Philosophical Self-Presentation in Late Antique Cappadocia

A Dissertation Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Stefan Vernon Hodges-Kluck
May 2017

Copyright © 2017 by Stefan Hodges-Kluck
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I could not have completed this work without the academic and personal support of a number of people. First and foremost, my dissertation supervisor Tina Shepardson has consistently encouraged my intellectual development, and has tirelessly read my chapters and advised my progress over the past three years. The rest of my committee, Maura Lafferty, Jacob Latham, and Thomas Burman have also offered useful questions, comments, source recommendations, and advice throughout this process, and I thank them for their willingness to contribute to making this dissertation what it is now. Thanks are also due to Clerk Shaw, who has been an invaluable treasury of knowledge about Plato. Needless to say, any shortcomings in my research are not the result of a lack of direction from the faculty at the University of Tennessee.

I have also benefited from the support of faculty at other institutions. In the 2012-2013 academic year, I was fortunate enough to participate in two workshops held by the University of California Consortium on Late Antiquity (UCCLA), in which I was able to cultivate my interests in ancient Greek and Roman education in conversation with experts in this field of study, including Catherine Chin, Edward Watts, Susanna Elm, Beth Digeser, and Lillian Larsen, among several others. Additionally, I have benefited from the comments of and conversations with other historians of late antique Cappadocia, most notably Nathan Howard and Arthur Urbano, both of whom have been most welcoming of my interests. Finally, I am grateful for the input and advice I have received from the working group for Religion, Medicine, Disability, and Health in Late Antiquity (ReMeDHe), particularly from Heidi Marx, Kristi Upson-Saia, Jessica Wright, and Jared Secord. Their extensive knowledge of ancient medicine has helped the progress of my own research, particularly in the first chapter.

This dissertation is also indebted to the financial and intellectual support of a number of institutions at the University of Tennessee. In 2015-2016, I completed a significant part of my writing with a Haslam Dissertation Fellowship from UT's Marco Institute for Medieval Renaissance Studies. During this year, I was housed at the UT Humanities Center, where I enjoyed a stimulating environment for the development of my ideas and received helpful feedback that allowed me to sharpen this dissertation's focus. Beyond my fellowship, moreover, Marco and the Humanities Center have each offered me funds to travel to both national and international conferences, for which I am very grateful. Additionally, the UT Department of History has provided essential financial support throughout my completion of this dissertation.

Lastly, the most important thanks for this dissertation are due to my wife, Katie Hodges-Kluck, and my parents, John Hodges and Pat Kluck. Katie's brilliance, encouragement, comfort, and support have consistently inspired me to continue with this work, even when it has not been easy. All throughout my life, my parents have encouraged my interests, motivating me to pursue knowledge even when I did not motivate myself. I cannot imagine completing such a work without their love.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation offers a new perspective to the development of religious orthodoxy in the second half of the fourth century CE by examining the role of the body in the inter- and intra-religious battles between Christians and "pagans" over the claim to the cultural capital of philosophy. Focusing on Cappadocia (modern-day central Turkey), a particularly vital region of the fourth-century Roman empire, I argue that during this time, Greek-speaking intellectuals created and disputed boundaries between Christianity and "paganism," as well as between "orthodoxy" and "heresy," based on longstanding elite notions of how an ideal philosopher should look, think, and act. I offer a close reading of the works of three Christian bishops—Basil of Caesarea (d. 378), his friend Gregory of Nazianzus (d. 389/90), and his brother Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394/95)—alongside those of their "pagan" contemporary, the emperor Julian (d. 363). For both Julian and the Cappadocians, I argue, religious orthodoxy—whether Christian or "pagan"—was not simply a matter of doctrine. Rather, these elite authors claimed that correct religion manifested itself in bodily features such as physical appearance and behavioral habits. In the rhetoric of these men, to be a proper follower of the gods entailed not only holding correct opinions and performing correct rituals, but exercising one's entire being in a way that made piety appear second-nature. Drawing on their common background in classical culture (*paideia*), the Cappadocians and Julian presented themselves as ideal philosophers, whose grasp of the "correct" knowledge and habits qualified them to serve as religious leaders. The notions of Christian theology and classical philosophy that they constructed were rooted as much in questions of habits, demeanor, and dress, as they were in questions of theology and knowledge.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1
CHAPTER ONE 52
Molded Bodies: Philosophical Habits and the Wax Tablet of the Soul
CHAPTER TWO 99
Visible Bodies: Philosophical Appearance and Ascetic Humility
CHAPTER THREE 151
Female Bodies: Philosophy and Authority in Presentations of Ascetic Christian Women
CHAPTER FOUR 207
Community Bodies: Teaching and Learning Philosophy at Annisa
CHAPTER FIVE 250
Saintly Bodies: Memorializing Orthodox Christian Philosophers
CONCLUSION 292
LIST OF REFERENCES 305
VITA 332

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AA	Eunomius, *Apologia apologiae*
Ad adul.	Basil of Caesarea, *Ad adulescentes*
Adam.	Adamantius, *Physiognomica*
Adv. opp.	John Chrysostom, *Adversus oppugnatores monasticae vitae*
Amm. Marc.	Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res gestae*
Anon. Lat.	Anonymous Latinus, *Physiognomica*
Apol.	Apuleius, *Apologia*
Ask. LR	Basil, *Asketikon* (Longer Responses)
Ask. SR	Basil, *Asketikon* (Shorter Responses)
Audi.	Plutarch, *De recta ratione audiendi*
Bas. *DV*	Basil of Ancyra, *De virginitate*
CE	Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium*
Caes.	Julian, *Caesares*
CLT	John Chrysostom, *Contra Ludos et Theatra*
Conf.	Augustine, *Confessiones*
CTh	*Codex Theodosianus*
Dial. Tryph.	Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*
Diss.	Epictetus, *Dissertationes*
Divinations	Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion
DSE	Gregory of Nazianzus, *De se et episcopis*
DSV	Gregory of Nazianzus, *De sua vita*

Ep.	*Epistula*
Eunap. *VS*	Eunapius, *Vitae sophistarum et philosophorum*
FDM	Valerius Maximus, *Facta et dicta memorabilia*
Greg. *DV*	Gregory of Nyssa, *De virginitate*
Grg.	Plato, *Gorgias*
Hum.	Basil of Caesarea, *De humilitate*
IBF	Gregory of Nyssa, *In Basilium fratrem*
Ieiun.	Basil of Caesarea, *De ieiunio*
Il.	Homer, *Iliad*
Imag.	Philostratus, *Imagines*
Inan. glor.	John Chrysostom, *De inani gloria*
JECS	*Journal of Early Christian Studies*
Jer. *Chron*.	Jerome, *Chronicon*
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies*
Leg.	Plato, *Leges*
Lib. educ.	Ps.-Plutarch, *De liberis educandis*
Ling.	Varro, *De lingua latina*
Math.	Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus mathematicos*
Mis.	Julian, *Misopōgōn*
Mort. Per.	Lucian, *De morte Peregrini*
NA	Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*
Od.	Homer, *Odyssey*

Off.	Cicero, *De officiis*
Or.	*Oratio*
Paed.	Clement of Alexandria, *Paidagōgos*
Pall.	Tertullian, *De Pallio*
Phd.	Plato, *Phaedo*
Phdr.	Plato, *Phaedrus*
Pisc.	Lucian, *Piscator*
Philostr. *VS*	Philostratus, *Vitae sophistarum*
Pol.	Polemo, *Physiognomica*
Pr. Coniug.	Plutarch, *Praecepta coniugalia*
Praef.	Praefatio
Pr. haeret.	Tertullian, *De Praescriptione haereticorum*
Prom. vinct.	Aeschylus, *Prometheus vinctus*
Resp.	Plato, *Respublica*
SP	*Studia Patristica*
Soc. *HE*	Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica*
Soz. *HE*	Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica*
SVC	Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae*
TCH	Transformation of the Classical Heritage
Tht.	Plato, *Theaetetus*
Ti.	Plato, *Timaeus*
TTH	Translated Texts for Historians

VGTh	Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita Gregorii Thaumaturgii*
Virg. vel.	Tertullian, *De virginibus velandis*
VA	Athanasius, *Vita Antonii*
VR	Plutarch, *Vita Romuli*
VM	Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita Macrinae*
VP	Iamblichus, *De vita pythagorica*

