He wrote that he might rebuild the sacred city and with the Jews worship the most high god there (*Ep. 204.398a*). Julian’s motivations can be placed into two related categories: theological and recapitulatory. In the first category, rebuilding the Jerusalem temple would benefit Julian by restoring non-Christian sacrifice, validating the Old Covenant, and invalidating Christian prophecy. In the second category, rebuilding the Temple of the Jews would invalidate the actions of Constantine and Gallus. Ephrem reported that Jewish leaders made an alliance with Julian in winter 362/3, and met further with the emperor in February/March (*Ephrem, I.5.3, 7.3, 10.1*).564

Avi-Yonah explains the silence of the Jewish authorities by the studied neutrality which they observed, although a significant portion of the rabbis supported the restoration project with enthusiasm.565 Drijvers identifies two reasons for the Jews not enthusiastically embracing the Temple restoration effort. First, the patriarch was from the house of Hillel and would not qualify to be the high priest. Second, it was taught in their community that only with the Messiah’s coming would the Temple be rebuilt.566 Avi-Yonah reminds us that in the expectations of the Jewish leaders, ‘the restoration of the Temple would happen when the Messiah arrived’.567 Any complaints regarding the fitness of Julian, definitely not a scion of the house of David, would likely be deflected by the argument that God had used King Cyrus of
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Persia to restore the Temple in the past. With their view coloured by the fourth-century Christian church’s predominantly Gentile ethnicity, the Jewish leadership may well have feared creating a Gentile Messiah in Julian. Given Julian’s interest in supplanting Jesus the Messiah, the possibilities of this could hardly have escaped him.

Execution - Fr. 11

In an undated fragment which Lydus said Julian addressed to the Jews, Julian announced, ‘for I am rebuilding with all zeal the temple of the Most High God’ (Julian, fr. 11, tr. Wright). The Jews were eager to move forward with the restoration. Ammianus XXIII.1.2 places Julian’s entrusting of Alypius to oversee the work to its completion in early January 363, although Barnes points out that Ammianus never specifies how long the preparation had been underway. While there is no literary evidence from the Jewish community supporting the restoration of the Temple, inscriptive evidence indicates that Julian did attempt in late 362 or possibly early 363 to have the Jewish temple at Jerusalem rebuilt. Following Israel’s annexation of Jerusalem in 1967, The Hebrew University began initial excavations of the Temple Mount. The supervising archaeologist, Benjamin Mazar, identified a Hebrew inscription carved onto one of the ashlars of the Western Wall as fourth-century and associated with Julian’s rebuilding effort. The inscription cited Isaiah on the prophesied restoration of Jerusalem: ureîtem vesās libbechem ve’atzmōtēchem kaddeshe, ‘You shall see and your heart shall rejoice; your bodies like the grass’.
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This is a citation from Isaiah 66, for which the complete verse reads, ‘You shall see and your heart shall rejoice; your bodies shall flourish like the grass; and it shall be known that the hand of the LORD is with his servants, and his indignation is against his enemies’ (Isa. 66.14, NRSV). While Jews, barred by Hadrian from entering Jerusalem more than one day a year, had reason to resent the empire and Julian’s support of them was more calculating than altruistic, this inscription indicates that the Jews were eager to move forward with the restoration. As Mazar put it, the verse was likely chosen ‘as the watchword of visionary activity: towards the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple to their former glory’. 571 A nearby building also buried in debris and ashes was in use in the fourth century, and provided coinage from the reigns of Constantine, Constantius II, and terminating with Julian’s reign. 572 These hopes were ultimately dashed, as both Julian’s campaign against the church and the program to rebuild the Jewish Temple were abandoned. Ammianus wrote of the beginning and failure of this rebuilding plan in one short section (Amm. XXIII.1.2-3, 2.6; cf. Zos., III.12.1). The setting of this interlude within Ammianus’ section on Antioch may mean Ammianus thought the project ended within the time of Julian’s stay in Antioch, which began in July 362 and ended 5 March 363 (Amm. XXII.9.14, XXIII.2.6), or that his residence to the plan’s collapse was made looking back, then returning to his historical narrative in sequence. 573 At any rate, Ammianus was with Julian in the east at the time of the earthquake ending the restoration attempt. 574

Aftermath
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Julian’s death in Persia and succession by a Christian emperor, Jovian, meant that the effort to restore the Jerusalem Temple was permanently suspended. Attempting to assess Julian’s motives, many ancient Christian writers assessed the ruination of Christ’s prophecy (and Constantine’s building program) as a primary factor for Julian. Citing Matthew 24:2 and 16:18 for support, in A.D. 377-78 Chrysostom wrote that Julian attempted to rebuild the temple to ‘put Christ’s power to the test’, and contended that this was because none could rebuild what Christ destroyed, or destroy what he built (Chrysostom, Babylas 120; Demonstration Against the Pagans that Christ is God 7-8). Philostorgius wrote that Julian’s plan to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem was designed to overturn the prophecies of Jesus (Philost. VII.9). Sozomen held that Julian ‘hoped by this means to falsify the prophecies of Christ’ (Soz., Hist. eccl. V.12). Of course, this rhetoric also cast Julian’s actions as failures demonstrating the power of God.

4. CONCLUSION

I have argued that Julian should be understood as having attempted to recapitulate the work of Constantine at Jerusalem in two ways. Julian attempted to overshadow the church which was described by a Christian writer as the ‘New Jerusalem’ with the rebuilt Temple of the Old Jerusalem. Julian would have effectively ended any Christian dominance of the location and overwritten Constantine’s Christianising narrative. Further, by renewing Jewish sacrifice under the old covenant and invalidating an assumed prophecy of Christ regarding the Temple, Julian’s iteratio of Constantine’s work would have produced a conclusive result, casting doubt upon
the credibility of the entire Christian enterprise. This would have been a major component of Julian’s promised *restitutio*.

It is key that in Jerusalem, Julian was not overwriting Christianity with paganism. Rather, he was wielding the brush of Judaism, which was more capable of truly overwriting one of Christianity’s most compelling narratives and truth claims. Julian was not trying to restore paganism for its own sake, but to unpick the triumphal narrative of Christianity. This very Christian maneuver highlights Julian’s understanding of his opponents, as well as his flexibility. Put broadly, this attempt was very ‘Christian-minded’ of Julian.

It is, in a sense, ironic that the strategic centrepiece of Julian’s program never involved his actual presence. The restoration of the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem was, however large a project, a relative unsubtle one, requiring only resources and capable local administration. Julian’s presence in Antioch for the troop buildup for the invasion of Persia would benefit from his presence as the commander. Even more so, the outworking of the newly re-organised paganism that he would unveil in Antioch would require his careful hand.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Julian’s time in Antioch has been characterised by Bowersock and Athanassiadi as a period of declining mental stability for the emperor, with Athanassiadi venturing to describe his behaviour as bordering on ‘insane’. Both emphasise the setbacks he suffered, and use that to frame his period of residence in the city, resulting in an emotionally fragile emperor with ill-defined motives. Yet a close examination of the evidence, particularly within the framework of recapitulation, reveals a competent emperor who made some mistakes but was by no means derailed by them from pursuing his purposes. I argue in this chapter that while Julian planned to stage his invasion of Persia from Antioch, he also had a recapitulatory purpose in the city: to co-opt Christianity by the development of a ‘pagan church’ (treated in another chapter), but also to respond to Constantine’s Christianisation of the city. This took the form of closing Constantine’s church alone in the city, removing the body of St. Babylas alone from Apollo’s shrine at Daphne where it was placed by Constantius II and Gallus, amidst the encouragement of general destruction of Christian churches in the area. Julian may have waited for opportune moments, but these actions were far from random, and fit a pattern of deliberate and rational engagement.

Julian left Constantine’s new city on or after 12 May 362, and entered the ancient metropolis of Antioch in July.\textsuperscript{577} The transfer to the city of the imperial court, as well as the troop build-up for the impending Persian campaign, created a food shortage, a not uncommon problem. Julian attempted to control this by provision of supplies, which led to rampant market manipulation by wealthy speculators. That autumn, he ordered the remains of Babylas removed from their location near the temple at Daphne, where his Christian half-brother had transported and reinterred them (Amm. XXII.12.8). Following this, on 22 October 362, the temple itself at Daphne was destroyed by fire, prompting Julian’s response of torture and church closure (Amm. XXII.13.1).\textsuperscript{578} He departed for the fatal Persian campaign on 5 March 363 (Amm. XXIII.2.6; Zos. III.12.1).\textsuperscript{579}

Much of the new material in this chapter comes from the \textit{Chronicle} of John Malalas. Malalas’ work in eighteen books covering creation to A.D. 565 is the earliest surviving Byzantine history of the world, and focuses both on sacred and Roman history. Most modern scholars justifiably dismiss his judgment and critical acumen.\textsuperscript{580} The exception to this might be valuable information specifically regarding Antioch, where Malalas was educated, and likely served in the office of the \textit{comes Orientis} before moving to Constantinople.\textsuperscript{581} For his narrative of fourth-
century events, Malalas used numerous written narratives, both Greek and Latin, as well as imperial laws, decrees, and letters.\textsuperscript{582}

Antioch was founded in 300 B.C. by the most successful of Alexander’s successors, Seleucus, and quickly grew into a sizable center of trade and culture. Overlooking Antioch from five miles to the south, the suburb of Daphne featured an oracular temple of Apollo containing a chryselephantine statue of Apollo built in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (216-163 B.C.), but sometimes also attributed to the founder of the city of Antioch, Seleucus, in 300 B.C. (Amm. XXII.13.1). According to Libanius, it was Seleucus that dedicated the grove of Daphne to the god Apollo, believing that it was the site where Apollo pursued Daphne, who was turned into a laurel tree which remained at the site (Lib., \textit{Or.} XI.94.). As Downey points out, it is unlikely he would have made such a dedication without building a temple, suggesting that attributions of the temple to Antiochus Epiphanes refer to that ruler’s later adornment of the site.\textsuperscript{583} The grove of Daphne was also enhanced by Diocletian, who built a palace and underground shrine of Hecate (Malalas XII.16-20).\textsuperscript{584} As part of his religious revival, Diocletian placed his dynasty under Jupiter’s protection and Maximianus under Hercules’. He rebuilt Antioch’s Olympic stadium for the games in Zeus’ honor, and either built or restored a statue of Zeus in the stadium (Malalas XII.5-16). Although Apollo’s oracle at Daphne’s Castalian Spring was famous for its prophecies, it became quiet during the second century, credit for which was claimed by the Christians. As early as c. A.D. 195, Clement of
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Alexandria claimed that the oracle at Delphi was defunct, and all like it (Clem. Al., Prot. II.11.1, cf. I.10, tr. Butterworth):

Σεσίγηται γον ἡ Κασταλίας πηγή καὶ Κολοφόνος ἀλλή πηγή, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὀμοίως τέθηκε νάματα μαντικὰ καὶ δὴ τοῦ τύφου κενὰ ὄνει μέν, δῆμος δ’ οὖν διελήλεγκται τοῖς ἰδίοις συνεκρεύσαντα μύθοις.

The Castalian spring, at least, is all silent. So is the spring of Colophon; and the rest of the prophetic streams are likewise dead. Stripped of their absurd pretensions, though none too soon, they are at last thoroughly exposed; the waters have run dry together with the legends attached to them.

This quotation is repeated in Eusebius’ fourth-century Preparation for the Gospel (Praep. Evan. II.3.2, cf. V.16; cf. Arnobius I.46.29-33).\(^{585}\) This account was, of course, not something that Clement could verify himself, and Athanassiadi has shown that oracular activity was still alive at Didyma and Delphi, yet the accounts of Clement and Eusebius undoubtedly influenced public perception.\(^{586}\) It is only fair to note that Ammianus attributed the blocking of the spring and the curtailing of its function to the Emperor Hadrian (Amm. XXII.12.8), although he had reason to divert attention from the debacle that ensued during Julian’s sojourn in the city.

Despite Antioch’s identity as a Hellenistic city, Christianity also had a long history in the metropolis of the Orient. It was the first place where followers of Christ were given the name Christian, and was also a major center of early church
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missions, with early leaders such as Peter, Paul, and Barnabas active in the city (Acts 11). Antioch was home to notable figures of the patristic period such as bishops Ignatius, Theophilus, and Babylas, who became bishop in approximately A.D. 238-44, and was martyred under the persecution of the emperor Decius, dying in prison in A.D. 250-1 (Eus., Hist. eccl. VI.29.4, 39.4). His relics were relocated twice, once by Gallus, and once by the Christians at the order of Julian. After his highly mobile posthumous career, Babylas was finally laid to rest at a church dedicated to him across the Orontes from the city.  

By the fourth century, Antioch was a city of great importance for several reasons. It was a large metropolis and trading centre with significant culture and history of its own, which also administered a large rural territory outside the city proper. Although Antioch was originally incorporated into the empire as a ‘free city’ with some practical autonomy, the web of imperial administration had tightened, with control shrinking down to the local βουλή or curia, a hereditary oligarchy. This administered local services and tax collection, but under the supervision of governors, and under the eye of the comes orientis, whose seat was in Antioch. It held strategic importance due to its location near the frontier with Persia, making it a natural headquarters for Roman emperors. It was an ecclesiastical centre for Christianity, which had played a significant role in the development and growth of that faith. While there is little comparative data on internal ethnic or economic relations, the city as a whole was populous, stable, and secure in the fourth
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century. It was, in short, the sort of city which a leader trying to establish a religious narrative of his own would naturally seek to make use of.

2. CONSTANTINE’S CHURCH CONSTRUCTION IN ANTIOCH

The history of Constantine and Antioch really begins with his predecessor Diocletian. Diocletian’s tetrarchy was consecrated under the protection of the gods, and claimed a genealogical relationship with them. The Eastern Augustus Diocletian (Jovius) was the son of Jupiter, while his junior Western Augustus Maximian (Herculius) was the son of Hercules. In addition, the Eastern Caesar under Diocletian, Galerius, had Sol Invictus, a god associated with Apollo, as his patron deity. As one scholar describes these associations: ‘Diocletian is the son of Jupiter who preserves the Roman Empire. A new age has dawned: the great heavenly emperor manifests his will through his son, the great king of earth’.

In 299, Diocletian, Galerius, and military leaders consulted the haruspices, but Tagis the magister haruspicum claimed the omens were unreadable as Christians present had crossed themselves (Lact. De mort. 10). The enraged Diocletian ordered all present to make sacrifice. This issue festered until winter 302, when Diocletian and Galerius met in Nicomedia with military and civic leaders as well as men of letters such as Hierocles to discuss the ‘Christian question’ (Lact. De mort. 11). These meetings may have included Porphyry as well, whose Against the Christians may have been written in support of the Great Persecution, although the dating

591 Liebeschuetz (1972), 256.
592 Barnes (1981), 12.
evidence is unclear.\textsuperscript{594} Diocletian consulted the oracle of Apollo, who encouraged persecution of the Christians (Lact. \textit{De mort.} 11). Following a week of public exhortations in Nicomedia against the Christians by Porphyry and Hierocles, Diocletian opened the Great Persecution on the pagan festival of the \textit{Terminalia}, 23 February 303 (Lact., \textit{De mort.} 13; Eus., \textit{Hist. eccl.} VIII.2.4, Praef. 1).\textsuperscript{595} At an unknown date, but likely part of this early phase of the persecution, Porphyry quoted Apollo’s oracle which called Christianity deceitful and polluting. Porphyry’s quotation is preserved by Augustine (Aug., \textit{De Civ.} XIX.23, tr. Dyson = Porphyry 344F Smith; cf. Arn. \textit{Adv. Nat.}, I.26.12-24):\textsuperscript{596}

You will, perhaps, be more able to write enduring letters on water, or open light wings and fly through the air like a bird, than bring your defiled and impious wife back to her senses. Let her continue as she likes, persevering in her vain delusions, singing lamentations for a god who died deluded himself: a god who was condemned by righteous judges and sentenced to die cruelly by the worst of deaths.

Constantine was attached to Diocletian’s court at that time, and witnessed the role of Apollo’s oracle in the Great Persecution. Digeser has recently made a compelling argument on the basis of historical context that Diocletian consulted the oracle of Apollo at \textit{Daphne}, which given Constantine’s presence at the court, would naturally

\textsuperscript{594} Bidez (1913), 67, 103, argued for a date prior to A.D. 270, Digeser (2000), 96 suggests a date as late as A.D. 295, while Barnes (1994), 65 argues for a date c. A.D. 300, and possibly as late as A.D. 305.
\textsuperscript{595} Liebeschuetz (1979), 247, holds that Diocletian did this to enroll Terminus the god of boundaries in his campaign to ‘to put a limit to the progress of Christianity’, although Pascal (1981), 252, points out that this depends on an anthropomorphising of Terminus on vague grounds.
contribute to Julian’s profound interest in Apollo’s oracle at Daphne.\textsuperscript{597} Although Lactantius blamed Galerius for the Great Persecution, it is worth noting that Constantine blamed Apollo and Diocletian (Jovius) for the Great Persecution, not Galerius.\textsuperscript{598} In his \textit{Letter to the Eastern Provincials}, Constantine wrote (Eus., \textit{Vit. Const.} II.50-1; cf. Lact., \textit{De mort.} X.1-6.):

Apollo at the time declared, it was said - from some cavern or dark recesss and not from heaven - that the righteous on earth prevented him from speaking truly, and that that was why he was composing false oracles from the tripods. That was what his priesthood, letting their long hair droop down and driven on by madness, deplored as the evil among mankind. But let us see to what ultimate disaster this led. I invoke you now, Most High God! I heard then, when I was still just a boy, how he who at that time held first rank among the Roman Emperors, fearful coward that he was, his mind deceived by error, anxiously enquired of his guards who the ‘righteous on earth’ might be. One of the sacrificial officers of his court answered, ‘Christians, I suppose.’ He swallowed the answer greedily like a drop of honey, and the swords designed to punish crimes he raised against unimpeachable holiness. Without delay he wrote, as it were with bloody dagger-blades, the edicts of carnage, and urged the magistrates to apply their native ingenuity to the invention of unprecedented tortures.

\textsuperscript{598} Millar (1977), 574;
Constantine later responded by initiating a war against Apollo, confiscating from Delphi the statue of the god, his cult tripods, and the victory column commemorating the battle of Plataea in 479 B.C., and relocating them to Constantinople where they became merely decorative (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.54.2; Soc., *Hist. eccl.* I.16.3; Zos. II.31.1). Delphi was no longer protected, and Christians apparently built martyr shrines within the sacred enclosure (Soz., *Hist. eccl.* V.20.7).