INTRODUCTION

In 375 CE Basil, the bishop of Caesarea, metropolitan city of the Roman province of Cappadocia (modern-day central Turkey), renounced his former mentor Eustathius of Sebaste because of a theological quarrel. In a letter addressed to Eustathius, who had been close to his family for decades, Basil reflected on his past relationship with this man, whom he now considered a heretic. Two decades earlier, Basil wrote, he had abandoned his classical education at Athens and sought tutelage from a mentor experienced in Christian ascetic life.[1] Eustathius' thick cloak, girdle, and untanned sandals all convinced Basil that this man was a worthy guide.[2] As Basil wrote in 375, however, he described this ascetic garb as a cover for Eustathius' "attacks against doctrine."[3] Yet by declaring his mentor a hidden heretic, Basil threw suspicion upon himself, and needed to explain why his own asceticism was legitimate if Eustathius' was heretical. To do so, he called upon his early education as a means of legitimizing his orthodoxy. From his childhood, Basil asserted, he received "no erroneous conceptions about God," so that he never had to "unlearn" such opinions later.[4] Basil insisted that as a child, he received the correct "notion about God" (*ennoia peri Theou*) from his mother and grandmother, and developed this notion as he matured.[5] Like a seed, which grows from small to large, yet still remains "the same in itself," so too he claimed that in himself "the same reasoning (*logon*) has

[1] *Ep.* 223.2.
[2] *Ep.* 223.3.
[3] *Ep.* 223.3. Ὅθεν οὐδὲ τὰς περὶ τῶν δογμάτων διαβολὰς προσιέμην.
[4] *Ep.* 223.3. οὐδέποτε πεπλανημένας ἔσχον τὰς περὶ Θεοῦ ὑπολήψεις, ἢ ἑτέρως φρονῶν μετέμαθον ὕστερον.
[5] *Ep.* 223.3.

been increased through progress."[6] He thus defended himself against charges of heresy arising from his former association with Eustathius by describing his orthodoxy as an integral part of his childhood, growing naturally as a seed grows into a plant.

The personal elements Basil chose to emphasize in this narration—his departure from Athenian education, his appearance-based judgment of Eustathius, and the "natural" development of his own orthodoxy from childhood—highlight a broader discourse of self-presentation commonly adopted by Roman elites in the later fourth century. This discourse is the subject of this dissertation. Through an examination of the writings of three Christian bishops—Basil of Caesarea (d. 378), his friend Gregory of Nazianzus (d. 389/90), and his brother Gregory of Nyssa (d.394/95)—alongside those of the "pagan" emperor Julian (r. 361-363), I argue that fourth-century elites created and disputed religious boundaries between Christianity and "paganism," as well as between "orthodoxy" and "heresy," based on longstanding classical notions of how a well-educated elite man should look, think, and act.[7] For fourth-century elites like Basil, the Gregorys, and Julian, I contend, definitions of religious orthodoxy and orthopraxy —two categories which overlapped significantly in Late Antiquity—involved not only theological doctrines and ritual practices, but also ideals of behavior long perpetuated by Greek and Roman elites. Fourth-century elites applied these ideals to their debates over religious orthodoxy/orthopraxy by claiming that those who looked, thought, and acted like "real" philosophers were those with legitimate authority to lead the "correct" religious communities.

---

[6] *Ep.* 223.3.40-4. Ὥσπερ γὰρ τὸ αὐξανόμενον μεῖζον μὲν ἀπὸ μικροῦ γίνεται, ταὐτὸ δέ ἐστιν ἑαυτῷ, οὐ κατὰ γένος μεταβαλλόμενον, ἀλλὰ κατ' αὔξησιν τελειούμενον· οὕτω λογίζομαι ἐμοὶ τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον διὰ τῆς προκοπῆς ηὐξῆσθαι.

[7] In this dissertation, I use "pagan" in quotes in order to highlight the fact that this word was a derogatory label given by Christians for people who worshiped traditional gods. I will describe Julian with the Greek term Hellene (*Hellēn*), and his "paganism" as Hellenism, because that was the term that he himself used.

Conversely, they argued that rivals who possessed "incorrect" theology could not possibly embody "correct" philosophy, and were thus unqualified to serve as religious leaders. In this way, the Cappadocians and Julian made bodily features such as behavioral habits and physical appearance as important signifiers of religious orthodoxy/orthopraxy as theological doctrine and ritual practice.

The decades between Julian's accession to Caesar in 355 and the ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 381 witnessed tumultuous debates over the hotly-contested boundaries of Christianity, Hellenism, orthodoxy/orthopraxy, Roman identity, and social class. While many people of conflicting theological and philosophical positions contested the nature of the Divine during this time, almost everyone agreed that philosophy and religion were intertwined, whether they believed that a "true" philosopher worshiped the Christian God or the traditional gods of the Greco-Roman pantheon. Later fourth-century elites, Christians and "pagans" alike, who wished to claim status as religious authorities argued across and within religious boundaries in their efforts to present themselves as legitimate philosophers and to intertwine the cultural capital of philosophy with their versions of religious orthodoxy/orthopraxy. In this effort, elites like Basil, the Gregorys, and Julian borrowed longstanding ideals of philosophy in order to present themselves as the "natural" leaders of orthodox religious communities. These ideals involved not only what texts a proper philosopher should read, but also what habits he (or, occasionally, she) should embody, and what sort of appearance he should present. The fourth-century religious and cultural debates in which the Cappadocians and Julian engaged thus involved disputes not only over bodies of texts, but also human bodies.

As highly-educated elites who produced a considerable amount of surviving literary works on the construction of religious boundaries in the later fourth century, these four authors provide the main focus of this dissertation. Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa—whose common origin has earned them the modern nickname "the Cappadocian Fathers"—were highly-educated Christian bishops who became prominent church leaders in the midst of late fourth-century battles over Christian orthodoxy. They all supported the "pro-Nicene" theology—so called for its adherence to the Council of Nicaea in 325—that would eventually be confirmed as orthodox by the Council of Constantinople in 381. The emperor Julian (r. 361-3), meanwhile, a contemporary of the Cappadocians, is commonly known as "the Apostate" because of his rejection of Christianity. Yet while Julian rejected Christianity in favor of the traditional Greco-Roman gods—he called himself a Greek (*Hellēn*), believing that "true" Greeks worshiped the classical Greek gods—his writings reveal that he and the Cappadocians shared a common intellectual milieu. Thus, while modern scholars in early Christianity and ancient Roman history have tended to study these men separately, I will explore all four of these figures as participants in an elite discourse that crossed religious boundaries.

To explore the Cappadocians' and Julian's participation in this elite discourse, I make use of sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's notion of *habitus*. While this Latin word precisely translates to "habit," Bourdieu uses it more broadly to refer to

> the product of the work of inculcation and appropriation necessary in order for those products of collective history, the objective structures (e.g. of language, economy, etc.) to succeed in reproducing themselves more or less completely, in the form of durable dispositions, in the organisms (which one can, if one wishes, call individuals) lastingly

> subjected to the same conditionings, and hence placed in the same material conditions of existence.[8]

"Habits"—both in the sense of deeply-engrained behaviors and in the sense of clothing—constitute only a part of one's *habitus*, which also includes less tangible features, such as speech, disposition, attitudes, demeanor, and comportment. Such features, I argue, formed an essential part of the Cappadocians' and Julian's constructions of religious orthodoxy/orthopraxy in the second half of the fourth century CE. While most scholars would acknowledge that orthodoxy and orthopraxy were closely interrelated in Late Antiquity, less has been done to show the importance of *habitus*—and in particular, the *habitus* of the highly-educated elite—in the construction and disputation over these categories. For highly-educated elites, like the Cappadocians and Julian, however, orthodoxy and orthopraxy involved not only correct doctrine and rituals, but also the maintenance of a certain *habitus* that made one's piety appear second-nature.

For elites of the Roman world, this *habitus* was intimately linked with *paideia*, a Greek term that refers both to the education that Greek-speaking Roman students received, and to the broader culture within which this education was situated. In spite of their religious differences, the Cappadocians and Julian were all heavily influenced by *paideia.* Under the Roman Empire, this *paideia* sought to teach highborn children the knowledge, skills, morals, and behaviors

[8] Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice, Cambridge Studies in Social and Cultural Anthropology 16 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 85. For the idea of education as a means of inculcating and reproducing such *habitus*, see also Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron, *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture*, trans. Richard Nice (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1990).

considered necessary to embody the *habitus* of the ruling elite.[9] By reading and interpreting classical authors such as Homer and Plato, by composing speeches in the style of orators such as Demosthenes, and by following the moral and physical models of virtue set forth by philosophers such as Socrates, young students learned to display themselves as members of a highly-selective social class whose noble birth and correct upbringing qualified them to serve in civic and imperial positions of authority. Since this *paideia* was chiefly reserved for young boys, it also served in the construction of elite Roman masculinity. In Maud Gleason's words, the performance of *paideia* was a "calisthenics of manhood" in which a student learned to display not only mastery of texts and language, but also control of his entire *habitus*: demeanor, posture, appearance, gaze, and even emotions.[10] Moreover, starting in the second century CE and progressing through Late Antiquity, *paideia* increasingly involved performing a certain level of ascetic renunciation in order to display self-moderation (*sōphrosunē*) and self-control (*enkrateia*), two qualities long valued by educated Greek and Roman elites in antiquity.[11] Through both learning and exercise (*askēsis*), highborn Roman males were to comport themselves in ways that made their social superiority to others appear natural on their bodies and in their actions.

---

[9] For education as a display of elite status, see Maud W. Gleason, *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995); Thomas Schmitz, *Bildung und Macht: zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*, Zetemata: Monographien zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 97 (Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1997); W. Martin Bloomer, *The School of Rome: Latin Studies and the Origins of Liberal Education* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011). For the mechanics of education in the ancient and late ancient worlds, see Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Raffaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), and Yun Lee Too (ed.), *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Boston: Brill, 2001).

[10] Gleason, *Making Men* (1995), xxii.

[11] For more on defining "ascetic renunciation," see discussion below in the Introduction.

In the fourth century, elite youths, regardless of religious affiliations, were still steeped in the culture of *paideia* in much the same way as children in previous centuries had been. Imperial support of Christianity, however, created for elites both new opportunities for power and new questions as to the purpose of this *paideia*. The Cappadocians and Julian alike viewed religious leadership, whether embodied by a Christian bishop or a Hellenic philosopher-emperor, as the supreme duty of a well-educated elite Roman. Their self-presentation as properly-trained men of *paideia* thus intended to signal not only masculinity and nobility, but also—and more importantly—mastery of the religious knowledge and practices that they considered necessary to lead the wider population of Roman worshipers to the correct God or gods. In other words, the Cappadocians and Julian participated in a discourse of *paideia* that transformed the "calisthenics of manhood" observed by Maud Gleason into a "calisthenics of religious orthodoxy."

Cappadocia as a Late Antique Cultural Crossroads

The Cappadocians and Julian were major participants in fourth-century developments in the discourse of *paideia*, and the extensive number of surviving works by these authors offers excellent material for a regional study of this discourse, which influenced cultural developments

throughout the Roman Empire.[12] Additionally, the region in which the Cappadocians and Julian produced the majority of their works adds extra significance to a study of these authors. Elites throughout Asia Minor, and particularly in Cappadocia, enjoyed considerable opportunities for power in the fourth century because of their strategic location. Emperors often passed through Cappadocia while traveling between the major eastern cities of Constantinople and Antioch, which served as staging grounds for military campaigns into the Balkans and Persia, respectively.[13] These emperors, all but one of whom were Christians, took sides in the bitter ecclesiastical battles of the fourth century by holding councils, and by exiling and recalling bishops based on their willingness to conform to these councils. Indeed, even the *Hellēn* Julian participated in these Christian battles when he recalled all bishops exiled under his predecessor Constantius. Because of their location in between two imperial military staging grounds, Cappadocian elites occupied a strategic—and often dangerous—position in ecclesiastical and imperial politics of the fourth century.

---

[12] Certainly, there are numerous locations and authors, both eastern and western, which merit attention for their participation in the fourth-century discourse of *paideia*. In the East, the cities of Alexandria and Antioch were important loci for the development and negotiation of Christian and non-Christian identities. The source material from Alexandria, however, is rich and unique enough to have merited several recent regional studies. For Alexandria, see esp. Edward Jay Watts, *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria*, TCH 41 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2006), 143-256; *idem*, *Riot in Alexandria: Tradition and Group Dynamics in Late Antique Pagan and Christian Communities*, TCH 46 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2010). For Antioch, see especially Raffaella Cribiore, *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007); *eadem*, *Libanius the Sophist: Rhetoric, Reality, and Religion in the Fourth Century*, Cornell Studies in Classical Philology (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013); Jaclyn LaRae Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and his Congregation in Antioch* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Isabella Sandwell, *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews, and Christians in Antioch* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Christine C. Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places: Late Antique Antioch and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2014). In the West, Christians such as Augustine, Rufinus, Ausonius, and Jerome, as well as "pagans" such as Symmachus, were all educated Latins who disputed the role and purpose of *paideia* in the later fourth century. For studies on these authors' relationship to *paideia*, see especially Catherine Chin, *Grammar and Christianity in the Late Roman World*, Divinations (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), and Megan Hale Williams: *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006).

[13] Raymond Van Dam, *Kingdom of Snow: Roman Rule and Greek Culture in Cappadocia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), 1-2.

The lives and careers of Basil, hGregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa attest to the heights to which educated elites in fourth-century Cappadocia could rise. As the name "Cappadocian Fathers" suggests, these men have tended to receive modern attention from patristics scholars interested primarily in their influence on trinitarian theology.[14] While acknowledging the useful contributions of this field of scholarship, this project will take a different approach to the Cappadocians by viewing them first and foremost as elite Roman men of *paideia*. Only recently have Basil and the Gregorys received attention from historians interested in situating them within the political, social, and cultural transformations of Late Antiquity. Most relevant for this project, the works of Philip Rousseau, Raymond Van Dam, Andrea Sterk, and Susanna Elm have highlighted the Cappadocians' status as members of the late Roman elite.[15] As these scholars have demonstrated, the Cappadocians were indelibly impressed with values that they absorbed through the *paideia* to which they were exposed as elite boys. These values manifested themselves in the ways these men presented themselves as bishops in the tumultuous political and theological climate of their day, and formed a core element of their constructions of Christian orthodoxy/orthopraxy.

The son of a prominent teacher of rhetoric in Caesarea, Basil has enjoyed a reputation among modern scholars as a leader of Christian ascetics, sage of classical and Christian wisdom,

---

[14] Some prominent theological studies of the Cappadocians include Jaroslav Pelikan, *Christianity and Classical Culture: the Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism*, Gifford Lectures 1992-1993 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993); Anthony Meredith, *The Cappadocians* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1995); Claudio Moreschini, *I Padri Cappadoci: storia, letteratura, teologia* (Rome: Città Nuova, 2008).

[15] Philip Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, TCH 20 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1994), esp. 27-92; Raymond Van Dam, *Kingdom of Snow* (2002), 159-202; Andrea Sterk, *Renouncing the World yet Leading the Church: The Monk-Bishop in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004); Susanna Elm, *'Virgins of God': The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity*, Oxford Classical Monographs (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 60-223; *eadem*, *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome*, TCH 49 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2012).

champion of Nicene theology, benefactor of the sick and the poor, and bishop of Caesarea.[16] Educated at Athens, he taught rhetoric at Caesarea before abandoning this post to pursue ascetic life at his family's retreat at Annisa, in Pontus.[17] A few years after his departure from teaching, Basil was ordained as a reader of the Caesarean church in 360, and became a priest of the same church in 362.[18] Eight years later, in 370, he was elected bishop, and became one of the leading episcopal authorities of the pro-Nicene Christian community at a time when this faction held little dominance in the East, since the emperor Valens (r. 364-378) supported an opposing faction.[19] As part of his rise as an ecclesiastical authority, in the 360s and 370s Basil emerged as a leader of an ascetic community at his family retreat at Annisa. While this retreat had housed ascetics before Basil—including his own mother Emmelia and older sister Macrina (d. 379), who may even have pressed her younger brother to join her there—during Basil's priesthood and episcopacy he worked to consolidate these ascetics into an organized, hierarchical community. He wrote several letters and homilies about ascetic life, and edited and published a collection of responses to questions posed by ascetics of this community—a collection today known as the

---

[16] For biographies of Basil, see Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (1994); Stephen M. Hildebrand, *Basil of Caesarea*, Foundations of Theological Exegesis and Christian Spirituality (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014). For key studies of Basil's works, see also Jean Bernardi, *La prédication des pères Cappadociens, le prédicateur et son auditoire* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1968), 17-91; Paul Jonathan Fedwick (ed.), *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-Hundredth Anniversary Symposium*, vol. 1 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981); Klaus Koschorke, *Spuren der Alten Liebe: Studien zum Kirchenbegriff des Basilius von Caesarea*, Paradosis 32 (Freibourg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1991).

[17] Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (1994), 61-3. For studies of Basil's asceticism, see also Thomas Špidlik, "L'idéal du monachisme basilien," in Fedwick (ed.), *Basil of Caesarea* (1981), 361-74; Rousseau (1994), 190-232; Elm, *Virgins of God* (1994), 184-223; Anna M. Silvas, *The Asketikon of St. Basil the Great* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 51-98.

[18] Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (1994), 84-5.

[19] Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (1994), 145-51. For Valens' religious policies, see Richard P. Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 289-93; Noel E. Lenski, *Failure of Empire: Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century A.D.*, TCH 34 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002), 242-63. I follow Lewis Ayres in calling Basil and his partisans "pro-Nicene": Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy: an Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 236-40. For more on fourth-century trinitarian conflicts, see discussion below in the Introduction.