Eusebius reported that at Antioch Constantine had the Great Church built, a large octagonal church with double colonnades and a gilded dome, under the supervision of Plutarchus, the first Christian archon of Antioch (Eus., *Vit. Const.* III.50.2; cf. *Triac.* IX.14; Malalas XIII.3). This church, also known as the *Domus Aurea* from its gilded dome, was dedicated to οὐσίων, or ‘concord’, a concept that was crucial to Constantine’s idea of a united church and united empire. Construction began over the site of Emperor Philip’s baths in 327, during which the workers unearthed a statue of the god Poseidon, which was melted down and reused for a statue of Constantine outside the praetorium (Malalas XIII.318.3-21). The Great Church was not dedicated until 6 January 341, during a church synod convened for the completion (Ath., *De syn.* XXV.1; Philost. p. 212.19-22 Bidez). This church, representing concord, was the one which Julian ordered closed in retaliation for the burning of the temple of Apollo at Daphne. During this same period, Constantine had exchanged his new construction for old statues, removing numerous pieces to

---

599 Bassett (2004), 224-7 no. 141, 230-1; Barnes (2011), 129.
Constantinople, although the only one identified was that of a hyena. At the time of the famine of A.D. 333 (Jerome, *Chronicle*, 315e, *s.a.* 333), Constantine made the city’s existing churches the distribution centers of his largesse, providing 36,000 *modii* of wheat (Theophanes a. 5824, p. 29.13-23, ed. De Boor). It was in 335 that Constantine also sent his second son Constantius II to the city to continue his education as a ruler and to provide the citizens an imperial presence (Eus., *Triac*. III.4; Julian, *Or*. I.13b; Soz., *Hist. eccl*. III.5.1). In A.D. 335, Constantine made the Christian Felicianus the first *comes Orientis*, and gave him the Temple of the Muses as his praetorium (Malalas XIII.23).

3. CONSTANTIUS AND GALLUS’ CONTINUATION

Constantius, who resided in Antioch as his winter quarters for over half his reign, carried on Constantine’s Christianisation in several ways. The work on the *Domus Aurea* had begun in either 326 (Theophanes a. 5819, p. 28.16-17 De Boor) or 327 (Jerome, *Chronicle* 313i, *s.a.* 327). It was dedicated by Constantius II at the feast of Epiphany, 6 January 341, although the dedication synod began in December 340, which may mean it was close enough to completion in summer 340 to allow Eusebius to describe it accurately (Eus., *Vit. Const*. III.50.2). The dedication had, by design, coincided with a church council, the Council of the Dedication, and so

---

604 Patria Constantinoupolis II.73, 79 in Preger (1901-7), 189 no. 13, 191 no.4-5; cf. Downey (1961), 350.
605 Downey (1961), 354.
606 Barnes (1982), 85.
607 Downey (1961), 355.
608 For Constantius’ movements, see Barnes (1993), 219-25.
609 Mayer and Allen (2012), 70; Burgess (1999), 204.
more than ninety bishops were on hand for the event (Ath., *De synodis* 22, 25; Soc. *Hist. eccl.* II.8; Soc., *Hist. eccl.* III.5; Malalas XIII.4). This followed the pattern laid down by Constantine, who arranged a church council in Jerusalem in 335 for the dedication of the Church of the Resurrection. Unlike his father six years earlier, Constantius II was present at the council (Ath., *De Synodis* 25). With all this active interest in the city, Constantius established such a warm relationship with Antioch that Julian reported that the city called itself *Antiochia Constantia* (I.40d). Julian does not use this term, merely reporting that the city called itself by Constantius’ name. Constantius not only demonstrated interest in Antioch, he was able to manage the unstable city with equanimity, unlike Gallus and Julian.612

In 350, Constantius was forced to deal with the Western usurper Magnentius and so appointed his cousin and brother-in-law Flavius Claudius Constantius (Gallus) as Caesar in the East in 351. Gallus was married to Constantina, Constantius’ sister and the daughter of Constantine and Fausta. Gallus made his contribution to the anti-pagan campaign of the neo-Flavians by building a *martyrium* near the temple and spring at Daphne, the suburb of Antioch, and transporting there the remains of Babylas, which reportedly silenced the oracle.613 According to Chrysostom, Gallus had interred Babylas at Daphne, believing that his presence would deter the debauchery of that pleasure resort, which it did as well as silencing the oracle (Chrysostom, *Babylas* 67, 69). We do not know how functional the spring at Daphne was, and so cannot gauge the extent of his success, but the message of the gesture was clear. Gallus did not share the same convivial relationship with Antioch that his

611 J.N.D. Kelly (1960), 264.
612 Henck (2007), 147-56.
613 According to Mango (1990), 52, the first known translation of relics.
cousin did, ruling the population with brutality and corruption. Gallus’ threat to execute the entire *cura* in A.D. 354 was followed by his instigating the murder of Constantius’ representatives sent to rein him in, and ultimately his own execution near Pola in autumn of that year (Amm. XIV.7.2, 7.13-6, 11.21-3).

David Woods questions the attribution of Babylas’ martyrium to Gallus, pointing out that during the time Antioch was Constantius’ primary residence, he had initiated numerous other construction projects in the metropolis. He reviews the timing of the construction of Babylas’ *martyrium*, and concludes quite reasonably that ‘one may doubt whether such a project could have been initiated and brought to completion all within the brief reign of Gallus there.’ While Malalas had recorded a dedication as being from the Great Church of Constantine, this has been corrected by modern scholars to an inscription dedicating a church of Constantius, and the only possibility is the Daphne martyrium (Malalas XIII.17).

The amended text reads:

Χριστῷ Κωνστάντιος ἐπέπαστον οἶκον ἔτευξεν,
Οὐπανίας ὥσπερ πανείκελα, πανφανόωντα,
Κωνσταντίου ἄνακτος ὑποδρήσοντος ἑφετμαῖς
Γοργόνιος δὲ κόμης θαλαμηπόλον ἔργον ὄφανε.

Constantius erected for Christ (this) lovely house,

Glittering brightly, in every respect like the vaults of heaven,

---

614 Woods (2005), 61;
617 The text and translation are of Mayer and Allen (2012), 96.
via Constantius, who serviced his lord’s commands;

the *comes* Gorgonius served as *cubicularius*.

In this text, Κωνστάντιος in the first line refers to Constantius II (Flavius Iulius Constantius) and Κωνσταντῖο in the third line to Gallus (Flavius Claudius Constantius). I accept this reasoning, and therefore argue that the project represented the completion of Constantius II’s plans, rather than Gallus’ initiative. By the time of Julian’s arrival in Antioch, this martyrium contained multiple sets of remains.\(^{618}\)

The later years of Constantius’ reign were fraught with peril for pagan Antiochenes, as the emperor increased his anti-pagan activities. Constantius also continued the campaign against Apollo, relocating or allowing the relocation of the remains of martyrs to both Daphne and also Didyma, possibly intending to prevent oracular function.\(^{619}\) Constantius had previously enacted laws censuring superstition, banning nocturnal sacrifice, closing temples, and banning idolatry (*C.Th. XVI.10.3-6*). Beginning in January 357, he not only issued three new laws banning divination, necromancy, and soothsaying, but he directed the *notarius* Paul and *comes Orientis* Domitius Modestus to enforce these laws using torture and execution. The victims of the purge throughout the East included many leading citizens, as recorded by the historian Ammianus and the Antiochene orator Libanius (*Amm. XIX.12.1-19; Lib., *Ep.* 112 Foerster). Ammianus held that a deformed, two-headed infant born at this time at Daphne was a divine sign of *rem publicam in statum verti deformem*, ‘the state transformed into an ugly condition’ (*Amm. XIX.12.19, tr. Kelly*).\(^{620}\) Avoiding

\(^{618}\) Mayer and Allen (2012), 97.

\(^{619}\) Digeser (2004), 76.

\(^{620}\) Downey (1963), 158.
the unrest brought about in *Antiochia Constantia* by this inquisition, the emperor wintered in Constantinople, remaining in the city from December 359 to March 360.\(^{621}\)

Constantius’ deposition of Eudoxius in 360 decreased the stability of the Christian ecclesiastical structure in Antioch, which was already suffering from an existing schism. After Constantine’s deposition of bishop Eustathius, his followers had steadfastly refused to recognise his non-Nicene successors, and were currently led by the priest Paulinus.\(^{622}\) Eudoxius had become bishop of Antioch under somewhat dubious circumstances in 358, conveniently arriving in the city in the last stages of the then-bishop Leontius’ illness in time to be elected without notifying other Syrian bishops (Soz., *Hist. eccl.* IV.12).\(^{623}\) A Constantinopolitan council called Eudoxius to Constantinople to replace their bishop Macedonius with Constantius’ approval, and Meletius was elected in Antioch to fill the vacancy.\(^{624}\) Less than a month after his installation, Meletius was summarily deposed after speaking of the Trinity in a fashion that suggested support of the Nicene formula (Epiphanius, *Panar.* LXXIII.29–33; Soc., *Hist. eccl.* II.44).\(^{625}\) Although his successor Euzoiius held official recognition, the Nicene party which followed Meletius was the most numerous of the three groups in Antioch (Ruf., *Hist. eccl.* X.25).\(^{626}\) The Christian community in Antioch was divided into followers of three rival bishops, Euzoiius (non-Nicene), Meletius (neo-Nicene), and Paulinus (Nicene), making the city a ripe target for the installation of Julian’s ‘pagan church’.

\(^{621}\) Barnes (1993), 223.  
\(^{622}\) Chadwick (2001), 293. Athanasius had made Eudoxius famous for his opposition to the Nicene formula (*On the Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia* 12.1-14.3); Barnes (1993), 134.  
\(^{623}\) Barnes (1993), 139; Chadwick (2001), 275-6.  
\(^{624}\) Chadwick (2001), 277.  
\(^{625}\) Barnes (1993), 149.  
\(^{626}\) Barnes (1993), 149.
In the middle of the fourth century, Antioch was one of the four major centres of Christianity. Constantine had built one of his major churches in the city, and Constantius and Gallus had left their marks on the metropolis as well. Julian, however, the man of letters, thought highly of Antioch and had high hopes for his future relationship with the city, banking much of his hopes on the mutual connection of Hellenic παιδεία. Things changed dramatically for pagans in Antioch and throughout the empire with the death of Constantius at Mopsucrene on 3 November 361 (Amm. XXII.15.1-3).627

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Church</td>
<td>c.320</td>
<td>The first cathedral, also known as Palaia, was destroyed under the reigns of Galerius and Maximinus (293-313), reconstruction initiated by bishop Vitalis (314-20), completed by bishop Philogonius (320-4). Located in the old part of the city.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Church</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>Also known as the Domus Aurea, this was begun under Constantine c. 327, and finished by Constantius II in summer 340 as the new cathedral. Location claimed to be in new part of city, but that attribution uncertain.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne</td>
<td>351-4</td>
<td>Construction initiated by Constantius, completed during Gallus’ tenure as Caesar.630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. JULIAN’S RE-CONSECRATION OF THE TEMPLE OF APOLLO

Anticipating a military struggle, in summer or autumn 361 Julian had written letters to major cities in which he declared his paganism publicly (Or. V; fr. 9 Wright).631

After entering Constantinople on 11 December 361, he opened his campaign to restore pagan worship throughout the empire (Amm. XXII.5.2; Soc., Hist. eccl. III.1.2). While Julian had a role in all of this for Antioch, he did not pursue it

627 Barnes (1993), 224.
631 Humphries (2012), 77.
aggressively until moving to the city in July 362 (Amm. XXII.9.14).\textsuperscript{632} Looking back from early 363, at the end of his time in Antioch, Julian reflected on his initial optimism and generous treatment of the city, recalling his plans to make Antioch ‘greater and more powerful’ (XII.367cd).\textsuperscript{633}

As noted in part three, the situation for the church in Antioch had become even more unstable, with no less than three hierarchies in the city. This situation was exacerbated with Julian’s remittance of the exile on Nicene bishops. When bishop Lucifer returned from Sardinia, he traveled to Antioch, he consecrated the priest Paulinus, leader of the old Nicene faction, as bishop in his own right. As Paulinus had the support of the influential bishops of Rome and Alexandria, this made Antioch particularly vulnerable to Julian’s pagan revival.

Julian also sent a priest named Pythiodorus ahead to Antioch to organize pagan worship according to Julian’s preferences (Lib., Ep. 694.6-7). Julian’s interest was not merely antiquarian, or broadly religious; he had declared himself a prophet of Apollo, whom he described as τοῖς δεσπότοις Διδυμίου ‘the Lord of Didymus’ (Ep. 88.450d). In early 362, he wrote that he was the μέγας ἄρχων and had received the ability to deliver prophecy from Apollo (Ep. 88.451b). Given the Christian claim to have stopped the prophecies and the history of Apollo’s oracles with the Great Persecution, this is a significant claim. A long line of Christian apologists had made use of Christianity’s prophets and signs fulfilling prophecy, notably Justin, Origen, and Eusebius. Julian’s interest in oracles seems to relate to replacing the Christian framework of prophecies and confirming signs with a pagan framework of Hellenic oracles and confirming signs.

\textsuperscript{633} Gleason (1986), 106-119.
Julian was also praised by Libanius in 362, as he did not wait for divine oracles, but ‘establishes himself in place of the Pythia’, presumably receiving prophecy directly (Libanius, *Or*. XIII.48). Libanius reported that Julian sought advice from oracles, and in winter 362-3 was preoccupied with oracular divination (Lib., *Or*. XV.29-31; *Or*. XVIII.179). Didymean Apollo’s oracle was near Miletus, where the city proclaimed in an inscription dedicated to Julian that it was τροφός τοῦ Διδυμόου Ἀπόλλωνος, ‘nurse of the Apollo of Didyma’ (SIG II, 906a). Julian quoted a Didymean oracle regarding the cutting off of wicked men who worked against the gods and their consecrated representatives (*Ep*. 89b.297cd; also quoted in *Ep*. 88.451a). This perfectly described Constantine and his sons, and paralleled Julian’s comments directed against them in his autobiographical myth in *Or*. VII. As described previously, Julian wrote that Constantine’s contempt for the gods made him willing to do wrong for gain (VII.227c). While Constantine had stolen from the temples, his sons had gone further, led by their apostasy to destroy temples and build churches instead (VII.228b-d). By his own account, Julian had been informed by Helios that ‘we wish your ancestral house to be cleansed’ (VII.234c). Fortunately, Julian was well-equipped for such a task, being the prophet of Apollo, the τοίς ἄλλοις δωμάτων καθάρσιος, ‘purifier of houses for the others’ (Aeschylus, *Eumenides* 63). Ultimately, Julian’s efforts were insufficient to restore the glory or function of the oracle (XII.346b, cf. Soz., *Hist. eccl.* V.19.15-16).

Julian’s interest in oracles can first be placed into context with a short detour to Delphi. The oracle at Delphi was famous throughout the Greco-Roman world, and in 362, Julian sent his physician and quaestor Oribasius there to seek an oracle. Some

---

have suggested that Oribasius made a personal visit and sought the oracle on his
own, but Gregory correctly notes that given Julian’s interest in oracles and the
Temple at Daphne, that is not sustainable.\footnote{Gregory (1983), 359-60.} This interest in oracles was noted by
Augustine, who described Julian as \textit{deorum illorum oraculis deditus}, ‘devoted... to
the oracles of those gods’ (Aug., \textit{De Civ.} IV.29.11-12, tr. Dyson mod.). The fifth-
century historian Theodoret wrote that this was part of a broader scheme and that
Julian ‘dispatched the trustiest of his officers to all the oracles throughout the Roman
Empire’ (Theodoret, \textit{Hist. eccl.} III.6, tr. NPNF). Simmons argues compellingly that
Julian’s interest was not tied to Antioch, but was part of a plan to invalidate
Christianity based on the writings of Porphyry. Bouffartigue’s study of Julian’s
writings indicates that he had indeed read \textit{Against the Christians}.\footnote{Bouffartigue (1992), 334-8, 346-53, 366-7, 373-5, 385.}
Porphyry had predicted the end of Christianity after a 365 year run (Aug., \textit{De Civ.} XVIII.53).
Simmons argues that Julian sought to fulfill these predictions and invalidate
Christianity’s truth claims in his aggressive religious program, and concludes: ‘If all
these objectives had been achieved by A.D. 394 - the date of the fulfillment of the
365 year prophecy - the Constantinian Revolution might indeed have been
successfully reversed’.\footnote{Simmons (2006), 91.}
The journey and ostensible response of the oracle which
Oribasius brought Julian back from Delphi is recorded in the eighth-century \textit{Artemii
\textit{Artemii Passio} make use of the fifth-century Philostorgius, but unfortunately this passage does not
demonstrably rest upon earlier authority.}

Εἴπατε τῷ βασιλεί, χαμαί πέσε δαιδάλος αὐλά,
οἵκέτι Φοίβος ἔχει καλύβην, οὐ μάντιδα δάφνην,
 οὐ παγάν λαλέουσαν, ἀπέσβετο καὶ λάλον ὄῳρ.

Speak to the king, the cleverly built palace has fallen to the ground.
No longer does Phoebus have a covering roof, nor the laurel of prophecy,
nor the babbling spring, and the babbling water has been quenched.

Oribasius was Julian’s close friend and a source for Eunapius’ *Universal History*. Eunapius described Oribasius as Julian’s ‘accomplice’ in arranging his rebellion against Constantius II, and wrote that Oribasius’ ‘outstanding virtues’ made Julian emperor (Eun., *Vit. soph.* XXI.1.4). The hierophant told Julian and two ‘accomplices’ (Oribasius and Euhemerus) that their attempt to end Constantius’ tyranny was favored (Eunapius, fr. 21, fr. 29 Blockley; cf. Amm. XXI.1.6). While still in Gaul and still holding the rank of Caesar, Julian wrote to Oribasius about his prophetic dream of two trees. Oribasius had written to Julian of a vision which evidently indicated good things for their future plans. Julian replied to his trusted friend that he had a dream ‘of the same sort’ which he considered a similarly authentic vision (*Ep.* 14.384b). In it he saw a large tree next to a sapling. The large tree was uprooted, endangering the smaller, but Julian was advised in the dream by a stranger that the roots of the smaller tree were intact and that it would flourish (*Ep.* 14.384b-d). It does not take much imagination to see Julian and Constantius as the two trees. Wright opines that the unnamed messenger is Hermes, in similar vein to his role in *Or.* VII.230c. While our late sources regarding the oracle at Delphi are
not reliable, it may be that, as at Daphne, Julian was attempting to overwrite the past at Delphi, using Oribasius as his agent.

To return to Antioch, Julian provided corroborating evidence regarding the priority he placed on temple reconstruction in a letter to his uncle Julian. He had appointed his trusted uncle Julian as *comes Orientis* in early 362, revealing the emphasis he placed on the role of Antioch in his program. His intention was signaled by his interest in preparing the temple of Apollo at Daphne prior to his arrival in the city. In 362, the young emperor sent his uncle detailed instructions regarding the pillars apparently removed for use in houses. He approved of all that his uncle had recommended in a previous letter, and instructed him to make restoring the pillars of Daphne his first priority (*Ep.* 80). This letter indicates that the emperor and his *comes* had been discussing plans for Antioch prior to his arrival, and also highlights his emphasis on the temple of Apollo.