Asketikon.[20] After Basil's death, this text was translated into Latin and Syriac, and eventually developed into the *Rule of St. Basil* commonly used in Greek orthodox monasteries.[21]

Basil's departure from teaching and adoption of an ascetic life have led several scholars to interpret his asceticism as a steady progression away from Greek philosophy and toward structured Christian asceticsm. Anna Silvas has argued that although in the late 350s, Basil's writings on Christian asceticism were filled with references to Greek philosophy, in the mid-360s he "carried out a thorough de-Hellenization and Christianization of his ascetic discourse."[22] Similarly, Stephen Hildebrand has described Basil's life as a "series of awakenings," the "seeds" of which "were planted in Basil's childhood," were dormant until his adoption of ascetic life, then "grew from philosophical to sacramental and scriptural, from rustic to urban, from socially simple to socially complex."[23] Hildebrand's use of the metaphor of growing seeds to describe Basil's development certainly evokes this bishop's insistence that correct Christian doctrine was planted in him during his childhood, as quoted at the beginning of this introduction. It is important, however, to remember that this language reveals the narrative that Basil himself attributed to his life in the 370s. Indeed, Philip Rousseau has emphasized that Basil's writings show evidence of a man seeking to "rewrite his own past" in the midst of his quarrels with

---

[20] For the creation of the *Asketkion*, see Sterk, *Renouncing the World* (2004), 49-53; Silvas, *Asketikon* (2005), 1-13.
[21] Silvas, *Asketikon* (2005), 102-29; *eadem*, "Edessa to Cassino: The Passage of Basil's *Asketikon* to the West," *Vigiliae Christianae* 56, (2002), 247-259; *eadem*, "The Latin *Regula Basilii* and the Syriac *Questions of the Brothers*: A Preliminary Inquiry," *Parole de l'Orient* 36 (2011), 445-452; Etienne Baudry, "Apports de la tradition manuscrite syriaque du Petit Ascéticon: pour une meillure connaissance de l'histoire du texte de l'Ascéticon de s. Basile le Grand," *Studia Monastica* 50:1 (2008), 41-68.
[22] Silvas, *Asketikon* (2005), 89.
[23] Hildebrand, *Basil of Caesarea* (2014), 16. Hildebrand agrees with Silvas' thesis that Basil de-Hellenized his ascetic discourse: Hildebrand, *Basil of Caesarea* (2014), 8-13.

theological rivals like Eustathius.[24] As I will argue in this study, this retrospective life narrative of progression, in which Basil presented himself as orthodox and Eustathius as heretical, had roots in the ideals and practices of educated elite Greeks and Romans.

Like Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus was steeped in the culture of elite *paideia* and is famous as a champion of pro-Nicene theology.[25] His orations defining and defending the pro-Nicene interpretation of the Trinity have even earned him the moniker "the Theologian" among later Christians, and his vigorous defense of Christians' right to classical culture has earned him a reputation as one of the church fathers most highly influenced by *paideia*.[26] The son of an elite rhetor-turned-bishop in Nazianzus, a small town in Cappadocia, Gregory was educated with Basil in Athens. After departing Athens at the same time as Basil, Gregory was ordained a priest by his father in 361. In apparent rejection of this ordination, he fled to Basil's ascetic retreat at Annisa, before eventually returning to accept his new role as priest.[27] This flight, as well as a subsequent retreat in the 370s, has led scholars to view him as a brilliant, yet administratively inept, man who was afraid of public office and preferred to pursue the life of the mind.[28] His

---

[24] Philip Rousseau, "Basil of Caesarea: Choosing a Past," in G.W. Clarke (ed.), *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity* (Rushcutters Bay, NSW, Australia: Australian National University Press, 1990), 37-58. There is an echo of this same argument in Rousseau's biography of Basil: Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (1994), 243-5. Van Dam also discusses Basil's reticence about his pre-ascetic life: Van Dam, *Becoming Christian: the Conversion of Roman Cappadocia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 162-70. For more on the broader constructions of, and competitions over, memory in Late Antiquity, see Charles W. Hedrick Jr., *History and Silence: Purge and Rehabilitation of Memory in Late Antiquity* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2000); Elizabeth A. Castelli, *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making*, Gender, Theory, and Religion (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004); Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places* (2014), 58-91.

[25] The principal biographies of Gregory of Nazianzus are John A. McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus: an Intellectual Biography* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminar Press, 2001); Brian E. Daley, S.J., *Gregory of Nazianzus*, Early Church Fathers (New York: Routledge, 2006), 1-61. For an excellent account of Gregory of Nazianzus up to 365, focusing especially on his early orations and their context, see also Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 17-60, 147-265, 336-477.

[26] See, for example, Jean Bernardi, *La Prédication* (1968), 254-60; Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Gregory of Nazianzus: Rhetor and Philosopher* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969); McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus* (2001), 82-3.

[27] McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus* (2001), 99-106; Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 147-53.

[28] Bernardi, *La prédication* (1968), 94; McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus* (2001), 15; Raymond Van Dam, *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 45-6; Daley, *Gregory of Nazianzus* (2006), 2.

time at Constantinople did little to counter this reputation. After the succession of the pro-Nicene emperor Theodosius in 379, Gregory was selected by a council of pro-Nicene bishops to be the new bishop of the imperial capital, which at the time was occupied by a majority of non-Nicene Christians. After this selection, he traveled to the capital to deliver sermons in order to establish a Nicene presence in the city.[29] In 380, however, a rival faction of pro-Nicenes from Alexandria took advantage of one of Gregory's temporary retreats from the city to ordain their own candidate, Maximus, in secret.[30] While Gregory managed to survive this coup, the affair damaged his reputation. Maximus' supporters had claimed that since Gregory had been ordained by his father in Nazianzus, he could not be re-ordained as bishop of Constantinople. After the Council of Constantinople in 381, Gregory resigned as bishop-to-be and withdrew to his hometown of Nazianzus, where he would spent most of the remaining decade of his life writing poems about his life and his family.[31]

Only recently has Gregory of Nazianzus received a more favorable scholarly reputation. As Susanna Elm has persuasively shown, Gregory's reputation as an inactive thinker is a result of his own self-presentation as a well-educated man whose appreciation of contemplative philosophy suitably prepared him for political life.[32] According to Elm's interpretation, Gregory's complaints about his ordination and retreats from his bishopric revealed, in his mind, a balance between action and contemplation that educated elites dating back to Plato in the fourth century BCE had advocated. Gregory's literary production after the fiasco in Constantinople further emphasizes his efforts to assert his authority as a contemplative philosopher. He, like

[29] McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus* (2001), 234-40.
[30] McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus* (2001), 311-25.
[31] McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus* (2001), 366-98.
[32] Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), esp. 6-9, 153-65, 429-32.

Basil, wrote his autobiography—as well as a memorial oration to Basil—in order to refute his enemies' attacks by presenting himself as a legitimate Christian bishop.[33] It is necessary to acknowledge that Gregory's reputation as an introvert with little proficiency in church politics is, above all, the product of his own self-presentation.

Unlike Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, the third Cappadocian bishop of this study, never studied at Athens.[34] Yet as Werner Jaeger argued nearly a half century ago, the Nyssen's writings show how deeply he was influenced by classical *paideia*.[35] Gregory was the younger brother of Basil, and was also briefly Basil's student while the latter taught rhetoric in Caesarea during the 350s.[36] He was a latecomer to ascetic Christian life, having himself taught at Caesarea from 364 to 371/2—at which time he may have been married—before joining his older siblings Basil and Macrina at Annisa, where he wrote his first surviving treatise, *On Virginity*, exhorting Christians to adopt ascetic celibacy.[37] In 372, Basil appointed his brother Gregory as bishop of Nyssa, a small town in Cappadocia, as part of his reaction to the emperor Valens splitting the province of Cappadocia into two, an imperial action which took almost all of Cappadocia's cities away from Basil's episcopal jurisdiction.[38] Yet while Gregory originally entered the episcopacy as a pawn in his older brother's ecclesiastical politics, after Basil's death in 378 he emerged as a leading figure in continuing his brother's episcopal and theological

---

[33] See Frederick W. Norris, "Your Honor, My Reputation: St. Gregory of Nazianzus's Funeral Oration on St. Basil the Great," in Thomas Hägg and Philip Rousseau (eds.), *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, TCH 31 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000), 140-59; Neil McLynn, "Gregory Nazianzen's Basil: the Literary Construction of a Christian Friendship," *SP* 37 (2001), 178-93. For more on Gregory's continued efforts of self-presentation after his departure from Constantinople, see also Bradley K. Storin, "In a Silent Way: Asceticism and Literature in the Rehabilitation of Gregory of Nazianzus," *JECS* 19:2 (2011), 225-57.
[34] For a succinct biography of Gregory of Nyssa, see Anna M. Silvas, *Gregory of Nyssa: the Letters*, SVC 83 (Boston: Brill, 2007), 1-57.
[35] Werner Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1961), 86-100.
[36] Silvas, *Gregory of Nyssa* (2007), 7-8.
[37] Silvas, *Gregory of Nyssa* (2007), 12-29. The suggestion that Gregory was once married comes from his detailed description of married life in Greg. *DV* 3.
[38] Van Dam, *Kingdom of Snow* (2002), 28-37.

battles.[39] From 378 until his death in 395, this Cappadocian produced numerous biographical/ hagiographical, philosophical, and exegetical works that reveal the deep extent of his exposure to classical *paideia*.

Unlike Basil (the skilled administrator) or Gregory of Nazianzus (the introverted intellectual), Gregory of Nyssa has not been consistently characterized by modern scholars. Indeed, the abstruse nature of his works—particularly later works such as his *Life of Moses*—has led scholars to describe this Cappadocian in a number of ways: contemplative mystic, skilled exegete, Origenist theologian, Platonist philosopher.[40] Most of these interpretations tend to suggest that Gregory of Nyssa, unlike Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus, was not particularly noteworthy for his administrative skills or rhetorical talent. Jean Daniélou, for example, has labeled Basil as a "chief of rank and man of action," the Nazianzen as a "humanist and perfect writer," and the Nyssen as a "spirited philosopher and mystic."[41] Andrew Louth, meanwhile, has remarked that while Gregory of Nyssa was the greatest of the Cappadocians in speculative theology, he was "inferior to the other two in rhetorical skill and organizing ability."[42] Yet this bishop's apparent philosophical and mystic bent should not preclude scholars from seeing him as an active participant in the rhetorical self-presentation in which his older brother Basil and friend Gregory of Nazianzus engaged. Though he did not follow Basil and the Nazianzen in writing about his own past, the Nyssen's works reveal a similar effort to present models of Christian

---

[39] Silvas, *Gregory of Nyssa* (2007), 39-57; *eadem*, "Basil and Gregory of Nyssa on the Ascetic Life: Introductory Comparisons," *SP* 67 (2013), 53-62, 59.
[40] For a good overview of scholarly interpretations of Gregory of Nyssa, see Morwenna Ludlow, *Gregory of Nyssa, Ancient and (Post)modern* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 1-10.
[41] Jean Daniélou, *Nouvelle histoire de l'Église 1, des origines à Saint Grégoire le Grand* (Paris: Seuil, 1963), 305-6: "Basile de Césarée, chef de file et homme d'action, son ami Grégoire de Nazianze, humanist et parfait écrivain, son frère, Grégoire de Nysse, philosophe hardi et mystique." For more on Gregory of Nyssa's preaching, similarly contrasting him with Gregory of Nazianzus, see Bernardi, *Le prédication* (1961), 261-330.
[42] Andrew Louth, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition from Plato to Denys* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 80.

authority that built on—and, in important ways, departed from—the other two Cappadocians' works.

In addition to the writings of these three Christian Cappadocians, this dissertation also investigates the works of their contemporary, the Hellenic emperor Julian, who shared their absorption in *paideia* in spite of his religious differences. Even though he only lived for about thirty years and reigned as sole emperor for just over eighteen months, the life of the emperor Julian has been one of the most popular subjects of scholarly biography.[43] The nephew of the first Christian emperor Constantine (r. 306-337), Julian was raised as a Christian and converted to Hellenic religion in the course of his education in Greek philosophy. When he became sole emperor in 361, he actively promoted sacrifice, temple restoration, and priestly offices in his effort to revive what he believed was genuine "Hellenism." In addition to the wealth of source material from this emperor's own pen—no other Roman emperor authored as many surviving works—Julian's status as an "apostate" from Christianity has attracted substantial attention from modern biographers. Biographies such as those of Glen Bowersock and Polymnia Athanassiadi-Fowden, for instance, have focused on Julian's "pagan" Hellenism as the polar opposite of Christianity.[44] Such approaches have treated his education as a subordinate aspect of his religion, with his exposure to Homer in his early schooldays planting the first seeds of devotion to the gods, his later school experiences in Asia Minor and Athens initiating him into philosophical mysteries, and his school legislation seeking to abolish Christians from what he believed was the

---

[43] Some fundamental biographies of the emperor Julian include Joseph Bidez, *La vie de l'empereur Julien* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1930), Robert Browning, *The Emperor Julian* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1976), Glen Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978, repr. 1997), Polymnia Athanassiadi-Fowden, *Julian: an Intellectual Biography* (New York: Routledge, 1981) and Klaus Rosen, *Julian: Kaiser, Gott, und Christenhaßer* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2006).

[44] For example, Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate* (1978), 26-29, 84-85; Athanassiadi-Fowden, *Julian* (1981), 1-12; Rosen, *Julian* (2006), 94-121.

exclusive cultural treasure of "pagan" Greeks.[45] More recent studies have treated Julian's education more extensively, investigating the emperor as a writer and a scholar and highlighting the extent of his knowledge through analysis of the vast number of texts he produced.[46]

While his extensive written corpus on its own has provided enough material for several studies, Julian was far from the only educated man in Late Antiquity who believed that proper religious worship and proper learning were parallel pursuits. Recent works by Raymond Van Dam and Susanna Elm have shown that Julian debated the values of education alongside Christians such as Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nazianzus. Van Dam's work on the Cappadocians has analyzed Julian alongside Basil and the Nazianzen as participants in the fourth-century "culture wars" over *paideia*.[47] Elm's work on Julian and Gregory, meanwhile, has shown how these two religious opponents agreed on the necessity of *paideia* for rulers, whose duty was to connect the civilized world (*oikoumenē*) with the Divine through proper religious practice.[48] In a recent article, Elm has even suggested that Julian, who not only shared theoretical concerns with educated Christians but was himself familiar with contemporary Christian theological debates, was in fact an essential player in the development of Christianity in the fourth century:

> Bringing Julian's and Gregory's writings into dialogue shows that both men had far more in common than divided them…Integral for all and to everything these men thought and wrote was the 'pagan learning' they all shared. Phrased differently, without paganism no Christianity, without Julian's writings no Gregory the Theologian. And what is true for

[45] The most concise narrative of Julian's education is Bouffartigue, *L'empereur Julien et la culture de son temps*, Collection des études augustiniennes série antiquité 133 (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1992), 13-49.
[46] Jean Bouffartigue, *L'empereur Julien* (1992); Rowland Smith, *Julian's Gods: Religion and Philosophy in the Thought and Action of Julian the Apostate* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Christian Schäfer (ed.), *Kaiser Julian "Apostata" und die philosophische Reaktion gegen das Christentum*, Millennium-Studien 21 (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008); Nicholas Baker-Brian and Shaun Tougher (eds.), *Emperor and Author: the Writings of Julian the Apostate* (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2012); Susanna Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012).
[47] Van Dam, *Kingdom of Snow* (2002): 160-202.
[48] Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), esp. 9-11.

> Gregory's writings also applies to a number of his important contemporaries and successors. Thus, paradoxical though it may sound, through the Christian (and especially Gregory's) response to the pagan Apostate's writings, Julian became in effect yet another Father of the Church.[49]

Certainly, neither Julian nor any of his Christian contemporaries would have approved of him receiving the label "Father of the Church." Yet Elm's observation highlights the value of examining this emperor alongside his Christian contemporaries, as he was as much a player in fourth-century religious controversies (both extra-Christian and intra-Christian) as were Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa.

In addition to Julian, there are certainly other contemporaries who could receive attention alongside the Cappadocians, such as the theologian Eunomius of Cyzcius (d. 393), the orators Themistius (d. 390) and Libanius (d. 393), and the priest John Chrysostom (d. 407), all of whom participated in important fourth-century eastern Roman political and cultural debates and were part of the Cappadocians' social network. The emperor Julian, however, shared with the Cappadocians a special interest in fusing philosophy and religious orthodoxy/orthopraxy that makes him particularly useful to investigate alongside these Christian bishops. The Cappadocians' and Julian's writings show substantial similarities in their efforts to mark their own philosophy as the proper manifestation of both social class and religious affiliation, and to brand rival forms of philosophy as subversive. Understanding how these authors' strategies of self-presentation were both explicitly and implicitly shaped by their immersion in *paideia* is thus essential to understanding the transformation of the Roman social and cultural elite in Late Antiquity. Not only did the Cappadocians and Julian read the same body of texts in their schools, they also learned to embody certain values as they absorbed and performed the *habitus* of

[49] Elm, "Julian the Writer and His Audience," in *Emperor and Author* (2012), 15.

Rome's educated elite. These values, centered around the idea that philosophical elites should display self-moderation (*sōphrosunē*) and self-control (*enkrateia*), manifested themselves in ascetic praxis for both Christians and *Hellēnes* in the fourth-century eastern Roman Empire. When they presented themselves and their communities as models of these values, and assailed their rivals for falling short of them, the Cappadocians and Julian asserted that their "correct" religious practice was a natural result of their "correct" birth, upbringing, and education. These assertions functioned as claims to cultural capital in important late antique competitions over the definition of categories such as Christianity, Hellenism, and orthodoxy, and over the construction of boundaries between "right" and "wrong" religious communities that these categories entailed.