Julian evidently had plans for great construction, quoting Augustus in his lament to Libanius, ‘I intended to make it a city of marble’ (*Lib.*, *Or*. XV.52). He also established a new library at Hadrian’s temple to Trajan, using the books taken from the recently deceased George of Alexandria (*Ep.* 106-7 Bidez; John of Antioch, *frag.* 273.1 Roberto). Julian came to Antioch to undo the work of the emperor Constantine regarding his war on the oracular temples of Apollo, as well as Constantine’s pattern of consecration and desecration.

Julian traveled to Antioch to bring his pagan revival to a city with a strong recent history of Christianity, but a more deeply rooted relationship with Hellenism. As part of this mission, he went to undo the work of Constantius II, who had moved the

---

640 *Frag.* 273.1 Roberto (2005), 457-9 = *frag.* 181 Müller (1851), 606-7 = *Suidas* I.401 s.v. Ἰοβιανός; cf. Downey (1961), 396.
remains of Babylas to a shrine of Apollo at Daphne, an early case of transportation of relics (Soc., Hist. eccl. III.17, Soz., Hist. eccl. III.17; Philostorgius VII.8; Chrysostom, Babylas 76).\textsuperscript{641}

Considering Julian’s Misopogon, Potter asks the perceptive question, ‘Did Julian plan to complete the work he had begun (albeit without success) at Jerusalem in the previous year by appropriating important Christian sites to new purposes?’ (XII.259a).\textsuperscript{642} Clearly Antioch held considerable importance for Julian, who traveled to Antioch in June 362 to accomplish several goals. Certainly, he would have had to make military preparations for his invasion of Persia the following summer, but his journey to Antioch was rather early.\textsuperscript{643} The timing of his move to Antioch, which coincided with his reorganization of Hellenism, is suggestive. The city was also attractive, because Constantine had built a notable church there, the Domus Aurea or church of όµόνοη, to serve the very vocal Christian population in the ‘metropolis of the Orient’. Antioch offered an opportunity for Julian to showcase his reorganized Hellenism, to reconvert the city with a long history of pagan religion. It also was a strategic location in the war on Apollo which had begun with Diocletian’s reliance on the oracle at the start of the Great Persecution. Surprisingly, two modern scholars speculate that Julian ‘possibly even had it in mind to make Antioch the capital of the empire’, but this is not based on statements from the emperor.\textsuperscript{644}

Upon arriving in Antioch, the situation looked promising, notwithstanding the evil portents with which Ammianus introduced his discussion of Julian’s stay (Amm. XXII.9.15). Julian began appropriately with the temple of Apollo at Daphne,

\textsuperscript{641} Claimed as the first by Mango (1990), 52.
\textsuperscript{642} Potter (2004), 516.
\textsuperscript{643} As assessed by Kaegi (1975), 161-171
\textsuperscript{644} Bowersock (1978), 95-6; cf. Athanassiadi (1981), 204.
intending to restore the temple and add a surrounding colonnade (Amm. XXII.13.2).

As part of making Antioch greater (XII.367d), Julian had remitted one fifth of their taxes, increased the size of their senate (which potentially increased revenues), gave the city additional land, and later purchased food for the citizens, actions which seem somewhat reminiscent of Constantine’s (XII.365b, 367d-368a, 370d-371a).

Civic life, of which pagan festival was a component, had declined as leading citizens channeled their aims from love of status and titles of honour, or φιλοτιµία, towards ambitious displays of wealth, typified by horse races and gladiatorial spectacles.  

Curial reform was a sizeable component of Julian’s program, as it provided the economic base for many of the activities which he held so dear. However, as Bradbury points out, Julian could enact new laws and alter policy, ‘but he could do little to alter the steep social pyramid that was solidly in place by the 360’s’.  

5. JULIAN’S DESECRATION

The situation in Antioch soured following further confrontation between Julian and the Christian community in Antioch. Julian ordered Babylas’ body removed from Daphne and had the site ritually purified (Amm. XXII.12.8). After Julian ordered the Christians to remove Babylas’ remains, they responded with a victorious procession through the city (Rufinus X.36; cf. Theodoret III.6):

The whole church therefore came together . . . and with immense rejoicing pulled along the martyr’s coffin in a long procession singing psalms with

646 Bradbury (1986), 186.
loud cries and exultation and saying, ‘May all those be put to shame who worship carven idols and who trust in their images.’

This turned into a public relations disaster, as the Christians portrayed this as a victory over Apollo, claiming that Babylas was doubly powerful, both in presence and absence.\(^{647}\) It appears that despite the presence of other bodies nearby, Julian only had removed the one placed by his half-brother Gallus. Given that in the intervening years, other bodies had been buried in the martyrium therefore polluting the temple precinct, Mayer and Allen characterise Julian’s removal of only Babylas as ‘peculiar’.\(^{648}\) As Chrysostom wrote in 377-78 (Chrysostom, *Babylas* 87; cf. XVI.90, XVIII.98; Greg. Naz., *Or.* IV.19; Theodoret III.6):

In fact it was no longer possible to keep up the pretence since the martyr alone (μόνον τόν μυρτυρα) was removed from there and none of the other corpses.

Chrysostom is dated to 377-78 as he mentions the death of Julian in 363 and does not mention the construction of the new shrine for Babylas in 379-80, and so was likely written during that interval. It can be further narrowed to 377-78, taking as approximation the mention of a twenty-year gap (mentioned at L.567) between events.\(^{649}\) Although in the late fourth century, Ammianus downplayed the religious conflict by writing of *corpora*, ‘bodies’ buried around the spring, but this is

---

\(^{647}\) And indeed, this episode was one of the few unifying factors during this period for the disparate Christian factions within the city.

\(^{648}\) Mayer and Allen (2012), 137.

\(^{649}\) Lieu (1989), 61.
contradicted by Julian, who himself referred to the singular τόν νεκρόν ‘the corpse’ (XII.361b). While Libanius was writing years later, he was resident in Antioch at the time, and referred to the removal of νεκρός τίνος, ‘a certain corpse’ (Lib., Or. LX.5).

Shortly thereafter, on the night of 22 October 362, a fire mysteriously started in the temple, causing the roof to collapse and destroy the statue of Apollo (Amm. XXII.13.1). Ammianus reflected many years later that it was possibly an accident caused by the philosopher Asclepiades (Amm. XXII.13.2-3). Although Athanassiadi insists ‘Julian did not blame the Christians for the incident’, he suspected Christian arson (XII.361b) and responded negatively to the event, including torture, church closure, and instigation of church destruction. Rufinus that Julian ordered both the priest attending the temple and numerous Christians tortured (Rufinus X.37). Of course, Rufinus was not present, but took the trouble to interview participants in the events in Antioch, including one young man tortured by Julian’s prefect. Like Gallus before him, Julian’s relationship with Antioch had deteriorated significantly, although he remained in the city another half a year.

While in Antioch, Julian reportedly followed his previous pattern of consecration and desecration in different ways. Julian threatened the Antiochenes, implying in early 363 that church burnings in Emesa could be repeated in Antioch as well (Greg. Naz., Or. IV.93; Julian, XII.357c). Julian himself suggested in early 363 that he was offering more than passive encouragement to those desecrating Christian churches. In the same response to the Antiochene’s mockery of him, Julian wrote (XII.361a, my translation):

---

I know well that they [those cities] love me more than their own sons, for they immediately raised up the sacred places of the gods and overthrew all of the tombs of the godless, on the preconcerted signal that was given by me recently; and they became stirred up in mind and buoyed in heart, and so have punished those sinning against the gods more than I had willed.

This is in contrast to Julian’s public edict issued from Antioch on 1 August 362, in which he instructed Bostrenian pagans not to attack the Christians or their communities (Ep. 114.437bc). Perhaps expanding on this account, Sozomen wrote that following the fire at the temple of Apollo at Daphne, to burn all the Christian shrines adjacent to the temple of Apollo near Miletus (Soz., Hist. eccl. V.20):

The emperor … on being further informed that the honoured remains of the martyrs were preserved in several houses of prayer near the temple of the Apollo Didymus, which is situated close to the city of Miletus, wrote to the governor of Caria, commanding him to destroy with fire all such edifices as
were furnished with a roof and an altar, and to throw down from their very foundations the houses of prayer which were incomplete in these respects.

Julian also responded to the fire immoderately by immediately closing Antioch’s Great Church, a decision demonstrated not to be a one-off response by his other actions. Julian had Constantine’s Great Church nailed shut and entry to it banned (Amm. XXII.13.2; Theodoret III.12.1). Although there were other church buildings in the city, some predating the Great Church, the only ones recorded closed were the ones built by Constantine and Constantius II. As modern Antakya thoroughly covers Antioch, our knowledge of ancient churches is rather limited, but we should assume the metropolis had many more at the time. Julian pillaged the *Domus Aurea* of its liturgical vessels for the imperial treasury, reminiscent of Constantine’s plundering of the temples (Theophanes a. 5894, p. 50.14 De Boor; cf. Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.* III.12.4). Later sources add reports of the *comes Orientis*, the emperor’s uncle Julian, torturing and murdering church leaders, desecrating the liturgical vessels, and a member of his retinue’s urination upon the altar of the church (Soz., *Hist. eccl.* V.8; Philost., *Hist. eccl.* VII.10). Theodoret wrote that Julian placed offerings sacrificed to the gods into contact with water supplies and food in the marketplace, similar to what was reported of Galerius during the Great persecution (Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.* III.15-7; Lact., *De mort.* XXXVII.2). As one historian who gives the accounts credence observes, Julian was ““paganizing”

---

651 Bidez (1930), 272, notes that Julian’s beliefs were permeated with a fanaticism foreign to the Hellenic spirit, although this seems to sidestep the role of Porphyry and Hierocles in Diocletian’s Great Persecution.
653 Downey (1961), 388.
without their prior approval what the local people took into their bodies’. I am cautious of the possible embellishment of these later accounts, but what they relate fits an established pattern of overwriting and recapitulation, leading me to conclude that they should not be dismissed.

Over the period of seven to eight months following Julian’s arrival, however, communication broke down between the emperor and his Antiochene subjects. The catalyst was the particularly weak harvest of 362 (Amm. XXII.13.14; Lib., Or. XVIII.195). In addition to the imperial court, the army Julian assembled for the invasion of Persia was very sizeable, according to Zosimus 65,000 strong (Zos. III.13.1). This resulted in a severe corn shortage with which the curiales were unable to help the emperor (Amm. XXII.14.2; Lib. Or. I.126; XVI.21). Julian insisted the city leaders refused to work towards a solution (XII.368d, 369d-370a), added to which Liebeschuetz points out the conflict of interest as the curiales were also, by and large, the local corn producers. Julian responded by capping corn prices and directly providing (but crucially, not rationing) wheat, which was snatched up by speculators (XII.369ab).

Julian’s highly negative experience eventually caused him to write an angry treatise interpreting his time in the city, the Misopogon. Some modern scholars have dismissed Julian’s work as simply bizarre. Bowersock writes that the Misopogon had its origins in the ‘irrational side of Julian’s character’, and that ‘Julian’s unsettling laughter can be heard throughout the Misopogon’. Athanassiadi opines that Julian’s response in the Misopogon is like that of a ‘wronged child’, and that his

---
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bitter realization there of his failure as a statesman led to difficulty maintaining contact with reality and his desire to emulate Alexander’s conquest of the east.\textsuperscript{659} Eschewing psycho-analysis, Downey admits that the \textit{Misopogon} was unsuccessful, but pointed out that it was ‘not a hysterical outburst, but… a planned and considered effort of propaganda’.\textsuperscript{660} Indeed, both pagan and Christian authors responded to the \textit{Misopogon} as a rational, even an effective work (Amm., XXII.14.2; Lib., \textit{Or}. XVIII.195-8; Soc., \textit{Hist eccl}. III.17; Soz., \textit{Hist. eccl}. V.19).\textsuperscript{661} In it, Julian framed the conflict as being between the libertine Christian Antiochenes, in opposition to the values of Hellenism, best exemplified by the virtue of being \textit{σώφρων} or ‘self-controlled’ (XII.342b, d, 344a, 344d, 355d). Julian further displayed his Hellenic allegiance by attributing his ‘poor’ character which the Antiochenes so disliked to his tutors Mardonius, Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, and Theophrastus (XII.353b). Julian sarcastically catalogued his ‘terrible sins’, which centered upon wearing a beard and compelling men to act righteously, which was the source of the Antiochenes frustration with him (XII.347a, 349c, 350a, 355a). More seriously, the Antiochenes praised men instead of gods, a fault which Julian definitely tied to Christianity, as he accused the ‘godless men’ of destroying the shrine of Daphne (XII.345a, 346b). The Antiochenes had mocked Julian, saying that the \textit{Chi} (Christ) and the \textit{Kappa} (Constantius) had never done them wrong, and in response, Julian wished them a double dose of the tyrannical rule of the \textit{Kappa} (XII.360d). Not a very comforting prospect, as Julian elsewhere described the ‘butchery’ of Constantius’ persecutions against the Nicene Christians (\textit{Ep}. 114.436a). Julian announced his intent to depart

\textsuperscript{659} Athanassiadi (1981), 202, 224.
\textsuperscript{660} Downey (1939), 314.
\textsuperscript{661} Gleason (1986), 107.
and not return, leaving the city to itself, and taking himself to people of better character, paralleling Cato’s abrupt departure from Antioch, as he cried aloud ‘Alas for this ill-fated city!’ (XII.364d, 366a, 370b). Julian planned to remove his headquarters to Tarsus when he returned from Persia (Amm. XXIII.3.5; Lib., Or. I.132). Julian closed with the warning that he left the matter in the hands of Adrasteia, the goddess of vengeance, and prayed that the gods would recompense Antioch for their treatment of him (XII.370b, 371b).

The Antiochenes may have feared a massacre, like Alexander’s at Thebes, or later, Theodosius at Thessalonica, as demonstrated by the rather panicked response of the Antiochene Senate who came after Julian to meet with him on 10 or 11 March 363 before his campaign (Ep. 58 Wright). Sandwell highlights the focal point of Julian’s wrath, namely that the Antiochenes had adopted Christ as the guardian of their city (XII.357c).\(^{662}\) The threat to Antioch is also demonstrated by Libanius’ approach to scolding the Antiochenes and instructing them to make peace with the emperor. Libanius told the Antiochene Christians that if they wanted forgiveness from Julian, they should ‘surrender their city to Zeus and the other gods’ (Or. XVI.46).\(^{663}\) He had asked about the fate of non-Christians in the city, whereupon Julian had threatened that ‘often a whole city has been punished for one wicked man’ (Lib., Or. XVI.50).\(^{664}\)

Julian left for his Persian campaign in foul humor, and Christian commentators all claimed that dire consequences were in store when Julian returned victorious from the East. In 377-78, John Chrysostom wrote that Julian prepared during his

---
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time in Antioch to make war against the church (Chrysostom, Babylas 119). He claimed that ‘those privy to his plans’ related statements that after Julian’s return from Persia he would destroy the church completely (Chrysostom, Babylas 121). Chrysostom identified Julian’s strategy as moving from the lesser difficulty (the Persian campaign), to the greater (destroying the church). The general theme that Julian intended to openly persecute the church upon returning from Persia was also followed by Gregory, Jerome, Orosius, Rufinus, Sozomen, and Theodoret (Greg. Naz. Or. V.25; Jerome, Chron. 325d, s.a. 363; Rufinus X.37; Orosius VII.30; Sozomen VI.2; Theodoret III.21).

Julian’s Persian campaign has been assumed to be an outgrowth of his love for the great Hellene Alexander the Great, to the point that even some modern scholars have adopted Socrates’ position that Julian believed himself Alexander reincarnated (Soc., Hist. eccl. III.21.7).  

Athanassiadi holds that Julian regarded Alexander ‘as a model and a hero, as his uncle had done before him’, but while I would not deny Julian’s modeling his character after Alexander, he may also have been simply following the path of Constantine himself. Baynes has shown the depth of Constantine’s public identification, including coinage, with Alexander prior to his planned invasion of Persia, and Barnes has shown the Itinerarium Alexandri encouraged Constantius to follow the exploits of Alexander, Trajan, and the ambitions of Constantine. Kaegi’s research demonstrates that Julian’s invasion

\[\text{footnotes}\]

\[\text{footnotes continued}\]
plan, was in fact, his uncle Constantine’s. Indeed, Trajan’s invasion of Parthia appears to have been a model impressed upon all subsequent generations.

6. CONCLUSION

The conflict in Antioch and around the issue of oracles can in one sense be seen as a conflict relating to the Greek god Apollo. Diocletian’s persecution was sparked by the oracles of Apollo (Eus., Vit. Const. II.50-1). Blaming Apollo’s oracle for Diocletian’s persecution, Constantine confiscated his cult tripods (Eus., Vit. Const. III.54.2; Soc., Hist. eccl. I.16.3; Zos., II.31.1), following which Christians were allowed to build martyr shrines at the site (Soz. V.20.7). Julian in turn is said to have sent Oribasius to receive an oracle from Delphi (Theod. III.6; Artemii Passio 35). As Constantine’s Christian nephew Gallus built or completed a martyr shrine to Babylas at the site of Apollo’s oracle in Daphne (Soc., Hist. eccl. III.17; Soz., Hist. eccl. III.17; Philost. VII.8; Chrysostom, Babylas 67, 69), Julian claimed Apollo’s oracle inhibited by presence of bodies, and removed one body, the one placed by his half-brother Gallus (XII.361b; Lib., Or. LX.5; Chrysostom, Babylas 87). In another sense, these are of course, reflective of Julian’s iteratio of Constantine in Antioch. Continuing our parallels, as Constantine built the large Domus Aurea church at Antioch (Eus., Vit. Const. III.50.2), Julian closed the Domus Aurea (Theod., Hist. eccl. III.12.4; Soz., Hist. eccl. V.8; Philost. VII.10), and ordered churches near Antioch and Miletus burned (XII.361a; Soz., Hist. eccl. 668 Kaegi (1981), 209-13; cf. Hunt (1998b), 73 n. 94: ‘The most recent precedent for Julian’s revision to a more aggressive strategy was, ironically, Constantine’.
V.20). The recapitulatory pattern throughout the empire exists in Julian’s actions in and around Antioch as well. This framework addresses issues that are not well explained in other paradigms, such as Julian’s apparent closure of only Constantine’s *Domus Aurea* church, his apparent removal of only the body of Babylas, and Oribasius’ mission to Delphi. These acts are all rationally explained if Julian is responding to Constantine, recapitulating his (and his son Constantius’) actions. Antioch was the first location where Julian was really able to attempt things on a large scale. His pagan revival was coming into its own, and here he introduced his pagan church. The events at Antioch described in this chapter offer a taste of what Julian’s *restitutio* would have provided.