Christianity and Culture in the Fourth-Century Mediterranean

Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, and Julian were all members of the "first Christian generation," the first generation of Roman elites to grow up under emperors who adopted and actively promoted Christianity.[50] All born in the 330s, these men were raised and educated during the reigns of the sons of Constantine: Constantine II (r. 337-340), Constans (r. 337-350), and Constantius II (r. 337-361). All three of these emperors, especially Constantius—who, as eastern emperor, controlled Cappadocia—followed their father's footsteps in promoting Christianity by offering imperial support to church construction and adjudicating in episcopal

[50] I use the phrase "first Christian generation" in relation to Edward Watts' "final pagan generation," by which he designates "the last group of elite Romans, both pagan and Christian, who were born into a world [of the 310s and 320s] in which most people believed that the pagan public religious order of the past few millennia would continue indefinitely" (Edward Watts, *The Final Pagan Generation*, TCH 53 [Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2015], 6).

conflicts.[51] While far from "Christianizing" the Empire, the imperial policies of Constantine's sons certainly opened up new avenues to power and influence for elites, who commonly relied on their *paideia* to forge social networks and open doors to key positions in civic and imperial leadership.[52] In the fourth century, Christian bishoprics became another arena in which people could exercise the authority granted to them by their *paideia*. While fourth-century bishops did not usually come from the highest levels of society—on the whole, they were the equivalent of mid-level urban administrators—some fourth-century elites (like the Cappadocians) were instrumental in adapting elite ideals to Christian leadership.[53]

With the influx of wealthy elites into ecclesiastical offices during the fourth century, however, tension developed among Christians and *Hellēnes* concerning the proper relationship between *paideia* and Christian piety. As Peter Gemeinhardt has argued, "the…paradox of Christian appropriation *and* critique of education was unavoidable, if the Church wished on the one hand to be present in the world as a critical authority and on the other hand to distinguish itself within this world as apart from it."[54] Certainly, this tension was nothing new in Christian discourse. From as early as the first century, Christians had recognized the need for both written

---

[51] There is debate among scholars of Constantine as to whether the emperor's policies sought to punish "pagans" (for instance, Timothy David Barnes, *Eusebius and Constantine* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981], esp. 224-60, 275), or simply to promote toleration and unity between different factions of Christians and non-Christians (for instance, H.A. Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops: the Politics of Intolerance* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000], esp. xv, 235-72). Either way, it is clear that Constantine's patronage of Christianity, particularly in the 320s and 330s, would have substantial ramifications for the religious landscape of the fourth-century empire. For studies of Constantius' religious policies, emphasizing especially this emperor's similarities to his father Constantine, see especially Timothy David Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), esp. 165-75, and Elm, *Sons of Hellenism*, 32-50.

[52] Peter Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992), 35-70.

[53] Brown, *Power and Persuasion* (1992), 71-117; Claudia Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: the Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition*, TCH 37 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005), 178-83.

[54] Peter Gemeinhardt, "Dürfen die Christen Lehrer Sein? Anspruch und Wirklichkeit im christlichen Bildungsdiskurs der Spätantike," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 51 (2008), 25-43, 43: "Das…Paradox christlicher Bildungsaneignung *und* -kritik war unvermeidbar, wenn denn die Kirche einerseits in der Welt as kritische Instanz präsent sein und sich anderseits innerhalb dieser Welt von ihr unterscheiden wollte."

and oral communication in order to form communities, yet with no institutions of their own to teach these skills, they relied on the training provided by a curriculum based on the texts of classical *paideia*.[55] Christians approached this dilemma in different ways. Some presented a strict dichotomy between "worldly" knowledge and "genuine" Christian wisdom. The late second/ early third-century North African author Tertullian, for instance, famously asked "what has Athens to do with Jerusalem? What has [Plato's] Academy to do with the church?"[56] Several others, however, like Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria, both of whom wrote in the late second/early third century, presented Christian life as the ideal manifestation of classical *paideia*.[57] Indeed, many (if not most) educated Christians would have disagreed with Tertullian's Athens/Jerusalem dichotomy, as *paideia* connected elites of various religious affiliations. In Alexandria, for example, both the Christian Origen and the "pagan" Plotinus—teacher of the famous anti-Christian polemicist Porphyry—learned philosophy under the tutelage of the Platonist philosopher Ammonius Saccas.[58]

While the fourth century saw the continuation of this intermingling, three important developments heightened tensions among Christian and Hellenic elites over whether, to what extent, and in what capacities Christians should embrace *paideia*. The first such development is the rising interest in asceticism among elite Christians. Texts like Athanasius' *Life of Antony*, which praised an (allegedly) unlearned monk's ability to defeat both "heretics" and "pagans" in

---

[55] Averil Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire*, Sather Classical Lectures 55 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1991), 15-46.
[56] *Pr. haeret.* 7.9: Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? quid academiae et ecclesiae?
[57] Justin Martyr: Jeremy Schott, *Christianity, Empire, and the Making of Religion in Late Antiquity*, Divinations (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 39-43. Clement: Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*, 2nd ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008), 122-39.
[58] Watts, *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria*, TCH 41 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2006), 150-68; Elizabeth DePalma Digeser, *A Threat to Public Piety: Christians, Platonists, and the Great Persecution* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012), 23-49.

philosophical debates, inspired young elite Christians to achieve a new kind of authority by rejecting the "secular" treasures of *paideia*.[59] Most famously, in 397 Augustine of Hippo (d. 430) recounted in his autobiographical *Confessions* that Antony's example inspired him to abandon his career as a teacher of rhetoric and receive baptism from Ambrose of Milan.[60] Augustine, however, was not the only elite Christian to place asceticism at odds with classical *paideia*. As mentioned above, Basil of Caesarea abandoned his post as teacher of rhetoric in order to travel in search of his ascetic mentor Eustathius.[61] In late fourth-century Antioch, such instances of young "dropouts" were so common that John Chrysostom (d. 407) wrote a treatise *Against the Opponents of Monastic Life*, in which he devoted two books to refuting parents who objected that their children were abandoning their expensive education in order to become ascetics in the Syrian hinterland.[62] While Augustine, Basil, and John Chrysostom lived in different regions of the Empire and at different points in the fourth century, all three of them highlighted how ascetic life could appeal to well-educated elites. As children, these men were trained in the traditional curriculum of Latin and Greek *paideia*, and they certainly applied the grammatical and rhetorical skills they learned in the classroom to their work as bishops and priests delivering sermons,

---

[59] Watts, *Final Pagan Generation*, 154-7. As Antony's own surviving letters show, this monk was not as unlearned as Athanasius portrayed him (Samuel Rubenson, *The Letters of St. Antony: Monasticism and the Making of a Saint*, Studies in Antiquity and Christianity [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995], 11). For Athanasius' construction of Antony as unlearned, see David Brakke, *Athanasius and Asceticism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 253-62.

[60] *Conf.* 8.6.15.

[61] *Ep.* 1.

[62] *Adv. opp.* 2-3. For analysis, see David Hunter, *A Comparison Between a King and a Monk; Against the Opponents of the Monastic Life: Two Treatises* (Lewiston, NY: E. Mellen Press, 1988), 1-68. Edward Watts also refers to educated elites like Augustine and Basil who adopted ascetic Christian life as "dropouts" (Watts, *Final Pagan Generation* [2015], 157-61).

refuting theological enemies, and interpreting biblical texts.[63] Yet in their advocacy of ascetic life, they called on young Christian elites to abandon the classroom and embrace a life that they characterized in opposition to the schooling of "the world."

The second development that contributed to fourth-century tensions over the heritage of *paideia* was the reign of the emperor Julian and its aftermath. As part of his efforts to promote Hellenism, this emperor issued controversial legislation that prohibited people from teaching grammar and rhetoric if they did not worship in the gods revered in classical texts.[64] In theory, this legislation sought to promote teachers' morals, but in practice, it attacked Christians (as well as more moderate "pagans").[65] As Julian quipped in an imperial rescript, if Christian teachers did not believe that ancient Greeks like Homer and Plato spoke truthfully about the gods, they should "go to the churches of the Galileans [his derogatory label for Christians] and expound Matthew and Luke."[66] Legally, Julian's legislation did not have a significant impact, as after his death a new law was issued that simply required teachers to be "equally suitable in life and eloquence,"

---

[63] For Augustine's preaching and its roots in classical rhetoric and philosophy, see especially Paul Kolbet, *Augustine and the Cure of Souls: Revising a Classical Ideal*, Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 17 (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010). For a similar study of John Chrysostom's preaching, see Jacyln Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity* (2006). For Basil as educated preacher, see Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (1994), 133-89, as well as Jaclyn Maxwell, "The Attitudes of Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus toward Uneducated Christians," *SP* 47 (2010), 117-22.

[64] The legislation appears in two forms: a law in the Theodosian Code (*CTh* 13.3.5) declaring that teachers needed to be morally upright, and Julian's *Ep.* 61c (Wright 36) specifying that moral rectitude consisted of worshiping the gods. Among the many analyses of this controversial legislation and its place in Julian's imperial policy, see in particular Rowland Smith, *Julian's Gods* (1995), 207-16; Emilio Germino, *Scuola e cultura nella legislazione di Giuliano l'Apostata* (Naples: Eugenio Jovene, 2004), 135-91; Watts, *City and School* (2006), 64-78; Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 139-43; Neil McLynn, "Julian and the Christian Professors," in Carol Harrison, Caroline Humfress, and Isabella Sandwell (eds.), *Being Christian in Late Antiquity: a Festschrift for Gillian Clark* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 120-36; Raffaella Cribiore, *Libanius the Sophist* (2013), 229-37.

[65] Raffaella Cribiore argues that Julian sought with this teaching legislation to distinguish "fervent pagans like himself from the gray pagans for whom the worship of the gods was little more than a traditional way of life": Cribiore, *Libanius the Sophist* (2013), 235.

[66] Julian, *Ep.* 61c 50-3 (Wright 36 423c-d). βαδιζόντων εἰς τὰς τῶν Γαλιλαίων ἐκκλησίας, ἐξηγησόμενοι Ματθαῖον καὶ Λουκᾶν.

without Julian's specific requirement of worship.[67] Even when Julian was alive, moreover, it is uncertain to what extent—if at all—the emperor wished to remove Christian teachers forcibly, or simply to trap them in a logical quandary in which they would have to admit that they did not acknowledge the legitimacy of the gods about whom they taught.[68] Yet while the legal effects of Julian's legislation were not substantial, this emperor did raise questions among educated Christians as to whether they could lay claim to the cultural treasures of *paideia* without supporting the gods of Homer and Vergil. In the words of H.A. Drake, Julian's teaching legislation "had the overall effect of driving a wedge between Christian belief and classical culture, thereby putting Christians steeped in this culture on the defensive in a way they had not been before."[69] Gregory of Nazianzus sought to defend Christians' right to *paideia* by arguing that Christians, not *Hellēnes* like Julian, were true heirs of the words (*logoi*) of the classical past because they worshiped Christ the Word (*Logos*).[70] Not all Christians, however, saw such a positive correlation between *Logos* and *logoi*. Marius Victorinus and Prohaeresius, renowned rhetors in Rome and Athens, respectively, reacted to Julian's teaching law by voluntarily resigning.[71] By his efforts to separate Christians from classical *paideia*, Julian introduced Tertullian's Athens/Jerusalem dichotomy into the minds of many fourth-century Christian elites.

---

[67] *CTh* 13.3.6. *Si qui erudiendis adulescentibus vita pariter et facundia idoneus erit, vel novum instituat auditorium vel repetat intermissum.* Indeed, the effectiveness of any piece of Roman legislation is debatable, since it depended on local elites' willingness and ability to post and enforce legislation sent by the emperor. For more on the functioning of imperial law in the late Roman Empire, see Simon Corcoran, *Empire of the Tetrarchs: Imperial Pronouncements and Government, AD 284-324*, Oxford Classical Monographs (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); John Matthews, *Laying Down the Law: a Study of the Theodosian Code* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000).

[68] McLynn, "Julian and the Christian Professors" (2013), 128-30.

[69] H.A. Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops* (2000), 435. For Julian's policies situated within a wider development of Christian intolerance in the later fourth century, see also Drake, "Lambs into Lions: Explaining Early Christian Intolerance," *Past and Present* 153 (1996), 3-36.

[70] *Or.* 4, Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 378-96.

[71] Marius Victorinus: *Conf*. 8.5.10. Prohaeresius: Eunap. *VS* 493, Jer. *Chron.* 363.

The final fourth-century development that encouraged tension over Christians' relationship to *paideia* manifested itself in the bitter theological conflicts between rival Christian factions. These conflicts were most prevalent in the eastern Empire and were centered around disagreements over the nature of the Trinity, and in particular, over the relationship between God the Father and God the Son/Word.[72] Initially spurred by a controversy in Alexandria between the priest Arius and his bishop Alexander, in 325 the Council of Nicaea met under the emperor Constantine's supervision in order to establish consensus about the relationship between the Father and the Son. This council issued a creed declaring that the Son was of the same essence (*homoousios*) as the Father, and condemning anyone (such as Arius) who declared that the Father and Son were of different substances. At this time, however, the creed was an *ad hoc* composition meant to condemn Arius' teachings, and not the fundamental piece of Christian theology it would later become.[73] While some, such as Athanasius of Alexandria (bishop Alexander's successor), argued in favor of describing the Son as *homoousios*, for the quarter century after the Council of Nicaea this term had little currency.[74] During the reigns of Constantine and his successor Constantius, bishops and priests continued to dispute theology while the emperors sought to establish a compromise between rival positions. It was with such compromise in mind that Constantius supported Homoian bishops, who believed that the Father and Son were similar (*homoios*), but supported a hierarchical difference between the two and refused to acknowledge the terminology of essence (*ousia*) used in the Council of Nicaea.[75] In

---

[72] The best narrative of fourth-century church politics comes from Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy* (2004), 41-269, 430-35.
[73] Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy* (2004), 85-100; Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 2002), 48-81; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: the Arian Controversy, 318-381* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 152-78.
[74] Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy* (2004), 100-30; Hanson, *The Search for Christian Doctrine* (1988), 181-207.
[75] Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy* (2004), 134-40; Hanson, *The Search for Christian Doctrine* (1988), 315-47.

359-60, Constantius called a council declaring Homoian theology to be correct and condemning dissenting bishops to exile.[76]

From Constantius' reign in the 350s to the beginning of Theososius' in 379, bishops with multiple theological positions competed for dominance in the Roman empire. Some, most notably the Cappadocians, rejected Constantius' Homoian councils and supported the original Nicene use of *homoousios*, for which reason modern scholars have called them either Homoousians or pro-Nicenes. Pro-Nicenes argued fervently for a doctrine that acknowledged equality between the Father and Son, as well as for the divinity of the Holy Spirit.[77] Others, such as Basil of Caesarea's mentor Eustathius, likewise opposed the Homoians, but hesitated to adopt the term *homoousios*. Instead, they described the Son as of a similar substance, *homoiousios*, and have thus been called Homoiousians.[78] Still others, such as the Cappadocians' theological rival Eunomius, adopted a doctrine that the Son was of a different substance (*heterousios*), and have thus been designated Heterousians by modern scholars.[79] There was little compromise between supporters of these rival theological camps, and power usually rested in the hands of whomever the emperor supported. Thus while Julian had recalled all previously-exiled bishops, under the reign of the emperor Valens (r. 364-378), who strongly supported Homoian doctrine, pro-Nicenes, Homoiousians, and Heterousians alike were exiled.[80] The emperor Theodosius, however, was a supporter of the pro-Nicene faction, and summoned a council at Constantinople in 381 that produced a creed supporting the legitimacy of the Council of Nicaea, declaring its

---

[76] Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy* (2004), 157-66; Hanson, *The Search for Christian Doctrine* (1988), 362-71.
[77] Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy* (2004), 140-4, 171-221, 236-40; Hanson, *The Search for Christian Doctrine* (1988), 451-556, 639-737.
[78] Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy* (2004), 149-57; Hanson, *The Search for Christian Doctrine* (1988), 348-57.
[79] Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy* (2004), 144-9; Vaggione, *Eunomius* (2000); Hanson, *The Search for Christian Doctrine* (1988), 598-636.
[80] Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy* (2004), 168-71; Vaggione, *Eunomius* (2000), 311.

doctrine to be orthodox, and exiling those who opposed it.[81] The Council of Constantinople effectively placed Basil (albeit posthumously) and the Gregorys on the winning side of fourth-century trinitarian conflicts.

To understand the relevance of Christian attitudes toward *paideia* to these conflicts, it is important to consider two points. First, terms like "same substance," "similar substance," and "different substance", whose values fourth-century bishops so intensely argued, were already loaded with a complexity of meanings from classical Greek philosophy.[82] The bishops who most actively disputed the uses of these terms were, on the whole, highly-educated products of classical Greek *paideia*, and deployed their high levels of grammatical, rhetorical and philosophical education to interpret Christian theology. Second, although bishops drew on classical learning for theological interpretation, there was debate over to what extent classical knowledge could (or should) be used to explain the ineffable essence of the Divine. This was a particularly prominent issue for the Cappadocian Fathers, who attacked Eunomius for (allegedly) suggesting that the human brain could comprehend the true nature of the Trinity.[83] In the fourth century, then, disputes among educated Christians over the proper use of classical *paideia* served not just to distinguish Christians from "pagans," but also—and often more importantly—to distinguish "orthodox" from "heretical" Christians.

---

[81] Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy* (2004), 240-60.
[82] Vaggione, *Eunomius* (2000), 53-7. For theological studies emphasizing the links between Greek philosophy and the Cappadocians' trinitarian theology, see especially Michel René Barnes, *Power of God: Δύναμις in Gregory of Nyssa's Trinitarian Theology* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2001), Mark DelCogliano, *Basil of Caesarea's anti-Eunomian Theory of Names: Christian Theology and Late-Antique Philosophy in the Fourth Century Trinitarian Controversy* (Boston: Brill, 2010); Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, *Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and the Transformation of Divine Simplicity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).
[83] Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (1994), 93-132; Vaggione, *Eunomius* (2000), 79-93, 147; Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 403-13.