We can now review Julian’s spatial recapitulation of Constantine in this larger section. Some modern scholars profess great difficulty in understanding Constantine’s actions, and have formulated a number of theories. Yet Constantine’s Christianisation sent a message to his contemporaries that was perhaps more clear to them than to modern scholars. Once Rome was his, Constantine arranged for basilicas to be built there, overwriting his political opponent Maxentius. Later, after prohibiting pagan sacrifice in the East, he founded and dedicated a New Rome on dates chosen to indicate his intention to parallel the Eternal City. The new city contained Christian imagery, stupendous churches, and was consecrated by the emperor’s installation of a giant cross in his palace. He closed the oracular temples of Apollo which he blamed for starting the Great Persecution. He demolished, desecrated, or took over pagan temples, and built Christian churches instead, on rare occasions that we know of, on the site of ruined temples. He built his greatest church at Jerusalem, where it established a Christian presence described as ‘New
Jerusalem’, over against the Old. Through all this, he fulfilled his stated intention to build up the church throughout the empire.

Constantine’s Christianization was thoroughly understood by Constantine’s surviving successor, Constantius II, who continued these trends. He continued the war against Apollo, building martyr shrines inside the temple precincts. He completed his father’s church buildings and added more. He tightened the anti-pagan laws. Constantius and his cousin Gallus may have gone to further extremes than Constantine would have wished.

Julian reacted against Constantine’s message, stating his intentions as well in Or. VII, namely that he was divinely called to cleanse the empire of the stain of impiety. He attempted to restore the oracular temples of Apollo, temple sacrifice, and rebuild the Jewish Temple at Jerusalem. He reintroduced pagan worship into Constantine’s New Rome, and built a temple in his quarters in the palace. Julian’s attempted recapitulation of space vis-à-vis Constantine is revealed above to be a significant factor in his reign. Constantine had established something of a precedent with his construction overwriting political rivals and pagan religious sites. Julian took that concept to another level with his framework of recapitulation, as discussed in chapter one. As described in his Or. VII, Julian’s thought meant that he, as the faithful heir of Constantius I, would fulfil the divine mandate to overwrite the work of the faithless heir. The theory of recapitulation encompasses the themes of church consecration, temple desecration, and the war on the oracles of Apollo. Constantine’s past activities drove Julian to some of his most notable and

670 As first discussed in chapter one, part six.
idiosyncratic actions, some of which are only adequately explained by a recapitulatory framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Summary of Julian's spatial recapitulation of Constantine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constantine (references from Eusebius, <em>Vit. Const.</em>)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Stripped temples of statues, precious metals. (III.54.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Outlawed sacrifice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Furnished newly built churches everywhere. (III.47.4) Built significant churches at Bethlehem (III.43.1), Mt. Olivet (III.43.3), Nicomedia (III.50.1), Mamre (removing <em>desecrated</em> rubble &amp; earth). (III.51.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Built many churches, martyr shrines, <em>consecrated</em> city to God. (III.48.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Purged city of idol worship – no cult service for images, altars, no sacrifice. (III.48.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In middle of imperial palace fixed ‘emblem of the saving passion’ [a cross] as protection for the Empire. (III.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jerusalem</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Restored site of Resurrection for purpose of Christian worship, built over site of Hadrian’s Temple of Aphrodite, removing <em>desecrated</em> rubble &amp; earth. (III.25-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This was the New Jerusalem facing the Old Jerusalem. (III.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antioch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Built large Domus Aurea church at Antioch. (III.50.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Denuded and desecrated shrines of Apollo at Delphi, Miletus, and Daphne. Nephew Gallus placed Babylas’ relics at the shrine of Apollo at Daphne.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ELEVEN:
RECAPITULATION OF CHRISTIAN PRAXIS AND STRUCTURE

1. INTRODUCTION

We have seen, in chapters one and three to five, Julian’s identification of himself with the son of god, similar in broad strokes to what Eusebius did for Constantine, presenting him as a mimetic Christ, as described in chapter one, part two. He carefully paralleled Christ with Heracles and Asclepius, then cast himself as the earthly avatar of both gods. In chapters seven to ten, we have also seen how Julian recapitulated Constantine’s pattern of consecration and desecration, undoing Constantine’s building program, and attempting to construct a pagan narrative over it. In this chapter, I will show how Julian combined elements of these previous two parts of his restoration in his recapitulation of Christian praxis and structure. Julian posited a new role for himself at the head of his re-imagined paganism, at the same time that he copied the ecclesiastical structure and clerical instructions of the Christian faith.

When Julian came to sole power, the initial step of restoring the legal status of pagan sacrifice was clear and obvious. However, to make paganism competitive with Christianity, he implemented several changes, none of which were entirely new. When Julian reintroduced paganism as the sole state religion, he provided new theological content for the deities Heracles and Asclepius, concepts from Christianity, and sometimes from identifiable texts. Rather like Constantine, Julian cast himself as a Messianic saviour, identifying himself with Heracles and
Asclepius. Finally, Julian aimed to borrow from Christianity the things that contributed to its uniqueness, and in Julian’s opinion, its effectiveness. Had Julian lived to complete its implementation, such a comprehensively integrated ‘pagan church’ could have been a potent weapon against Christianity, simultaneously attacking and co-opting it.

The components Julian borrowed in his ecclesiastical recapitulation were several. Julian co-opted the moral discipline and hierarchical structure of the Christian clergy, as well as the ascetic communities and charitable functions of the Christian church. In many cases, there is no other inspiration apart from the church where he could have derived his ideas. We must also bear in mind his ‘pagan chapel’ in the palace at Constantinople, discussed in chapter eight. Julian crafted his ‘new paganism’ to follow Christianity’s Episcopal structure, ascetic living, charitable functions, and didactic purpose.

Our material for the fifth-century church historians who comment on this issue is somewhat suspect, as they had never lived under organised state paganism and might reasonably be supposed to view Julian’s paganism as a mirror image of the Christian church. They may have portrayed Julian’s reign in light of an apology for their own era, influenced by Theodosius’ anti-pagan response. Despite this, Julian provides us ample source material in his letters regarding his plans for the new paganism of his restoration, which indeed appears to be largely co-opted from the Christian church. In his letter to the high priest of Galatia, Julian wrote of Christianity’s gains, which he attributed to their charity and holy living, virtues which he wanted inculcated in his new paganism (Ep. 84a.429d-430a). In this letter, one of the ones termed Julian’s ‘lettres pastorales’ by Koch, Julian outlined a
program for encouraging these virtues among the pagan priesthood, and providing
the organizational framework to support related activities (Ep. 30, 79, 85, 86, 87,
89a, 89b Bidez). 671 Modern scholarship recognises Julian’s endeavor to parallel
Christianity’s ecclesiastical organisation and charitable functions, although only a
few provide details in support of their claim. 672 In the early twentieth century, Koch
wrote an influential series of articles, entitling Julian’s restored Paganism ‘une église
païenne’, a term which has been followed by numerous scholars. 673 However, none
have fully demonstrated how the components of such a ‘pagan church’ worked
together in a cohesive unity with the rest of Julian’s program, which indeed they do.

2. CHRISTIANITY UNDER CONSTANTINE

In his lifetime, Constantine reshaped the status of Christianity in the empire.
Politically, Constantine gave his personal endorsement to Christianity, and
supported the careers of fellow Christians. Legally, he restored Christians’ status
after persecution and gave bishoprics special status under the law (Eus., Hist. eccl.
X.5.15-17), and also pressured Licinius at Milan to extend legality in the East (Lact.,
De mort. XLVIII.2-12; Eus., Hist. eccl. X.5.1-14). Financially, Constantine used
imperial funds to construct churches (Eus., Vit. Const. III.25-40), and granted
support for bishops (Eus., Hist. eccl. X.6-7). Constantius continued this process, by
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summoning and funding travel to church councils, and edging out paganism under the law (for which, see chapter seven).

**Hierarchy**

Constantine modified the structure of the church by introducing a role for the state. Eusebius’ theory of the role of the emperor in relation to the church moves in the direction of the Byzantine unity of emperor and church. While this is sometimes criticised as ‘caesaropapism’, Francis Dvornik points out that the emperor could summon but not vote in Byzantine councils, indicating a balance of power. Development in this direction was likely inevitable, as his was the first generation of the church to have legal status and receive state beneficence. This understanding must be qualified, however, as some have misinterpreted the role Constantine chose for himself. Constantine declared himself the ἐπίσκοπος, ‘bishop’ or ‘overseer’, of those outside the church, although both the sense and the off-hand context indicate he was not establishing himself as its functional head, and may have been reassuring bishops that their jurisdiction wouldn’t be encroached upon (Eus., *Vit. Const.* IV.24). Some have asserted that the Council of Nicaea was ‘Constantine’s council’. However, all that we have evidence for is that after bishops had called a council which was quashed by Licinius, he re-called bishops to a council that he attended, but Ossius of Cordoba oversaw. Despite these qualifiers, for the first time the state was wielding definite influence within the church. Constantine ordered churches built and temples abandoned, as discussed in detail in the previous chapter. He also gave theological advice, encouraging bishops to seek unity, and according to

---

675 Dvornik (1951), 1-23.
Eusebius suggesting the term ὁμοούσιος at the Council of Nicaea, which framed theological debate through the rest of the century (Ath., De decr. 33).\textsuperscript{677} Beginning in 313, the emperor exempted Christian clergy from expensive public service, strengthening the importance of that office, a law which was clarified in edicts up to 330 (C.Th. XVI.2.1, 2, 4, 7). The emperor also used state funding to make churches points of access to his largesse, providing the poor with food and clothing (Eus., Vit. Const. I.43, IV.28; Soz., Hist. eccl. V.5).

Constantine’s crafting of his own public persona was reinforced by Eusebius’ theological portrayal of him. Eusebius presented Constantine as a deliverer of the faithful from tyranny, very much in the style of Moses in the Exodus (Eus., Vit. Const. I.12.1, 39.1).\textsuperscript{678} In the hands of Eusebius, the emperor was specially chosen by God for his role as ‘a friend of the all-sovereign God, and was established as a clear example to all mankind of the life of godliness’ (Eus., Vit. Const. I.3.17). He grew up in the Imperial court under tyrants, and indeed the Mosaic motif was applied to all stages of his life (Eus., Vit. Const. I.12.1, 20.2).\textsuperscript{679} He received a vision from heaven, much like Moses’ burning bush (Eus., Vit. Const. I.12.1, II.12.1). Again like Moses, Constantine was described as a divine prophet (Eus., Vit. Const. I.12.1, II.12.1). These numerous Mosaic parallels also took on a Messianic flavour when Eusebius compared Moses and Jesus in his Demonstratio Evangelica (Eus., Dem. evan. III.2.6-7). According to Eusebius, Constantine viewed his divine mission as including the healing of the empire, the rescue of its citizens from tyranny, particularly the people of his faith, and the bringing to them knowledge of his God

\textsuperscript{677} Beatrice (2002), 246.
\textsuperscript{678} Averil Cameron (1991), 55; (1997), 158-63; Cameron and Hall (1999), 42.
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(Eus., *Vit. Const.* II.64-5, 55.1; cf. *De laud.* VI.21). Using the term broadly, he hoped to bring them to ‘salvation’ (Eus., *Vit. Const.* II.28.2; IV.9.). Constantine apparently believed that God confirmed his power and mission through ‘many tokens’ (Eus., *Vit. Const.* II.55.2). Much of this role is confirmed in Constantine’s own letters preserved by Eusebius (Eus., *Vit. Const.* II.55.2).

According to Eusebius, Constantine was, among his other perfect qualities, perfect in justice, piety, and devotion to God (Eus., *De laud.* V). Eusebius wrote of Constantine as being like an interpreter of his God, and accepted direct communication between the two (Eus., *De laud.* X, XVIII). Constantine ‘exercised a bishop’s supervision over all his subjects, and exhorted them all, as far as lay in his power, to lead the godly life’ (Eus., *Vit. Const.* IV.24). Setton notes the numerous imperial epithets attributed to God by Eusebius in conjunction with his praise of the emperor, and concludes ‘Truly God had been cast in the image of the Roman emperor’.

In 351, Cyril of Jerusalem wrote of Constantius II similarly to his father as θεοφιλής ‘beloved of God’ (*Ep. ad Constant. Imp.* 1).

**Charity**

Poverty was a perennial and generally accepted feature of the Roman world, and pagans and Christians both attempted to demonstrate εὐεργεσία or ‘beneficence’. As Parkin reminds us, however, ‘Christian charity did not develop out of pagan munificence. The two were concerned with fundamentally different sectors of ancient society’. The Christian movement had established early on an emphasis

---

680 Setton (1941), 47-8.
681 Parkin (2006), 60.
on philanthropic activities, with giving focused on the lowest social strata.\textsuperscript{682} Downey points out that pagans had long considered their prime virtue to be φιλανθρωπία, the love of humans for one another, but Christians initially focused on ἀγάπη, which exceeded the extent of φιλανθρωπία: ‘The love of man for God was one aspect of agape which philanthropia could not replace’.\textsuperscript{683}

This was inherited from the Old Testament tradition, crystallized in the command to ‘love your neighbor as yourself’ (Lev. 19.18; Deut. 10.19), which was also extended to strangers. Christ pushed that boundary out even further, explaining to his followers that they should love their enemies and pray for their persecutors (Mt. 5.43-4, Lk. 6.27-8). He evidently placed great weight on charity to the poor, as reflected in the apostolic κήρυγµα (Lk. 11.41, 12.33). Paul wrote that at the Jerusalem council, James, Peter, and John asked him to remember the poor among the Gentiles, which he was eager to do (Gal. 2.10; cf. Jas. 2.2-5).\textsuperscript{684} This frequently took the form of hospitality, exemplified by Christ’s dining with the poor, and the reminder to the Christian community to always exhibit love, hospitality, and service (Mk. 2.16, Mt. 9.11, Lk. 5.30. 1 Pet. 4.8-10; cf. Heb. 13.1-2). The first-century church looked to the apostolic foundation of the order of deacons to distribute food among the poor in church (Acts 6.1-6). An early church manual from the first or second century refers to food collections for the poor (Didache 13.4-5). In the second-century Roman churches, collections of money were taken during worship services for the poor and needy (Justin Martyr, 1 Apol. I.67). At the turn of the third century, Tertullian described the uses of the Christian community’s resources in

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Parkin (2006), 60.}
\footnote{Downey (1955), 200. Christians also sometimes used philanthropia theologically, describing God’s work for humanity (e.g., Titus 3.4).}
\footnote{New Testament scholars debate whether this means the poor or Jews of Jerusalem.}
\end{footnotes}
caring for the poor, orphans, and elderly (Tert., *Apol. XXXIX*.5-6). As time went on, certain by the fourth century, and the church began engaging the wider culture more deliberately, Christian writers adopted the traditional term φιλανθρωπία as well. Clement used the term to describe the ideal man’s love for his fellows, while Origen and Athanasius tied the incarnation to God’s φιλανθρωπία for mankind (Clem. Al., *Strom.* VII.3.19.1; Origen, *C. Cels.* IV.17.24; Ath., *De inc.*, I.3; XII.6; cf. Eus., *De eccl. theol.*, II.18). Christian clergy used the pulpit to make the poor visible to social elites.\(^{685}\) As Grig highlights with a study of three parties for the poor, creating social mobility may not have been the agenda of the late antique church, but it was understood to be important to use the resources of the church for the poor. While the poor remained in place, ‘ideas of poverty and the poor were undoubtedly transformed by the church in late antiquity’.\(^{686}\)

Eusebius lauded Constantine for following this charitable tradition, understandably so, as he was mimetic vice-regent on earth of the Christian God.\(^{687}\) Eusebius wrote Constantine’s imitation of God’s φιλανθρωπία was his most noticeable quality (Eus., *Tric. Or.* II.6; *Vit. Const.* IV.54; cf. Ath., *Apol. ad Const.*, 2 and 22).\(^{688}\) Delmaire has tied many specific instances of Constantine’s charitable activities to the food shortages of 328-30.\(^{689}\) Constantine publicly gave clothing, food, and money to beggars (Eus., *Vit. Const.* I.43). Constantine also apparently provided for distribution by the churches estates, clothing, and grain, with the grain allowance to Alexandria being particularly well-known (Eus., *Vit. Const.* IV.28).\(^{690}\)

\(^{685}\) Finn (2006b), 130.
\(^{686}\) Grig (2006), 158.
\(^{690}\) Finn (2006), 56.
Brown points out that as with the 214 tons of grain per year for Antioch, the amount of grain was sometimes negligible, but the public obligation was key.\textsuperscript{691} Constantine’s grants were characterised by Eusebius as the fulfillment of Isaiah’s prophecy that kings would be the foster-fathers of God’s people (Eus., \textit{Comm. Isa.} 316.9-22 Ziegler, citing Isa. 49:23).\textsuperscript{692} In addition, we should recall from chapters seven to ten how Constantine’s construction and use of space supported the religion he endorsed. The donation of lavish basilicas and the restoration of martyr’s burial places spoke clearly to the privileged status of Christianity under Constantine.\textsuperscript{693}

3. PAGANISM UNDER JULIAN

Eusebius’ \textit{Life of Constantine} opened with a declaration that Constantine was the exemplar for the human race and the earthly reflection of his heavenly rule (Eus., \textit{Vit. Const.} I.3.4, 5.1). When Julian could first publicly address the issue without fear, he emphasised that the murderer of his family was Constantine’s son, and launched from there into the divine purpose behind himself being spared (V.271c). This was further expounded in his seventh oration in which he addressed the divine plan to recapitulate Constantine’s rule. Like Constantine, Julian took on the role of (re)founder and defender of the faith of his personal religion, presented his own personal paganism as the state religion, and provided state funding to support it. Despite his hatred of Christianity, the paganism Julian envisioned owed a great deal to Christianity in terms of its practice of piety and ecclesial structure. This

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{691} Brown (2002), 32.
\item \textsuperscript{692} Brown (2002), 32; cf. Hollerich (1999), 21.
\item \textsuperscript{693} Finn (2006), 9.
\end{itemize}
relationship was deliberate, as Julian saw advantages in Christian organization and its engagement of society.

Bowersock identifies the period leading up to Julian’s travel to Antioch as the time he began ‘to formulate his plans for an integrated pagan church, with priests appointed by himself’. In late May or early June of 362, Julian wrote Ep. 84a to Arsacius, the ἀρχιερεύς or high priest of Galatia, which can be dated by its mention of the request of citizens of Pessinus, likely written after stopping there on the journey to Antioch (Amm. XXII.9.5). In it, he discussed his concerns regarding the advance of Christianity or ‘atheism’ over against paganism. He lamented paganism’s failure to thrive and complacency regarding the Christians (Ep. 84a.429d-430a, my translation):

Τί οὖν; ἡμεῖς οἰόμεθα ταῦτα ἀρκεῖν, οὐδὲ ἀποβλέπομεν ὡς μάλιστα τὴν ἀθεότητα συνηύξησεν ἤ περὶ τοὺς ξένους φιλανθρωπία καὶ ἤ περὶ τὰς ταφὰς τῶν νεκρῶν προμήθεια καὶ ἤ πεπλασμένη σειμώντης κατὰ τὸν βίον; Ὡν ἔκαστον οἴομαι χρῆμα παρ’ ἡμῶν ἄληθῶς ἐπιτηδεύεσθαι.

What then? We expect this to suffice, and do not see that it increased atheism so much, their philanthropy to strangers, care for the graves of the dead, and the supposed holiness of their lives? I think that we ought truly to practise each of these.

---

694 Bowersock (1978), 85.
695 Seeck (1919), 210.
Julian continued, prescribing that all priests in Galatia who failed in these virtues or attending worship should be dismissed. This combined praise of Christian strengths and prescription for using them to restore paganism to its rightful supremacy is enlightening. Philanthropy is a particular issue for Julian, who Julian claimed that the Christians devoted themselves to φιλανθρωπία when they realized that pagan priests ignored the poor.

**Hierarchy**

In its long history, Greco-Roman religion had developed a tradition whose practice leaned upon civic organization. The close relationship between the Greco-Roman cult of the gods and Greek and Roman civic organization frequently expressed itself as religion being concerned for the welfare of the state. The provincial assembly or concilium provinciae came into widespread use during the Principate, and was responsible for the cult of Rome and Augustus, as well as electing a provincial high priest or sacerdos provinciae.696 This high priest with the title sacerdotalis was exempt from the duty and expense of serving in his local council or curia.697 These officeholders were drawn from the curiales, and had been chosen for those bodies on the basis of free birth, wealth, and reputation, and were commonly from the metropolis of the province.698 Their uniform consisted of crowns, purple tunics and robes, a contrast to later priestly attire under Maximinus.699 During the Great Persecution, eastern emperor Maximinus Daia

---

697 Jones (1964), 764-5.
698 Jones (1964), 765.
restructured the priesthood, primarily with an eye towards ‘furthering public cult’. He personally appointed high priests for each city from its leading citizens on the basis of distinguished career and anti-Christian zeal (Eus., Hist. eccl. IX.4.2; Lact., De mort. XXXVI.4). They were responsible for daily sacrifice, preventing Christian assembly, and arresting Christians (Lact., De mort. XXXVI.4-5). Maximinus Daia also created a higher order of priests drawn from individuals of greater social rank, and described by Lactantius as being quasi pontifices, ‘like pontiffs’ (Lact., De mort. XXXVI.5). After reviewing the epigraphic evidence Nicholson concludes that heredity and public service were the primary qualifications. Both levels of Maximinus’ priests were uniformed in a white cloak or chlamys, with which the emperor ‘associated them with the imperial service, for which it was the official dress’ (Lact., De mort. XXXVI.5). Some have drawn comparisons to Christianity, as Moreau did, claiming direct relationship between Maximinus Daia, Julian, and Christianity. However, while Maximinus Daia may have added another layer of centralized hierarchy and tasked priests as well as magistrates with persecution, this was not a significant departure from traditional pagan religious structure. Julian’s innovations, on the other hand, owe much to Christianity, and little or nothing to Maximinus Daia.

Pagan religion took on a more structured aspect under Julian, as he borrowed Christianity’s Episcopal structure. Julian was at the top of the hierarchy as μέγιστος ἀρχιερεύς (Ep. 88.451b; 89b.298d). Like Maximinus Daia, Julian instituted provincial high priests with supervisory authority (Ep. 89a.453a). Athanassiadi

700 Mitchell (1988), 118.
703 Moreau (1954), 403: Maximin ‘imite, comme le fera plus tard Julien, l’organisation de l’eglise chrétienne’ (mimics, as will Julian later, the organization of the Christian Church).
catalogues Julian’s high priests and notes their relationship to Neoplatonism. The high priest of Asia was Theodorus (Ep. 30; 89a.452d), who was a fellow pupil of Maximus with Julian (Ep. 89a.452a; 89b.298b). The high priests of Lydia were Chrysanthius and Melite of Sardis, both students of Julian’s mentor Maximus (Eun., Vit. soph. VII.4.9). The high priest of Galatia was Arsaces (Ep. 84). Another high priest, possibly of Cilicia, was Seleucus, who had known Julian since the 350s (Ep. 86; Lib., Ep. 13). The high priest of Greece was the hierophant of Eleusis who initiated Julian (Eun., Vit. soph. VII.3.9). With religious roles matching the political, these provincial pagan high priests were equivalent in rank to Christian metropolitans and secular provincial governors. This ecclesial rank among Christians is first attested at Ancyra in 314, with canons nine, fourteen, sixteen, and twenty of the Synod of Antioch in 328 asserting a metropolitan’s right to ordain and dismiss bishops. The line of organisational development here runs from the Roman state to the Christian religion to Julian’s pagan religion. Browning notes the significance of Julian’s description of ‘his surveillance of subordinate priests by a verb (episkopein) cognate to the word for a Christian bishop (episkopos)’. In addition, Julian’s restructuring involved a unique new role for himself, although Julian’s role was more formalised than Constantine’s. While it is true that both emperors were already titled pontifex maximus, it is also clear that both saw their role involving an unprecedentedly aggressive engagement of their society on behalf

705 Jones, et al. (1971), 897, s.v.: Theodorus 8.
706 Jones, et al. (1971), 110, s.v.: Arsacius 3.
707 Jones, et al. (1971), 818-9, s.v.: Seleucus 1.
710 Browning (1975), 178.
of their personal religion, which I have argued for in chapter one. Julian wrote that he would not only be the high priest (ἀρχιερέα μέγιστον, the usual translation of pontifex maximus), but the architect of the new paganism: ‘not of your own self do you alone devise these precepts and practice them, but you have me also to give you support, who by the grace of the gods am known as sovereign pontiff’ (Ep. 89b.298c; cf. Ep. 18, Ep. 57). In addition to this, Julian seemed to pattern his role as pontifex maximus after Constantine, much as he was mimetically portrayed by Eusebius. Contributing to the uniqueness of his role, Julian wrote that sacrifices on his behalf were efficacious for all Hellenes (Ep. 10). For such reasons, Browning identifies Julian’s hierarchy as ‘clearly an imitation of that of the Christian church’, and Simons recognises the parallels between Constantine as mimetic ruler for God and Julian for Helios.

Priors

Julian not only made changes to the structure of pagan religion in direct imitation of Christianity, but his priesthood emphasized personal holiness, rather than civic stature, as the primary qualification. In a sense, he made a secular office an overtly religious one. It is unsurprising that Julian held that priests should obey the laws (Ep. 89a.453b), but Julian’s moral and social strictures for pagan priests were unprecedented. As Barnes notes, Julian held to ‘a puritanical and ascetic neopaganism that owed a great deal to Christianity and was therefore markedly

---

untraditional’. In May or June 362, Julian wrote of priestly qualifications with three emphases: φιλανθρωπία ‘philanthropy’, προµήθεia ‘care’, and σεµνότης ‘holiness’ (Ep. 84a.429d-430a). For Julian, these practices and moral virtues frequently associated positively with the Christians would help restore vitality to paganism. Previously, paganism had allowed for participation in and leadership of civic worship, regardless of personal characteristics. Christianity’s moral influence became a tendency towards asceticism in the fourth century, which Julian, who lived an ascetically inclined life himself, naturally picked up upon. Julian lived frugally, ate sparingly, and was not interested in sex after the death of his wife, something which was presented as a virtue, although not a typical pagan virtue (Amm. XXV.4.2). This fits with a growing trend towards asceticism in Neoplatonic thought, although Julian and his planned clergy surpassed this. Bidez notes that for his priests, Julian preferred theurgic neoplatonists. Julian instructed that priests should avoid anything base, including offensive humour, disreputable prose and poetry, specifically Archilochus, Hipponax, Epicurus, and Pyrrho, the theatre, the games, and Jewish prophecy appropriated by the Christians (Ep. 89b.300c). Priests were urged towards purity from defilement, and also from poor associations: friends who were chariot-racers, actors, dancers, and mimes were prohibited (Ep. 89b.304c). This rigorist approach to paganism appalled commentators from both pagan and Christian quarters, with both Gregory and Ammianus criticizing Julian’s decision to ban Christians from education posts (Amm. XXII.10.7; Gr. Naz. Or. IV.5). One
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718 Bidez (1930), 267. As Christianity had offered an alternate respectable career, so Julian took the opportunity to offer the same patronage to Neoplatonists.
modern biographer has written that Julian’s ‘belief was permeated by a fanaticism foreign to the Hellenic spirit’.\textsuperscript{719} This rigorist perspective, falling short of the expected gravitas of an emperor, may also have contributed to Ammianus’ religious assessment of Julian as supersticiosus (Amm. XXV.4.17)\textsuperscript{720} Browning writes of Julian’s ideal priest: ‘In other words, he was expected to behave as a Christian priest was expected to. The conclusion is inescapable that Julian models his pagan hiereus on the Christian clergy’.\textsuperscript{721}

Julian described his interpretation of the office of high-priests in a letter to the high priest Theodorus in Spring 362, which is reminiscent of the Pastoral Epistles. Julian wrote (\textit{Ep}. 89a.453a, my translation; cf. 1 Tim. 3):

\begin{quote}
Τί τούτο οὖν ἐστιν ὁ φημὶ σοι νῦν ἐπιτρέπειν; ἃρχειν τῶν περὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἱερὸν ἀπάντων ἐπισκοπουμένῳ τούς καθ’ ἐκάστην πόλιν ἱερέας καὶ ἀπονέμοντι τὸ πρέπον ἐκάστῳ. Πρέπει δὲ ἐπιείκεια μὲν πρῶτον ἄρχοντι, χρηστότητι τε ἐπ’ αὐτὴ καὶ φιλανθρωπία πρὸς τοὺς ἄξιους αὐτῶν τυγχάνειν·
\end{quote}

What then is this which I say I now commit to you? To rule over all the temples in Asia, exercising oversight over the priests in each city and assigning what is fitting to each. Now virtuousness is fitting in the first place, and next, goodness and philanthropy towards those who deserve to obtain them.

\textsuperscript{719} Bidez (1930), 272.
\textsuperscript{720} Hunt (1985), 199.
\textsuperscript{721} Browning (1975), 177.
Alan Cameron has documented the decline of priestly offices in Rome, which had become marks of high birth and influence rather than piety.\(^{722}\) The possibility existed of Christians holding provincial high priestly offices, and Julian ordered that priests who did not piously attend pagan worship with their families should be removed from office (\textit{Ep.} 84a.430ab).\(^{723}\) Priests should think piously about the gods, and venerate their temples and images (\textit{Ep.} 89b.293a, 296b, 300c). Such piety would be demonstrated by zeal, learning hymns by heart, praying three times daily, and philosophical reflection (\textit{Ep.} 89b.293d). The aspect of thrice-daily prayer is an interesting one, which had its roots in Christian practice of daily prayer at the third, sixth, and ninth hours as described in the third century by Tertullian and Hippolytus.\(^{724}\) Tertullian suggested that prayer at these hours commemorated the gift of the Holy Spirit, Peter’s prayer at the sixth hour, and Peter and John going to the Temple at the ninth hour (\textit{De orat.} 25; cf. Acts 2.25, 10.9, 3.1). Hippolytus claimed that these were chosen to honour the Crucifixion, corresponding to the times at which Christ was nailed to the cross, when darkness descended, and when he was pierced with the spear (\textit{Apost. Trad.} XXXVI.2-6; cf. Mk. 15.25, Lk. 23.44; Jn. 19.34). Beyond these practices, Julian’s terminology for characteristics desired of priests parallels that found in the Pastoral Epistles in the New Testament.\(^{725}\)

A brief comparison of the Pastoral Epistles and Julian’s ‘lettres pastorales’ demonstrates the conceptual parallels. As the author of the Pastoral Epistles exhorted Timothy to \(\varepsilon\iota\sigma\sigma\varepsilon\beta\iota\alpha\) or ‘piety’ (1 Tim. 6.11), Julian demanded the same

\(^{722}\) Alan Cameron (2011), 170-1.
\(^{723}\) We do not have examples, and so have no idea if this was consistently enforced.
\(^{724}\) Prayer served to cross class divides in Christianity, as widows and children would participate in regulated daily community prayer. The possibility that Julian may have been aiming at something of the same is interesting, as Julian is frequently depicted as being a removed intellectual.
\(^{725}\) While the Pastoral Epistles’ authorship by Paul is challenged by some modern scholars, the fact remains that they were viewed by the early church as having apostolic authority.
(Ep. 89b.299b, 300c) and warned against exhibiting ἀσέβεια (Ep. 84a). As Christian clergy were to engage in παράκλησις or ‘exhortation’ (1 Tim. 4.13; 2 Tim. 4.2; Tit. 1.9), so Julian’s priests were to παρανικεῖω or ‘exhort’ (Ep. 89b.289a), a kind of religious exhortation clearly imported from Christianity. As Timothy was instructed to select those who were δίκαιος or ‘righteous’ (Tit. 1.8) and practised δικαιοσύνη ‘righteousness’ (1 Tim. 6.11), so Julian warned that his clergy must not ἀδικεῖω ‘act unrighteously’ (Ep. 89a). Both types of clergy were to engage in philanthropy, with Timothy and Titus told to select those who were so to strangers or φιλόξενος (1 Tim. 3.2; Tit. 1.8), while Julian desired φιλανθρωπία (Ep. 22, Ep. 20, Ep. 89b.289b), and specified in another passage that it be applied to strangers (Ep. 84a.430bc; cf. Ep. 89b.289b) as they served Ξένιον Δία, ‘Zeus of strangers’ (Ep. 89b.291bc). It is interesting that as many modern scholars draw attention to Julian’s ‘pagan church’, there are not more verbal parallels, but here as elsewhere Julian was subtle. He did not clumsily copy phrases from the Pastoral Epistles, but did nevertheless parallel the concepts for his own purposes. While this is not a provable proposition, I suggest that this kind of paralleling coupled with studied avoidance of using the same vocabulary is a sort of evidence of its own. As part of his massive four-article survey of Julian as the founder of the ‘pagan church’, Koch wrote that Julian’s program was, ‘une simple imitation de la tradition chrétienne’.\footnotesize{726}

Charity

While hospitality to strangers and protection of asylum-seekers were historically emphasized by pagan religion, it did not emphasize charitable works in the same

fashion as Christianity. Parkin cites examples of pagan authors writing of giving to the ‘needy’, but without meaning the destitute poor (Cicero, *Off*. I.68; II.36–7, 52–5, 61–2, 69; Seneca, *Clem*. II.6.2; *Ben*. IV.10.4–5; *Ep*. 120.2). This does not mandate a lack of sympathy, but as beggars survived, it suggests that elites were not the source of organised charitable giving. As has been noted, ‘very few euergetists would have described what they were doing as poor relief’. By the fourth century, pagans saw a need to compete with Christianity in this area, and promoted pagan φιλανθρωπία as a similar alternative to the Christian version. Φιλανθρωπία is a godly virtue, first known to us from the fifth-century B.C. tragedy *Prometheus Bound* (1128). In the Second Sophistic, we find Plutarch using φιλανθρωπία broadly as a mark of the civilised man, referring to clemency, generosity, liberality, etc., but criticising its use by the low to their enemies (*Precepts of Statecraft* 799c). Affirming this rather elitist understanding, Dio Chrysostom associated this virtue with the ruler in his *First Discourse on Kingship* (Dio Chr., I.20, IV.24). This is matched in the fourth century by Themistius’ repeated insistence that philanthropia is not only a god-like virtue, but the highest virtue for the ruler (*Themistius*, *Or*. XV.188c; *Or*. IV.51d, *Or*. I.5c, *Or*. XIX.226d:). This claim must be considered in light of Themistius’ long-term strategy of smoothing things over by ironically implying that ‘paganism could supply everything that Christianity could offer’. By the time of Themistius, this had become a clearer response to Christianity. Themistius held that φιλανθρωπία was God’s highest attribute (*Them.*, *Or*. XI.147a-
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b). He advised Constantius numerous times in his *Or*. I to emulate this principle and rule accordingly (Them., *Or*. I.5a, 5c, 6b, 8a, 10cd, 12). Specifically, he pushed the emperor to consider that an emperor who ruled with φιλανθρωπία would ‘strive to imitate in part the ruler of the whole’ and ultimately remake his soul in God’s image (Them., *Or*. I.9a-c).\(^733\)

Julian intended to focus great effort and government funding in promoting pagan philanthropy, just as Constantine had used state funds to support Christian charity.\(^734\)

In the previously discussed letter to a priest, Julian provided his own definition of φιλανθρωπία focusing on moral conduct (*Ep*. 89b.289a). Julian reported that Helios promised him the conditional support of the gods, ‘so long as you are pious towards us and loyal to your friends, and humane (φιλάνθρωπος) towards your subjects, ruling them and guiding them as to what is best’ (VII.233d, tr. Wright, mod.). Libanius held that φιλανθρωπία was the pinnacle of traits that emperor and people could share (Lib., *Or*. III.29; *Or*. XI.155, 243). When Julian the Hellene ruled a Hellenic empire, Libanius described him as φιλάνθρωπος (Lib., *Or*. XV.25). However, when Julian touted φιλανθρωπία, he did so in a way that exceeded Themistius and Libanius, and also in a very Christian-focused fashion. Koch holds that pagan φιλανθρωπία was not done for love of god, and that Julian’s insistence on this divine angle was borrowed from Christianity.\(^735\)

As noted by Downey, the classical concept of φιλανθρωπία focused on the love of gods for men or men for one another, but Julian insisted that his priests be φιλόθεον, ‘lovers of God’ (*Ep*. 89b.305b).\(^736\)

Chateaubriand points out four examples of Julian’s personal clemency:

---

\(^733\) Tr. Downey (1955a), 201.

\(^734\) Browning (1975), 178.

\(^735\) Koch (1928), 60, 79; cf. Rothrauff (1964), 69.

\(^736\) Downey (1955a), 271.
not executing a ridiculous aspirant to the imperial purple (Amm. XXII.9.10), forgoing reprisal against a blind Christian priest who verbally attacked him (Soc., *Hist. eccl.* III.12; Soz., *Hist. eccl.* V.4), forestalling the trial of a man who conspired against his half-brother Gallus (Amm. XXII.9.16), and forgiving Theodotus who had conspired against him (Amm. XXII.14.4). While Julian may have exhibited φιλανθρωπία publicly towards some, the extent of such was limited, as demonstrated by his desecration of Christian sites and subtle persecutions detailed in chapter one. In his effort ‘to look for and bring to light the devotion to principle which underlies the actions of all great men’, Rothrauff attempts to make φιλανθρωπία the defining characteristic of Julian’s reign, but the attempt is unsustainable. Although Kabiersch admitted that speculation as to motive is fruitless, he concluded that the primary difference between the concepts of pagan φιλανθρωπία and Christian caritas was that the Christians offered assistance without concern as to the recipient’s worthiness.

Traditionally, cities or civic leaders in the Greek east funded pagan festivals, and indeed as Bradbury highlights, the cost of these elaborate festivals was a contributor to the disappearance of pagan sacrifice during difficult economic times. Julian planned to move beyond beneficence at civic religious events to offer organized, regular philanthropy within his ‘pagan church’. Julian chided paganism for failing to live up to its claims, pointing out that they served Zeus the Ξένιον Δία, ‘Zeus of strangers’, yet remained inhospitable to strangers (*Ep.* 89b.291bc, citing Homer, *Od.* VI.207). Julian insisted that the high-priests establish hostels in order to provide

---
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φιλανθρωπία to strangers (Ep. 84a.430bc; cf. Ep. 89b.289b). When Julian described an ideal polis, he wrote of one in which countless priests had purified the city by purging it of every immoral thing (VI.186d). He also allocated 30,000 modii (slightly over 250 tons) of corn and 60,000 pints of wine to the priests of Galatia, to be distributed to the poor, strangers, and beggars (Ep. 89a.430c), which Brown notes is approximately the same amount as Constantine’s distributions for the same purpose.741 The emperor made clear his displeasure that the world could see that Christians supported not only their own poor, but the pagan poor as well, while ‘we treat our kinsmen as though they were strangers’ (Ep. 89a.430d; cf. 431b; Ep. 89b.291d). He wanted pagans to contribute towards this kind of public service, and ‘to offer their first fruits to the gods’ (ἀπάρχεσθαι τοῖς θεοῖς τῶν καρπῶν), a phrase found in both Christian and pagan sources (Ep. 84a.430d-431a; cf. Lev. 23.10-14; Homer, Iliad IX.529).742 Those who gave generously would recover their gifts from the gods, as Julian did when he recovered his grandmother’s estate (Ep. 89b.290cd).

Julian advocated these virtues, but also set conditions on their boundaries. As noted above, the goodness and benevolence were restricted to those deserving of them. Those deserving excluded the Christians, as demonstrated when Pessinus sought imperial aid and Julian instructed the high priest Arsacius to convey his terms that they all supplicate the Mother of the gods. (Ep. 84a.432a, citing Homer, Od. X.73). Julian extended this thinking regarding Christianity in a letter in early 362 to the priestess Theodora. In it, he explained that a priest should show reverence by demonstrating his or her own household to be free of ‘such grave distempers’ (Ep. 85). Julian had written of his divine mandate to cleanse the

742 Homer uses this to refer to sacrifice of fruit which should have been offered to Artemis.
household of his fathers, and later wrote to the priestess Theodora that one should cleanse one’s household of unbelieving slaves, by re-education if possible, by dismissal if not (VII.234c; Ep. 85). In Julian’s view, showing favour to anyone who rejected the gods, regardless of gender or legal status, was wrong, and those within the household rejecting the gods must be converted or dispensed with (Ep. 85). This perspective takes on especial significance when one recalls that Julian was the dominus, or head of household for the entire empire. Julian did note elsewhere that it was a pious act to share even with the wicked, though he admitted the paradox of such a situation (Ep. 89b.290d), despite his praise of the Christians for doing exactly that (Ep. 84a.430d). Julian’s contemporaries recognized this trend in action. Sozomen identified three key points in Julian’s duplication of the structure of the Christian church: teachers for exhortation, monasteries for philosophical reflection, and hospitals for charitable work (Soz., Hist. eccl. V.16). Browning notes the irony of Julian, who had criticised Christian asceticism in his Or. VII, making provision for parallel places of ascetic study and reflection in his restructured paganism, writing that ‘the model here is purely Christian’. Sozomen wrote that Julian eschewed torture and persecution because he knew these things had led to the growth of the Christian church, and he believed benevolence would be a superior weapon (Soz., Hist. eccl. V.4). This reorganization of a revised and unified Hellenism may have had unintended consequences, as Smith points out that Julian’s replacement of the nebulous paganism he inherited finally gave the Christians a focus for their attack.

---

743 Browning (1975), 180.
744 Smith (1995), 220.
4. CONCLUSION

One scholar has written that ‘Julian was not trying to turn the clock back to the paganism of former times: he was trying to create something altogether new and indeed probably impossible, a pagan church’.\(^{745}\) The establishment of a pagan church overwriting the Christian church was a key component of Julian’s recapitulation of Constantine. Julian inherited a narrative in which Constantine, the ‘friend of Christ’ and first Christian emperor, led his people to salvation like Moses, and inaugurated a new age. Julian responded in kind, crafting a narrative in which he, the special devotee of Helios, would be the first emperor to return to a revived paganism, inaugurating a new age. Both emperors bore the title *pontifex maximus* and viewed themselves in something of an apostolic role. As Eusebius claimed a special relationship for Constantine with his God (Eus., *Vit. Const.* I.3.17), Julian claimed to be the devotee and son of Helios (VII.232c; X.336c). Both emperors received a visionary experience from the divine (Eus., *Vit. Const.* I.12.1; II.12.1; Julian, VII.232c). As Constantine claimed to have been chosen to restore the empire and save his people from pagan tyrants (Eus., *Vit. Const.* II.28.2; 55.1; 64-5; IV.9; *De laud.* VI.21), so Julian claimed to have been chosen to restore the empire and save his people from apostate tyrants (VII.234c, 231d). As Constantine received direct revelation from God (Eus., *Vit. Const.* II.12.1), Julian named himself the prophet of Apollo (*Ep.* 88.451b). Both placed their personal stamp upon the faiths they defended. In Julian’s case, he instituted an ecclesiastical hierarchy similar to that found in Christianity, and his statement that paganism should do as the

\(^{745}\) Bowersock (1990), 12.
Christians have done is an especially powerful piece of evidence for Julian’s *iteratio* (*Ep.* 84a.429d-430a). His clerical instructions bore a remarkable conceptual similarity to those for Christian clergy. Finally, Julian’s philanthropic efforts were focused on the same things which had been successful for Christianity. Had Julian lived to fully implement his ‘pagan church’, his co-option of Christian practise and ecclesiastical structure would have allowed a recapitulation of Constantine’s Christianisation.
CONCLUSION

Julian’s anticipated *restitutio* never came to fruition, as his restoration ended with his death on 26 June 363 in a skirmish during the retreat from Persia. Had he survived to continue his efforts, or at least died gloriously in victory in Persia, it is possible that his pagan recapitulation of the Constantinian revolution might have had a profound impact on Western history. But was this really so unlikely? Following Julian’s death, both pagan and Christian authors hastened to define Julian’s reign and intentions in a way that benefited their constituency. Some modern scholars have claimed that Julian’s revival was markedly *unpopular*, with Bowersock dismissing support for Julian’s revival at even the beginning of his reign, writing that ‘the deadly earnestness of Julian was manifest and unwelcome’.746 Further, that trickle of support had evaporated by the time of Julian’s death when, ‘the fanatic was gone, and there were few to regret him’.747 While this does not mandate popularity for Julian’s revival, it surely mitigates the suggestion that it was thoroughly unpopular.

Thus far this thesis has inevitably focused upon the emperor’s thought, but there is material evidence that indicates that Julian’s call for pagan restoration was not falling on deaf ears. An interpretation of contemporary response during his reign may be drawn from inscriptions displaying support and in some cases mirroring the theme of recapitulation. Indeed, inscriptional evidence, primarily from city councils in the provinces, praised Julian for restoring the Roman world and religion. Provincial governors and councils could have merely offered the emperor standard

746 Bowersock (1978), 80.
praises, but instead chose to praise the most controversial aspect of Julian’s reign, his pagan revival.

I will highlight three inscriptional themes that shed light upon the relationship between Julian’s intentions and methods in his restoration and support from local initiatives. This response is illustrated by inscribed dedications on sacred structures, the numerous inscriptions by councils lauding him as the restorer of the Roman World and Roman religion, and inscriptions replacing Constantinian inscriptions and the Chi-Rho with Julianic inscriptions and the radiate crown of Helios.\(^748\)

On a milestone inscription in Mursa, Pannonia (modern-day Osijek, Croatia), Julian was lauded as being *Bono r(ei) p(ublicae) nato . . . ob deleta vitia temporum preteritorum* ‘born for the good of the republic . . . on account of the blotting out of the corruptions of former times’ (*ILS* 8946; *CIL* III, 10648b). Julian marched through Pannonia, stopping in Sirmium where he wrote letters to major cities decrying the injustice done his family by Constantius (Amm., XXI.10.6; cf. Lib., *Or*. XII.64). Conti suggests that the inscription was placed along Julian’s route to confront Constantius II by Aurelius Victor, as thanks for his promotion to *consularis* or provincial governor.\(^749\) This is quite possible, although no pattern elsewhere exists to support it, as Salway concludes: ‘there is no discernible correlation between Julian’s movements and the distribution of the surviving texts’.\(^750\) Significantly, Julian himself stated in both his public and private letters that he and his troops were making pagan sacrifice on their march, which suggests that the author of the inscription saw the restoration in light of Julian’s paganism (*Ep*. 8 415c; V.286d;

\(^{748}\) The sources are a variety of inscription collections, including three recent efforts to collate Julianic inscriptions by Arce (1986); Conti (2004); Salway (2012), 137-57.

\(^{749}\) Conti (2004), 109, no. 73; cf. *CIL* III, 10648b; *ILS* 8946; *ILCV* 11; Arce (1986), 108, 147-8, no. 96.

\(^{750}\) Salway (2012), 140.
contra Amm. XXII.5.2). This would give us a date in the second half of 361. This inscription demonstrates not only very open support for Julian, but goes further, identifying with his goals of revival and recapitulation. This unique public acknowledgement of the ‘corruptions of the former time’ is rather remarkable, and indicative of not only support for Julian, but some broader resentment against the rule of the Christianizing emperors prior to him. This of course does not have to have done strictly for Julian’s benefit, as the geographic distribution of surviving inscriptions is in line with typical inscriptions in the Roman world.  

Long before Julian’s day, Simonides claimed that only an idiot would think that an inscribed stele would guarantee an inscription’s immortality, and this statement was reinforced under Julian’s reign with actions targeting Constantine’s milestones. Julianic milestones are common, with 127 of 185 surviving inscriptions being miliaria, but these are unusual. In 1923 Eugène Albertini addressed the French Committee on Historical and Scientific Works on the milestone inscriptions in North Africa, and commented that ‘it seems to me there is something exceptional in the Cherchel milestones’. Exceptional indeed, for the milestones between Cherchel and Algiers display evidence of a quasi-abolitio at Julian’s orders or by someone acting in support of him. Albertini’s report on ten milestones with quadrangle bases and single columns showed that all but one side of the double-sided columns had been overwritten. The original Constantinian inscriptions, faintly visible under the Julianic inscriptions, praised Constantine,

---

751 Salway (2012), 140.
753 Salway (2012), 141. Eberhard Sauer (forthcoming) notes that milestones are more common at the beginning of a reign, and were frequently erected in out of the way places.
754 Albertini (1923), 119: ‘Mais il me semble qu’il y a dans les milliaires de Cherchel quelque chose d’exceptionnel’. Not all of these are in the most recent compilation of Julian's inscriptions, Conti (2004).
Constantius II, and Constantine II, and were surmounted by the Chi-rho symbol. This inscription can be dated between 326 and 333 as neither Crispus nor Constans are mentioned. The inscription survived on one column (designated 1A by Albertini), on the side facing away from the public. On the other side (designated as 1B), this was hammered out and replaced by the Julianic inscription as follows, which was generally repeated on the other columns. A focus of Albertini’s interest and the significance of the palimpsest inscription was that it hammered out the Chi-Rho monogram of Constantine.\textsuperscript{755} While Julian may have requested the action himself, in the absence of evidence, a more likely suspect was the governor of Caesarian Mauretania, Athenius, who supported the Donatist faction and was therefore, as the enemy of the emperor’s enemy, a potential political friend (Opt. II.18).\textsuperscript{756} The exceptionality of these milestones was enhanced roughly a decade later when Paul Massiéra published a supplemental inscription on another of the series of milestones.\textsuperscript{757} Despite Julian's rhetoric against Constantine, the re-use of milestones is common. The defacing of names is unusual, but beyond that, there is a symbolic value to these milestones. Half a century later, these same milestones attracted the attention of another scholar, Pierre Salama, who noted that the unusual motif at the top of the inscriptions, placed similarly to the Constantinian Chi-Rho, was in actuality the radiate crown associated with Helios. Rather than a decorative flourish, this symbol should be understood in context as representative of Julian’s devotion to Helios, whom he identified elsewhere as his father. This takes on added

\textsuperscript{755} Albertini (1923), 114: ‘Le monogramme constantinien, qui était en tête de l’inscription primitive, a été martelé’.

\textsuperscript{756} Cf. Jones et al. (1971), 121; Albertini (1923), 119.

\textsuperscript{757} Massiéra (1934), 226 no. 13; cf. AE 1985, 952; Conti (2004), 169, no. 164; Arce (1986), 105 no. 53. The milestone was found on the Bordj-Bou-Arreridj-Medjana road in Algeria, and currently residing in the garden in front of the Bordj-Medjana roadhouse.
significance when we recall that from the perspective of Julian, it was Constantine who was the apostate, and the abandoned god in question was none other than Sol Invictus or Helios.\textsuperscript{758} While a chain of such milestones on a single road suggests local intervention, Salama assessed this as evidence of a ‘massive operation of abolition and reuse of Constantinian inscriptions’.\textsuperscript{759}

Julian was also praised for restoring the Empire’s traditional religion, sacred rites, and temples. The first of these inscriptions, found on a statue base in Casae, Numidia, near modern-day El Mahder, Algeria, praises Julian as \textit{restitutori libe[r]t[at]is et Ro[manae] religion[is]}, ‘restorer of liberty and Roman religion’.\textsuperscript{760} A similar inscription exists praising the emperor Decius, who led an earlier Christian persecution, in the same language (\textit{AE} 1973, 253). In Thibilis, modern-day Announa, Algeria, Julian was praised for being the \textit{restitutor sacrorum}, ‘restorer of the sacred rites’.\textsuperscript{761} It specifies it was \textit{ordo splendissimus Thib(ilitanorum) p(osuit) d(edicavitque)}, ‘placed and dedicated by the most distinguished council of Thibilis’. Strikingly, the other dedicated statues in Thibilis, from the emperors Constantius I, Galerius and Constantine, all come from the governor, while this appears to originate from the \textit{ordo} itself, which suggests ‘spontaneous local recognition’.\textsuperscript{762}

This support for Julian’s religious program extended to Palestine as well, where on the Gaza-Berytus coastal road we find the inscription: Ε\underline{ι}ς [ος] νικ\[
\underline{ουλι}\] [ανέ\underline{υ}], ‘One God conquers, Julian, year 465’ [A.D. 361/2] (\textit{AE} 1948, 758). This same motif regarding one in the same series of milestones is described by Conti (2004), 169, who agrees that the unusual decoration of the milestone should be viewed in relation to the similar cult of the emperor and Helios - Sol Invictus.


\textsuperscript{759} Conti, 170, no. 167.

\textsuperscript{760} Conti (2004), 177, no. 176. The inscription’s current housing is unknown.

\textsuperscript{761} As noted by Conti (2004), 177, no. 176.
The author was likely the *rector provinciae* who with Alypius was part of Julian’s effort to restore the Jerusalem Temple (Amm., XXIII.1.3). Other milestones tie support for Julian to monotheism, including four on the Gerasa-Philadelphia road, all with inscriptions similar to: εἷς ὁ θεός Ἰούλιανός βασιλεύει, ‘one god, Julian, rules’ (*AE* 1998, 1445b). Finally, Julian was praised as the *templorum [re]staurator*, ‘restorer of the temples’ in an inscription is a half-pedestal made of soft local limestone found in the Jordan valley in the area of Panaeas, Caesarea Philippi. It can probably be dated to early 363, which, if correct, speaks to the staying power of his revival.

These inscriptions suggest several important things about Julian’s religious revival. First, the geographical distribution of inscriptions implies wider geographic support than has sometimes been acknowledged. Second, the inscriptions sometimes reflect local initiative. Third, the way in which people responded may suggest awareness of an official line regarding the recapitulatory overwriting of the past. In all, it appears that Julian cast the seeds of revival on more fertile ground than has sometimes been supposed.

---

763 Conti (2004), 68-9. The inscription was originally read as ἕτος ζξ [ὑ] the year 467 on the Ashkelon calendar, which erroneously placed it in Jovian’s reign. However, after cleaning of the stone in the museum, the reading was corrected to ἕτος [ὑ], i.e. the year 465, corresponding to October-November A.D. 361 to October-November A.D. 362. It is now housed in the ‘Corrine Maman’ Museum in Ashdod.


765 Conti (2004), 71-2, no. 18; cf. Negev (1969), 170. The inscription, 105 cm long, 50 cm high, with letters ranging between 5 and 9 cm in height, is now in the Beit Ussishkin Museum.

766 Negev (1969), 170-3, initially dated the inscription to summer 362, but Bowersock (1978), 123-4, holds that the *barbarorum extintori* suggests the conflict with the Persians, described as *barbaroi* by Libanius, and therefore a *terminus post quem* of early 363 (Lib., *Or*. XV.3, 17; *Or*. XVI.9). As Greeks called Persians barbarians but Latins did not, it could also be referring to victories over Germans in the West, looking forward to the Persian campaign.
That Julian responded to Constantine’s Christianisation in some sense is hardly surprising, but the way in which he did it was remarkable. Constantine had exhibited a pattern of overwriting the narratives of his opponents and of the pagan past. Julian adopted this and became a greater and more deliberate overwriter, setting this out in a public oration in 362. In his Or. VII, Julian borrowed the concept of recapitulation from Christian theology, encompassing the steps of *similitudo*, *iteratio*, and *restitutio*. In this scheme, Christ, the divinely chosen representative and son of God and the virgin mother, overwrote the sins of Adam, the representative who had defied God.

In establishing *similitudo*, Julian cast Constantine as the failed apostate representative, himself as the divinely chosen representative and son of Helios and the virgin goddess Athena, and specifically recapitulated Christ’s temptation in the role of a pagan son of god (chapters one and two). Julian portrayed Heracles and Asclepius as pagan reflections of Christ, pre-existent, salvific, and miracle-working sons of god (VII.219d-220a; Or. XI.144b, 153b; C.Gal. 200ab), then cast himself as the son of Helios (Or. VII.229c-230a) and mimetic Heracles (Or. VII.230cd), much as Eusebius had portrayed Constantine as the mimetic Christ (chapters three, four, and five). This line was reflected back in the writings of Julian’s contemporaries, who cast the emperor in Herculian terms (Lib., Or. XII.28, 44; Or. XV.36), Asclepian terms (Lib., Or. XIII.42; Or. XV.69; Or. XVII.36; Or. XVIII. 124-5, 281; Him., Or. XLI.8), and as the son of the god Helios (Him. Or. XLI.8; Lib., Or. XIII.47; Eun., frags. 27-29). While some modern scholars have seen a ‘pagan Trinity’ in Julian’s works, Julian’s portrayals of Divine Father and Son were ‘binitarian’, paralleling the mimetic portrayals of Constantine he was reacting
against (chapter six). In addition to establishing himself as a parallel divine representative, Julian followed the theme of *iteratio* to overwrite the sinful actions of the failed representative who had defied God. Julian criticised Constantine’s desecration and closure of pagan temples, (*Or*. VII.228b-d), and responded with a systematic programme of reversal and restoration (chapter seven). At Constantinople, Constantine had emphasised the Christian nature of his city by halting pagan sacrifice and building a cross at the seat of his power in the palace, and Julian responded by restoring pagan sacrifice and constructing a pagan chapel in the palace (chapter eight). At Jerusalem, Constantine constructed the Church of the Holy Sepulchre facing the remains of the Temple, which Eusebius characterised as the eschatological New Jerusalem. Julian attempted to recapitulate Constantine and deny the Christian claim to the city by rebuilding the Temple and restoring Jewish sacrifice (chapter nine). At Antioch, Constantine or his sons had built churches and Constantius II had transported St. Babylas to the site of the Temple of Apollo and reportedly shutting it down. Julian removed Babylas’ body alone of the bodies buried there, and closed the Constantinian church (chapter ten). Julian’s *iteratio* also found expression in his attempt at Antioch to co-opt the Christian church (chapter eleven). As Constantine had provided support to Christianity’s episcopally-structured organisation, allowing churches to spread the faith through charitable activities, so Julian re-organised paganism along the same lines, instructing his provincial high priests to follow the successful Christian example.

All of the above is consistent with Julian’s statement of purpose in *Or*. VII, in which he substituted Constantine for Adam and outlined his programme of recapitulation. What I believe I have demonstrated is a perhaps clearer explanation
for Julian’s decisions in his campaign to restore paganism and overwrite the narrative of Christianisation. I believe there has been a gap in the literature on this topic which modern scholarship has been satisfied with. Unfortunately, this has left some events unexplained, and Julian’s consistency questioned. I believe that my thesis also expands upon and unifies disparate elements which have been noted by previous scholars. I suggest that whatever mistakes Julian made along the way, any appraisal of his strategy that takes this into account must admit the subtlety and skill of his approach.

Scholarship on Julian has too often suffered from an excess of either adulation or vitriol, which I have done my utmost to avoid. This thesis both highlighted the need for research into Julian’s interaction with Christian theology, and also confirmed certain themes in previous research. My approach has built upon and developed from disparate elements from previous scholarship. I am indebted to a number of historians who have provided a framework of dates and movements, chief among these being Barnes,\footnote{Barnes (1993), (1998); cf. Seeck (1919), Drijvers (2004).} from whom I have also drawn heavily regarding the view of Constantine that Julian reacted against.\footnote{Barnes (1981), (2011).} I have adopted Bowersock’s interpretation of Julian’s duplicity in his rise to power, from the Gallic campaign to the acclamation at Paris, though I disagree with his scathing estimate of Julian’s character.\footnote{Bowersock (1978); cf. Barnes (1998).} From Athanassiadi, I have maintained the idea that Julian was \textit{sui generis}, synthesising existing elements to attempt something radically new, though I do not agree with her thesis that the something in question was Mithraism.\footnote{Athanassiadi (1981).} From a long line of scholars beginning with Koch, I have made use of Julian’s co-opting...
Christian ecclesiastical structure and function. Despite these debts which I am happy to acknowledge, I have not agreed with every aspect of Julian’s portrayal from any particular school or scholar. Indeed, I challenge the idea implied by much of recent scholarship, namely that Julian proactively engaged Christianity due to his commitment to paganism.

Responding to Julian’s statements in Or. VII about recapitulating Constantine’s apostasy and revolution, I have introduced a theological concept into what is usually treated as a classical area of study. Using the heuristic tool Julian himself provided, has yielded, I hope, an interesting new perspective highlighting his use and alteration of opposing ideas. I have drawn attention to the unappreciated extent of his use of Christian material, but I trust without reducing him to the status of a slavish imitator. Julian exhibited a genuine flair for creative synthesis which made him a truly capable opponent. As the emperor, he possessed enormous resources, and as a convert to paganism, he had a powerful testimony. Yet these alone would not have had the same impact without his creative approach, blending overt ridicule and covert undermining in his writings, and visual and material challenges in his construction programs. Had Julian lived longer, these methods might have proven very successful indeed. This approach brings us to a better understanding of Julian. While his stated ideal was Marcus Aurelius, in practise he operated much more like his uncle Constantine. Although the two engaged in a bitter war of consecration and

---

772 Koch (1927), (1927b), (1928).
773 The implications of this are broader than I realised in setting out. Much as Alexandrian theologians have been seen as presenting a ‘Hellenised Christianity’ to an audience familiar with certain philosophical language but not the core of the Christian faith, it could be argued that Julian promulgated something of a ‘Christianised Hellenism’, with Christian dressing but an unyielding core of pagan thought.
desecration across a half-century front, there were many more brutal figures among
their contemporaries.

Taking a holistic approach to Julian, I have closely examined the history of his
actions, as well as his writings. Specifically, I have examined Julian’s relevant texts
with an eye to his use of themes from classical literature as well as the Christian
Scriptures and early patristic theologians. While no attempt can produce a final
definitive history of Julian’s thought and action, this approach taking into account
several modern disciplines has been profitable, highlighting the extent of Julian’s
use of the Christian Scriptures, emphasising the deliberate logic in his campaign,
and offering a way of looking at Julian which ties together several themes in one
clear narrative. I believe that bringing this theological concept to bear on Julian’s
writings offers a fuller understanding of his unique response to Constantine and
Christianisation. Hopefully, this approach can contribute to a new perspective on
Julian, and offer a foundation for future analysis of his writings in light of his
response to Christianisation.
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APPENDIX A

Table 5. Key dates in the life of Julian\(^ {774} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Julian born in Constantinople (poss. 331).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Father and half-brothers murdered in Constantinople.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337-42</td>
<td>Nicomedia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342-48</td>
<td>Macellum, reunited with half-brother Gallus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348-51</td>
<td>Studying in Constantinople, Nicomedia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351-54</td>
<td>Studying in Pergamum and Ephesus. Apparent conversion to paganism (\textit{Ep. 111.434cd, Lib., Or. XVIII.18}).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Imprisoned at Comum following Gallus’ execution, released after Eusebia’s intervention to study in Athens for 2 months (II.118abc; Amm. XIV.11.21-23; XV.2.7-8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Nov. 355</td>
<td>Elevated to Caesar in West and married to Constantius’ sister Helena (II.123d; Amm. XV.8.18).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dec. 355</td>
<td>Sent to lead armies in Gaul as a figurehead (V.273c, 277d).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355/6</td>
<td>Campaigning, winters at Vienne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 356</td>
<td>Major victory at Cologne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356/7</td>
<td>Campaigning, winters at Sens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 357</td>
<td>Major victory at Strasbourg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358-early 360</td>
<td>Campaigning, winters at Paris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 359/60</td>
<td>Preparing for eastern campaign, Constantius requisitions 23k troops from Julian (V.282d).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 360</td>
<td>Acclaimed as Augustus by troops at Paris (V.284bc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 360</td>
<td>Supports Council of Paris under Nicene bishop Hilary of Poitiers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Nov. 360</td>
<td>Celebrates \textit{quinquennalia}, which functions as formal inauguration as Augustus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Nov. 360 – Mar.? 361</td>
<td>Julian winters at Vienne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 361</td>
<td>Participated in Epiphany services at Vienne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nov. 361</td>
<td>Constantius II dies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Dec. 361</td>
<td>Julian enters Constantinople.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 361</td>
<td>Julian authors \textit{Caesars (Or. X)} for the week-long feast of Saturnalia beginning 17 Dec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Feb. 362</td>
<td>Proclaims amnesty for exiled Nicenes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 362</td>
<td>Invites controversial non-Nicene Aetius to return and visit him personally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 362</td>
<td>Gives his \textit{Or. VII}, laying out his religious plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 12 May 362</td>
<td>Leaves Constantinople.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Jul. 362</td>
<td>Enters city during festival of Adonis (Amm., XXII.9.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summer / autumn 362</td>
<td>Writes ‘pagan pastoral letters’ to his reorganised priests. Likely beginning of the effort to restore the Jerusalem Temple (poss. early 363).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 362</td>
<td>Composes \textit{Or. XI, Hymn to King Helios}.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 362/3</td>
<td>Composes \textit{Against the Galileans}.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Mar. 363</td>
<td>Julian departs Antioch for Persia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/19 May 363</td>
<td>Earthquake ends effort to restore Jerusalem Temple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Jun. 363</td>
<td>Dies in Persia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^ {774} \) Incorporating the research of Seeck (1919); Barnes (1993), (1998).
APPENDIX B:
JULIAN’S AD PHOTINUM

1. INTRODUCTION

It has been noted that the corpus of Julian’s letters is unusual for a Roman Emperor, both in terms of quantity and variety.\(^775\) Within this body of writings, Julian’s letter to Photinus is also unique. The letter exists only in a translation into what has been intriguingly described as ‘curious and sometimes untranslatable Latin’.\(^776\) For all its lack of status as a letter existing only in translation, it offers undeniably interesting content, shedding light on the conflict between the last pagan emperor and the legacy of Christianisation from his uncle Constantine. Yet this important letter has received disproportionately little attention, and deserves a more careful English translation with adequate explanatory notes, both of which I hope to remedy.\(^777\)

Sometime after 12 May A.D. 362, the Emperor Julian moved from Constantinople to Antioch.\(^778\) His purpose in so doing was twofold: to prepare for his future invasion of Persia, and to further his campaign for Hellenic religious revival. That revival depended not only upon the articulation and promulgation of a robust contemporary Hellenism, but also the denigration and subversion of Christianity. A prolific writer as well a successful man of action, Julian intended to make the most of his visit to Antioch, a city with a past steeped in Hellenism, but a

\(^775\) Trapp (2012), 105-6.
\(^776\) Wright (1923), 187.
\(^777\) By comparison, the commentary of Bidez (1924) has only four brief notes.
\(^778\) Matthews (1989), 108, who also describes Julian’s acclamation on entry as ‘almost Messianic terms’, points out contra Seeck (1919), 210, that Julian’s arrival coincided with the festival of Adonis, 18 July 362 (Amm. XXII.9.15).
contemporary population largely influenced by Christianity. This is not to suggest that his revival could not have been managed from another location than Antioch, but that this was a far more potent context for the revelation of his so-called ‘pagan church’. In studying these themes, Julian’s letter to his contemporary Photinus is of great value, bearing as it does upon the writing of Julian’s Contra Galilaeos, which although much longer exists in an even more fragmentary state.

2. TEXT

Bidez and Cumont suggested that it was Libanius who initially collected Julian’s letters, but if true, the Ad Photinum evidently passed through that net. The three extant excerpts of the letter were preserved c. A.D. 546 by the Constantinopolitan Facundus Hermianensis, who provided an introduction for each of the three sections. The editio princeps found in Migne’s Patrologia Latina LXVII.621 was produced from the eighth-century Verona manuscript, and subsequently there have been a number of modern critical editions of this letter. It is Ep. 79 in Hertlein (1876), Ep. 90 in Bidez and Cumont (1922), and Ep. 55 in Wright (1923). Also, in 1880, Neumann attempted to reconstruct the original Greek of the first two of three fragments. In my translation, I have made use of Bidez and Cumont’s edition (Oxford and Paris, 1922) and have noted textual differences, barring minor issues of

781 Wright (1923), 186.
782 Bidez (1924), 105-6.
783 Bidez re-used this text without alteration in his own 1924 edition and translation.
punctuation.\textsuperscript{784} There are only two English translations of \textit{Ad Photinum}. The first was that of Wilmer C. Wright. This work, now ninety years old, was one of the earlier volumes in the Loeb Classical Library, and lacks much in the way of explanatory notes to clarify the occasionally awkward translation.\textsuperscript{785} As Bidez and Cumont (1922) was not yet available, Wright worked from Hertlein’s 1876 edition, with her own minor alterations.\textsuperscript{786} The more recent translation is that of R. Joseph Hoffmann, whose translations have been heavily criticised for, among other things, improving the argument of ancient polemicists.\textsuperscript{787} Although Hoffmann worked from Bidez and Cumont’s 1922 edition, his translation appears without the corresponding Latin text in his \textit{Julian’s Against the Galileans}.\textsuperscript{788} All editors of the text agree to its authenticity. On historical grounds, it is consistent with Julian’s methodology elsewhere (more on this shortly), and its mentions of historical persons are not anachronistic.

\textsuperscript{784} My references are to the Budé edition of Julian’s works, barring \textit{C. Gal.}, for which I use Wright’s modification of Hertlein.
\textsuperscript{785} As with a number of the early Loeb’s, the demands of urgency are apparent, and the indices and charts suffer particularly.
\textsuperscript{786} Wright (1923), lxvi.
\textsuperscript{787} E.g., Trigg (1988), 354: ‘This is not a \textit{bona fide} translation’; Green (1998), 187: ‘What H. has done is in fact to take the \textit{disiecta membra} from Origen and link them together with transitions and other rhetorical devices of his own, without telling the reader’.
\textsuperscript{788} Hoffmann (2004), 89.
For reasons that will become clear shortly, the dating of *Ad Photinum* carries historical significance. Julian came to Antioch in July 362, arriving at the time of the festival of Adonis (Amm., XXII.9.14-15). The transfer to the city of the imperial court, as well as the troop build-up for the impending Persian campaign, created a food shortage, a not uncommon problem. Julian attempted to control this by provision of supplies, which led to rampant market manipulation by wealthy speculators and unrest in the metropolis. That autumn, he ordered the remains of Babylas removed from their location at the temple at Daphne built by his cousin Constantius II, at which his half-brother Gallus had transported and reinterred them (Amm. XXII.12.8). Following this, on 22 October 362, the Temple at Daphne was destroyed by fire, prompting Julian’s response of torture and church closure (Amm. XXII.13.1; Rufinus, *Hist. eccl.* X.37; Soz., *Hist. eccl.* V.8; Theod., *Hist. eccl.* III.12.1). He departed for the fatal Persian campaign on 5 March 363 (Amm. XXIII.2.6; Zos. III.12.1). Scholars have recognised that *Ad Photinum* forecasts the writing of *Contra Galilaeos*, which Libanius tells us was written during the winter of 362-3 (Lib., *Or.* XVIII.178). This has led to dating *Ad Photinum* within the very broad range July 362 to March 363 as does Wright, or arbitrarily selecting a
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789 Seeck (1919), 210.
790 The impetus behind the construction of Babylas’ martyrrium and the transportation was likely that of Constantius II. Woods (2005), 60-1; Mayer and Allen (2012), 96.
791 Seeck (1919), 211; Athanassiadi (1981), 206.
792 Seeck (1919), 212.
793 E.g., Wright (1923), 314; Bidez (1924), 105; Hoffmann (2004), 75.
specific date within that range, as does Elm for February 363 with no explanation.\textsuperscript{794}

For reasons which I will discuss in more detail shortly, I believe it should be dated to the earlier half of that range, and not later than early December 362.

4. FIRST FRAGMENT: INCARNATION

Julian’s opening of the letter is not preserved. Facundus introduced the first fragment with the sentence: \textit{Julianus enim}\textsuperscript{795} \textit{Christo perfidus imperator sic Photino haeresiarchae adversus Diodorum scribit}, ‘For instance, Julian the perfidious emperor wrote to the heresiarch Photinus against Diodorus’.

\textit{Tu quidem, o Photine, verisimilis videris et proximus salvari} \textsuperscript{796} bene faciens nequaquam in utero inducere quem credidisti deum. \textit{Diodorus autem, Nazaraei magus, eius pigmentalibus manganes} \textsuperscript{797} acuens irrationabilitatem, acutus apparuit sophista religionis agrestis.

Now you, Photinus, seem near the truth, and close to being saved, doing well by absolutely not putting in the womb the one you believed to be god. Diodorus on the other hand, a magician of the Galilean, by enhancing his irrationality with scintillations and trickery, was evidently a clever sophist of the rustic religion.

\textsuperscript{794} Wright (1923), 186; Elm (2012), 233, amended to January-February 363 at (2012), 305; Caltabiano (1991), 267-8.

\textsuperscript{795} Wright: \textit{et enim}.

\textsuperscript{796} Facundus, Hertlein: \textit{salvare}.

\textsuperscript{797} Facundus, Hertlein: \textit{manganes}.
Julian’s correspondent *Photinus* is surely the same Photinus that Julian referenced later in his major anti-Christian polemic (C. Gal. 262c). Photinus had been deacon of the church at Ancyra under bishop Marcellus. The ecclesiastical historian Sozomen recorded that Photinus, who became bishop of Sirmium, had struck out a middle path between Nicene and non-Nicene Christianity, and alienated both parties (Soz., *Hist. Eccl.* IV.6). For his heretical Christological views, Photinus was condemned by synods in Milan (345), Rome, and Sirmium (356). The emperor Constantius II resolutely opposed the Nicene definition, and was instrumental in convening the synod in Photinus’ bishopric of Sirmium to finally depose him. This evidently contributed to the use that Julian, who despised Nicene and non-Nicene Christianity alike, thought he could make of Photinus, who wrote works opposing both. Julian’s tone to Photinus is not one of warm camaraderie, but the aggressive friendliness seems designed to possibly offend or at least to goad the recipient to action. From Julian’s statements above, Photinus’ views regarding Christ, while not identical with the Emperor’s, were evidently close enough to Julian’s for practical matters, contradicting Hoffmann’s translation of ‘you alone hold’. Sara Parvis suggests that Photinus was accused of teaching that Jesus was merely a man, but more likely taught that there were two separate hypostases, one of God, and one of Jesus. This fits Julian’s statement above, in that teaching that

---

800 Parvis (2006), 228.
802 Parvis (2006), 248.
Christ was a mere man would not have been close to Julian’s position, but identical to it.

In 360-61, between his acclamation and Constantius II’s death, Julian had supported the Nicene Christians in the West. He supported the Council of Paris in 361, led by the firmly Nicene Hilary of Poitiers, and participated (an an ordained reader) in Epiphany services at Vienne in January 361. Following his return to Constantinople as sole ruler, on 4 February 362 Julian issued an amnesty for Nicene Christians exiled by Constantius II to return to their sees. As Ammianus pointed out, this was a shrewd political move designed to set Christian factions against one another (Amm. XXII.5.4). Julian further stirred things up by inviting the non-Nicene bishop Aetius not only to take up his bishopric, but to visit the emperor personally (Ep. 15). I suggest that Julian’s letter to the excommunicated non-Nicene Photinus be seen in the same light, not necessarily an expression of solidarity as it might appear on the surface, but another example of his attempts to destabilise Christianity.

The ‘truth’ which Julian refers to regarding the incarnation is that Christ was not God incarnate, as he later confirmed at length (C. Gal. 262cde, 276e, 333d). The incarnation, represented here by in utero inducere . . . deum was a major issue for Hellenes following the Platonic tradition. Hoffmann here rather inexplicably derives ‘brought forth from’ from in utero inducere. Photinus, like Julian, rejected the idea of the incarnation as it was understood by most Christians. This was a common theme among the Platonist anti-Christian polemicists, and can be found in

---

803 Julian wintered at Vienne from 6 November to approximately March 361 (Amm. XX.10.3; XXI.1, 2.5, 3.1); Barnes (1993), 228.
804 Wallis (1972), 104.
Celsus (C. Cels. VI.73.20-1), Porphyry (Aug., De Civ. X.28), Macarius’ Anonymous philosopher (Apocriticus IV.22), and Julian (C. Gal. 262d). The Anonymous’ mocking of the idea of divine incarnation in a womb μεστὸν αἵματος χορίου καὶ χολῆς καὶ τῶν ἐτὶ πολλῶν ἀποπωτέρων, ‘full of blood, afterbirth, bile, and yet more disgusting things’ (Apocriticus IV.22), demonstrates how repugnant the idea of the ideal divine entering into a material womb was to Platonists, and sheds light on Julian’s indignant tone here.  

Julian’s target Diodorus had been a presbyter in the church at Antioch, where he led a group of ascetics. Diodorus’ influence was magnified by those he mentored at the school he founded, including Theodore of Mopsuestia and John Chrysostom. He advocated a Christology that emphasised the distinction between the divine Logos and the human Jesus. Well after Julian’s death, Diodorus was in A.D. 378 ordained bishop of Tarsus. Diodorus’ description as Magus can be translated as ‘Magi’, or, given the nature of the historical Magi’s role in Persia, ‘priest’, as does Wright, followed by Hoffmann. I agree with Neumann’s suggestion that the underlying Greek word is μάγος, although I find the likelihood that Julian intended to refer to Diodorus as a Magi rather unlikely. If indeed he had written of him as a πρεσβύτερος, ‘priest or presbyter’, Facundus would surely not have chosen magus over the equivalents common in Christian usage of clericus or sacerdos. I have translated magus as ‘magician’, given the common polemical trope of ascribing
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806 The text of Macarius’ Apocriticus is that of Goulet (2003), and the translation is my own.  
807 Chadwick (2001), 520.  
808 Chadwick (2001), 518. Elm (2012), 401-3 discusses a reconstruction of Diodorus’ teaching in more detail.  
810 Neumann (1880), 6.
Christ’s miracles to magical tricks (e.g. *C. Cels.* I.68.3-9), which also fits Julian’s sarcasm regarding Diodorus’ rhetorical tricks on his listeners. I have also translated *Nazaraei* as ‘Galilean’, in line with Julian’s preference for that Greek term which surely underlies *Nazaraei* here.

Julian evidently created a play on words in his original, represented by Facundus with *acuens . . . acutus*, which unfortunately, cannot be emphasised by using the same word in translation without producing rather awkward English. Julian’s simple *irrationabilitatem* here is expanded by Wright as ‘that nonsensical theory about the womb’, followed closely by Hoffmann as ‘this ridiculous theory about the womb’.  

811 The Latin *manganis*, which can mean ‘machinations’, is very likely Facundus’ translation of the underlying Greek *μάγγανον*, yielding the meaning ‘trickery’, in line with *magus* above. Referring to Christianity as a *religionis agrestis* is ironic given Christianity’s later reference to non-believers as pagans, which originally referred to ‘rustic’, although in Christian use it had the sense of ‘civilian’.  

812 Wright translates *religionis agrestis* as ‘that creed of the country-folk’, which has the advantage of alliteration, but ‘creed’ would correspond to *fides* or *doctrina* rather to *religionis* and suggests a concrete confession.  

813 Julian’s contempt reflected in ‘irrationality’ and ‘rustic religion’ is found throughout his works, in which he routinely rubbished Christianity as *πλάσµα*, ‘fiction’ (*C. Gal.* 39a), and *νόσος*, ‘disease’ (*Or.* VII.229d; *Ep.* 41.438c; *Ep.* 58.401c).

---

812 Cameron (2011), 14-17.
813 Wright (1923), 189.
In the second section, Julian identifies a theme that became very important with his future writing projects. Facundus introduces it briefly: *Et post paululum*, ‘And a little further on’:

> Quem,

si nobis opitulati fuerint dii et deae et Musae omnes et Fortuna,
ostendemus infirmum et corruptorem legum et rationum et mysteriorum
paganorum et deorum infernorum et illum novum eius deum Galilaeum,
quem aeternum fabulose praedicat, indigna morte et sepultura denudatum
confictae a Diodoro deitatis.

If the gods and goddesses, and all the Muses and Fortune will aid us, I will expose him as powerless and a corruptor of the laws and of reason and of the mysteries of Hellenism and of the gods of the underworld, and that that new Galilean god of his, which he in fable preaches eternal, was stripped by shameful death and burial of the deity pretended by Diodorus.

Julian had in fact, claimed that the gods and goddesses had promised aid in his *Oration to the Cynic Heraclius*, where he received tokens including the torch of Helios, the *gorgoneion* of Athena, and the *caduceus* of Hermes (VII.233cd). Their divine assistance was to enable him to complete the divine mission of reversing Constantine’s apostasy, cleansing the empire, and restoring their worship. In this
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814 Wright: Quod.
815 Asmus: et indigna.
work, written prior to March 362 in Constantinople, Julian initiated a subtle attack against Christianity, recrafting Heracles into a water-walking son of Zeus and the virgin goddess Athena, whom Zeus τὸ κόσμῳ σωτὴρα ἐφύτευσεν, ‘begat to be the saviour of the world’ (VII.219d-220a).

In that work, he also outlined his framework for responding to the Christianisation of the empire, claiming a role for himself as the divinely chosen restorer and steward (VII.227c-234c). With Julian’s resolute statement ostendemus, ‘I will expose’, he revealed his intentions for future works. He would expand on what had already been done with his anti-Christian statements in earlier works.

Commentators have noted that in Ad Photinum Julian offered a prelude to his future work Contra Galilaeos which directly refuted Christian theology. What remains of that work corresponds to this early sampling. Julian attempted to strip Christ, Diodorus’ ‘new Galilean god’ of his status as the son of God and as divine himself. His categorisation of the Christian κήρυγµα as fabulosus or ‘fable’ corresponds to the opening of the Contra Galilaeos, in which he refers to Christianity as a πλάσµα or ‘fiction’ which appealed to that part of the soul which was φιλόµυθος or ‘loved legends’ (C. Gal. 39ab).

Julian’s Ad Photinum also forecasts a work that targeted Christianity less overtly, his Hymn to King Helios (Or. XI), which I suggest should be considered in a broader application of Julian’s statement above. Following the Oration to the Cynic Heraclius, Julian had in summer 362 travelled from Constantinople to Antioch and renewed his acquaintance with Libanius, who soon became an intimate of the
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816 This Heracles - Christ parallel is noted to varying degrees by Wright (1913), 111; Lacombrade (1964), 131; Barnes (1998), 147-8; and Nesselrath (2008), 213-4.
817 Wright (1923), 189; Bidez and Cumont (1922), 156.
emperor. In the *Hymn to King Helios*, written in December 362 at Antioch, Julian portrayed Asclepius much as he had Heracles earlier that year. In it, Asclepius became the pre-existent son of Zeus-Helios (XI.144b), begotten to be the saviour of the world (XI.153b). As noted by Polymnia Athanassiadi, Libanius promptly began writing of the young emperor in noticeably Asclepian terms, a trend which continued even after Julian’s death (Lib., *Or.* XIII.42; XV.69; XVII.36; XVIII.281). Julian reinforced this theme in his more overt polemic *Contra Galilaeos*, in which Asclepius was presented as the begotten son of Zeus-Helios, who incarnated as a man in order to restore sinful souls (*C. Gal.* 200ab). While the timing of Julian’s letter, his oration, and Libanius’ response may be coincidental, recall that Julian preferred to work subtly with a small group of close associates. His circle’s manipulation of his soldiers’ ‘spontaneous’ acclamation of him as emperor is a perfect example of this. If I am correct to include both the direct *C. Gal.* and the indirect *Or.* XI as contributing to the exposure of Diodorus’ false new Galilean god, this narrows the date of composition of *Ad Photinum* to between July and December 362.

The key question of why Julian wrote such a letter can be answered, I believe, by recalling the words of the historian Ammianus Marcellinus, who wrote that Julian allowed the Nicene Christians who had been exiled by his predecessor Constantius II to return, with the cynical intent of setting rival factions of Christians at one another (Amm. XXII.5.4). In 360-1, prior to the death of Constantius II, Julian had supported the Nicene Christians in the West for just such reasons, abandoning that
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818 These Asclepius - Christ parallels are noted to varying degrees by Wright (1913), 419 n.1, (1923), 315; Lacombrade (1964), 131; and Athanassiadi (1981), 167.
gambit on the death of Constantius. Diodorus was a key figure in the opposition to both Apollinaris and Meletius, as well as the head of a prominent school in Antioch which taught the Nicene Christian version of the incarnation that was anathema to Julian. By goading Photinus into going on the offensive regarding the incarnation, revealing his intentions to do the same, and providing material with which to rubbish the ailing Diodorus, Julian could do significant damage. Julian had arrived at Antioch with high hopes of bringing the population around to his pagan revival, and while there, he wrote his letters regarding the restructure of paganism into what some have termed a ‘pagan church’. Yet, the situation was starting to sour, and he found himself alienated from the population. He would launch his great polemical work *Contra Galilaeos*, and return to his theme of co-opting the attributes of Christ for a pagan god, this time substituting Asclepius for Heracles. But first, he would return to a method which had proven its usefulness to him, attempting to divide and conquer the Christians by setting the excommunicated Photinus against the Nicene Christian Diodorus. Based on the timing of the collapse of the situation in Antioch, I suggest that this further narrows the likely date of *Ad Photinum* to between late October and early December 362.
6. THIRD FRAGMENT: EFFECT

In our last fragment, Julian writes of the effect of scorning the gods, as Diodorus suffers greatly under their judgement. Facundus introduces the section with *Sicut autem solent errantes convicti fingere quod arte magis quam veritate vincantur, sequitur dicens*, ‘But just as those convicted of erring habitually invent because they are conquered by trickery rather than by truth, he continues, asserting’:

*Iste enim malo communis utilitatis Athenas navigans et philosophans imprudenter musicarum participatus est rationum et rhetoricis confectionibus*\(^{821}\) *odibilem armavit*\(^{822}\) *linguam adversus caelestes deos, usque adeo ignorans paganorum mysteria omnemque miserabil iter imbibens, ut aient, degenerum et imperitorum eius theologorum piscatorium*\(^{823}\) *errorem. Propter quod iam diu est quod ab ipsis punitur diis. Iam enim per multos annos in periculum conversus et in corruptionem thoracis incidens, ad summum pervenit supplicium. Omne eius corpus consumptum est. Nam malae eius conciderunt, rugae vero in altitudinem corporis descenderunt. Quod non est philosophicae conversationis indicio, sicut videri vult ab\(^{824}\) se deceptis, sed iustitiae pro certo deorumque poenae, qua percutitur competenti ratione, usque ad novissimum vitae suae finem asperam et amaram vitam vivens et faciem pallore confectam.*

---

\(^{821}\) Facundus, Hertlein: *confectionibus.*

\(^{822}\) Wright: *adarmavit.*

\(^{823}\) My emendation. Facundus, Hertlein, Wright, Bidez and Cumont: *piscatorium.*

\(^{824}\) Wright: *a.*
This man, you see, to the detriment of the common good, sailing to Athens and practising as a philosopher rashly took part in the arguments of the muses and armed his hateful tongue with rhetorical fabrications against the holy gods, to such an extent being ignorant of the mysteries of the Hellenes, and drinking in complete, as they say, the fisherman’s error of his wretched and inexperienced theologians. For this, it is a long time now that he has been punished by the gods themselves. For having been in danger for many years, he has contracted a corruption attacking his chest, and suffers the greatest torment. All of his body has been consumed, for his cheeks have sunk, and truly, deep wrinkles have run down the length of his body. This is not an indication of the philosophical life, as he wishes it to seem to those deceived by him, but it is a sign of justice for sure, and the gods’ punishment, by which he is stricken as he deserves to be: up to the very end of his life, living a bitter and harsh life, with a face disfigured by pallor.

For *paganorum mysteria* Hoffmann has ‘the mysteries <of our religion>’. Rather than imply that there is nothing in the text, *paganorum* should be translated literally as ‘of the pagans’, as does Wright, or perhaps better yet ‘of the Hellenes’, as *paganorum* is surely Facundus’ translation of Julian’s consistent reference to his religion as Ἔλληνισμός. Both Julian and his contemporary Libanius of Antioch referred to themselves as Hellenes (Julian, *Ep.* 29; *C. Gal.* 229c; Lib., *Ep.* 1120.2; 1211.2; 1431.5). Those *mysteria*, also mentioned in the second section, were
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826 Wright (1923), 189. For a reasoned discussion of ‘pagan’ as a broad, non-biased term, see Cameron (2011), 14-32.
important to Julian, who was a Neoplatonist pagan of the theurgical school of Iamblichus and Maximus. Julian had been secretly initiated into the mysteries while still under Constantius II’s rule (VII.235c; Gr. Naz. Or. IV.55), and was praised by Himerius for initiating others into the mysteries, likely in the pagan chapel he had built in the palace at Constantinople (Him., Or. XLI.8; cf. Lib., Or. XVIII.127; Or. XII.80-1).

Julian harboured great resentment against Christians making use of Hellenic *philosophia*. He thoroughly criticised Constantine, his sons, and their relatives for their ignorance and lack of education, which he asserted was a contributing factor leading to the slaughter of his own branch of the dynasty in the purge of 337 (VII.227d-228b). Julian credited philosophy for saving him during his long captivity, an isolation that he blamed for the brutality of his less philosophically-inclined brother Gallus (V.272a). Elsewhere, Julian indignantly asked why Christians persisted in desiring to use Hellenic learning (*C. Gal.* 229c). This perspective that Hellenic *παιδεία* was the exclusive preserve of those identifying themselves as Hellenes in a religious sense led to his rescript banning Christian teachers from the educational system, for which even Ammianus Marcellinus soundly criticised him (Amm. XXII.10.7; cf. Julian, Ep. 61c). In his last major work, Julian gave credit for his way of life to the philosophers Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, and Theophrastus (XII.353b).

Hoffmann brackets the text from *Propter* onward, a departure from all previous editors, asserting that it is that of Facundus, on no surer foundation than its ‘obvious

---
827 See Burgess (2008), 1-51 for a thorough discussion of this purge and the assessment of Constantius II’s responsibility.
indulgence in the physical description of Diodorus’ disease’.\(^{828}\) No explanation is offered as to why a Christian scribe would delight in the depiction of a Christian’s suffering from (pagan) divine retribution. The portion of the text that Hoffmann brackets actually fits Julian’s themes quite closely: Christianity as a disease, glee at the discomfiture of enemies, punishment from the gods, and criticism of the ascetic life. In addition, as Bidez points out, in Antioch Julian would have had opportunity to observe Diodorus’ condition for himself.\(^{829}\) As mentioned above, Julian referred to Christianity as a νόσος or ‘disease’ in several places (Or. VII.229d; Ep. 41.438c; Ep. 58.401c). In his writings, Julian was not at all sympathetic at the death of his former tutor George (Ep. 60.379d-380a), or the struggles of Athanasius of Alexandria (Ep. 110.398d), both of whom he opposed. He proposed divine punishment for the apostate Constantine and his sons Constantine II, Constantius II, and Constans (VII.229c; X.336b). He also mocked the Christian ascetic life as obtaining much for little sacrifice (VII.224b).

While Julian would no doubt agree with the tone of Wright’s depiction of the Christians as ‘creed-making fishermen’, this does not agree with the text of Julian’s letter. Again, we see ‘creed’ inserted without textual warrant. Rather surprisingly, Hoffmann duplicates this thought-for-thought translation, translating theologorum as ‘creed-making’, just as he does religionis as ‘creed’ above.\(^{830}\) Diodorus’ corruptionem, while not the more typical morbus or malum, is clearly a disease. While the description suggests tuberculosis, Diodorus’ having contracted the disease

---

\(^{828}\) Hoffmann (2004), 157, n. 495.

\(^{829}\) Bidez (1924), 105.

\(^{830}\) Hoffmann (2004), 157.
well before Julian's writing in A.D. 362 and living until approximately 390 means some other serious but less fatal respiratory disease may have been the culprit.

7. CONCLUSION

I have attempted to offer a reasonably readable English translation, but above all to be faithful to the original text, which I believe has been lacking. The text, while composed of three fragments, should be viewed as a whole without resorting to unsubstantiated claims of scribal interpolation. Julian’s letter to Photinus provides us a glimpse of his thoughts in the last year of his life. Julian had passed through a phase of carefully constructed panegyric to the cousin he mistrusted as murderer of his own family (Or. I; Or. III), followed by an epistle to the Athenians targeting Constantius (Or. V). Significant literary contributions to Julian’s anti-Christian campaign, both the direct kind (C. Gal.) and the indirect (Or. X, XI) were still to come. In the Ad Photinum, we have a snapshot demonstrating Julian's intentions and touching upon his methodology, catching him in mid-stride between two phases of his campaign against Christianity.
**Table 6: Timeline of actions related to *Ad Photinum***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Julian’s action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>360-1</td>
<td>Supports Nicene Christians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Feb 362</td>
<td>Proclaims amnesty for exiled Nicene Christians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 362 (after 4 Feb)</td>
<td>Invites the controversial non-Nicene Aetius to return and to visit him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before Mar 362</td>
<td>Publicly casts Heracles as a Christ-supplanting figure in his state program for religious restoration (<em>Or. VII</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after 12 May 362</td>
<td>Leaves Constantinople</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-July 362</td>
<td>Arrives at Antioch and is soon troubled by food shortage and unrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Oct 362</td>
<td>With the destruction of the Temple of Daphne, realises the situation has become unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late Oct-early Dec 362</td>
<td>Invites the excommunicated non-Nicene Photinus to attack the teachings of the Nicene Diodorus in <em>Ep. 90 (Ad Photinum)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 362</td>
<td>Publicly casts Asclepius as a Christ-supplanting figure in <em>Or. XI</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winter 362-3</td>
<td>Publicly casts Asclepius as a Christ-supplanting figure in <em>C. Gal.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>