While all three of these developments created tension for Christian elites in the fourth century over their relationship to *paideia*, this tension manifested itself through the cultural language of *paideia*. Some Christians, like Gregory of Nazianzus, were explicit about their connection with classical culture, and declared their elite education a marker of their genuine suitability for Christian leadership. Others, like Basil, who renounced their childhood exposure to elite education, still participated in a discourse shaped by this education. Even when they labeled the *paideia* that molded them into well-born elites as a worldly vanity, Christians like Basil deployed categories that were rooted in longstanding ideals of the educated elite. In each case, the language of *paideia* about molding, impressing, naturalizing, and performing elite status allowed highly-educated authors to present themselves and their communities as "proper" adherents of the Divine, while assailing their enemies as "pagans" and "heretics."

Philosophical Asceticism and Self-Presentation in Late Antiquity

This dissertation approaches the Cappadocians' and Julian's participation in the late antique discourse of *paideia* by examining these authors' views on asceticism, paying close attention to how these authors presented themselves as ascetics, and how these strategies of self-presentation reflected their immersion in the elite culture of classical *paideia*.[84] Before discussing this self-presentation, however, I must specify my use of the term "asceticism." I follow Dale Martin's definition of this word as "those human impulses and practices of self-

[84] I intentionally choose the term "asceticism," *not* "monasticism," to describe the writings and communities of the Cappadocian Fathers. While the Cappadocians' organized community at Annisa could be referred to as a "monastic" community, I prefer the term "asceticism," because during the scope of this study it was not institutionalized as a monastery, and because "asceticism" focuses more on the performative exercises in which I am interested.

control, training, and discipline that reject or avoid, for the purpose of attaining a 'higher good,' the enjoyment of 'goods' normally thought appropriate for human use in the society in question."[85] For the ancient world, Martin has listed "fasting, renouncing sexual or erotic contact, avoiding bathing, giving up wine, and depriving oneself of familial and customary social connections or other comforts" as characteristic ascetic practices, and has also specified that "certain behaviors that may be considered 'normal' when practiced to a limited degree (prayer, fasting, standing, kneeling) become 'ascetic' when practiced to an extent considered by most people of the society to be beyond the 'normal.'"[86] The Cappadocians and Julian constantly advocated such practices in their writings. For these authors, moreover, I would add dressing modestly—a corollary, perhaps, to "avoiding bathing"—and avoiding the reading of certain texts —a corollary, perhaps, to "depriving oneself of customary social connections"—as particularly significant ascetic practices.

When discussing the Cappadocians' and Julian's ascetic writings, however, it is important to keep in mind that these authors provided far from the only versions of late antique asceticism. Even beyond the traditional scholarly distinction between the solitary hermitage of Antony and the communal monasticism of Pachomius—and, indeed, most late antique scholars no longer accept Antony and Pachomius as founders of asceticism or monasticism—practices across the late ancient Mediterranean world that could be labeled "ascetic" varied significantly based on the

---

[85] Dale B. Martin, "Introduction," in Dale B. Martin and Patricia Cox Miller (eds.), *The Cultural Turn in Late Ancient Studies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 1-21, 15. Richard Valantasis has offered a more positive interpretation of "asceticism" that places less emphasis on the activity of self-denial, and instead views "asceticism" as an exercise in self-improvement that transforms one's self for the better: Richard Valantasis, "Is The Gospel of Thomas Ascetical?" *JECS* 7:1 (1999), 55-81. Martin, however, pushes back against Valantasis' positive definition of asceticism as any kind of self-transformation as too broad: Martin, "Introduction" (2005), 14-15. For an account of nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarly approaches to asceticism across geographical and disciplinary boundaries, see Vincent L. Wimbush and Richard Valantasis, "Introduction," in *idem* (eds.), *Asceticism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), xix-xxxiii.

[86] Martin, "Introduction" (2005), 15-6.

geographic location, domesticity, urban/rural proximity, religious affiliation, gender, and class of the practitioners.[87] As Elizabeth Clark has aptly argued, "since asceticism has meaning only in relation to other behaviors in a given culture, scholars can best study the varying 'structures of compensation,' what ascetics give up and what they get, in various particular historical situations."[88] Accordingly, in this study, I do not characterize "asceticism" as a monolithic entity, but instead pay attention to the ideals and practices that the Cappadocians and Julian advocated that can reasonably be labeled "ascetic," and place these ideals and practices within these authors' historical and geographical contexts in the fourth-century eastern Roman empire.

The ascetic practices of the Cappadocians and Julian were deeply rooted in the world of elite *paideia* in which these men had been immersed from childhood. In particular, their writings on asceticism often echo ideals promoted by ancient philosophers, particularly Platonists and Stoics.[89] As Werner Jaeger has observed concerning Gregory of Nyssa, "as the Greek philosopher's whole life was a process of *paideia* through philosophical ascesis, so for Gregory Christianity was not a mere set of dogmas but the perfect life based on the *theoria* or contemplation of God and on ever more perfect union with Him."[90] Similarly, Pierre Hadot has argued that educated Christians—including the Cappadocians, whom he cites extensively—

---

[87] For overviews of the variety of types of asceticism/monasticism in Late Antiquity, see especially Elizabeth A. Clark, *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), 14-42; J. William Harmless, S.J., "Monasticism," in Susan Ashbrook Harvey and David Hunter (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 493-517; Columba Stewart, OSB, "Monasticism," in Philip F. Esler (ed.), *The Early Christian World*, vol. 1 (New York: Routledge, 2000), 344-64. For a discussion of traditional scholarly approaches to asceticism (before the linguistic and cultural turns in the later twentieth century), see Vincent L. Wimbush and Richard Valantasis, "Introduction," in *idem* (eds.), *Asceticism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), xix-xxxiii.

[88] Clark, *Reading Renunciation* (1999), 15. The "strategies of compensation" comes from Geoffrey Galt Harpham, "Asceticism and the Compensations of Art," in *Asceticism* (1995), 357-68, 359-60.

[89] For an overview of these ideals in the Hellenistic period and their persistence into the Roman Empire, see Pierre Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?* trans. Michael Chase (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2002), esp. 55-76, 126-42, 143-71.

[90] Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (1961), 90.

viewed Christianity as a philosophy, and asceticism as the spiritual exercises in which Christian philosophers engaged.[91] Hadot, in turn, heavily influenced the works of Michel Foucault, who has studied both Christian asceticism and ancient philosophy as methods of caring for the "self" in antiquity.[92] Historians of Late Antiquity have continued this trend of highlighting connections, rather than rifts, between Christian asceticism/monasticism and classical philosophy/*paideia*.[93]

The philosophical asceticism advocated by the Cappadocians and Julian was intertwined with ideas about social class and the boundaries between elites and the rest of society. These authors tended to describe their asceticism in terms of self-moderation (*sōphrosunē*) and self-control (*enkrateia*), values commonly praised by educated Greek and Roman elites.[94] In doing so, they sought to draw a line between their own "moderate" asceticism and the "extreme" asceticism of theological and philosophical rivals, whom they caricatured as non-elite and/or anti-elite. While they presented their own ascetic practices as natural parts of their religious devotion and as examples of their self-moderation, they rebuked their rivals, who performed similar practices and adopted similar appearance, as non-elite "extremists" seeking to subvert

---

[91] Pierre Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life: Spiritual Exercises from Socrates to Foucault*, ed. Arnold I. Davidson, trans. Michael Chase (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1995), 126-44; *idem*, *What is Ancient Philosophy?* (2002), 237-52. For a broader study of the Cappadocians' use of the term "philosophy," see also Anne Marie Malingrey, *'Philosophia': étude d'un groupe de mots dans la littérature grecque, des présocratiques au IVe siècle après J.C.*, Études et commentaires 40 (Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1961), 207-61.

[92] Michel Foucault, "Self Writing," "Technologies of the Self," in *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth, the Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*, vol. 1, ed. Paul Rabinow, trans. Robert Hurley et al. (New York: New Press, 1997), 207-51. For recent analysis of the "self" in antiquity, see also the articles in David Brakke, Michael L. Satlow, and Steven Weitzman (eds.), *Religion and the Self in Antiquity* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2005).

[93] See, for example, Douglas Burton-Christie, *The Word in the Desert: Scripture and the Quest for Holiness in Early Christian Monasticism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); Philip Rousseau, "The Identity of the Ascetic Master in the *Historia Religiosa* of Theodoret of Cyrrhus: a New *Paideia*?" *Mediterranean Archaeology* 11 (1998), 229-44; Clark, *Reading Renunciation* (1999), 53-61; Samuel Rubenson, "Philosophy and Simplicity: The Problem of Classical Education in Early Christian Biography," in *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (2000), 110-39; Lillian I. Larsen, "The *Apophthegmata Patrum*: Rustic Rumination or Rhetorical Recitation," *Meddelanden från Collegium Patristicum Lundense* 23 (2008), 21-30. See also the forthcoming articles by Lillian Larsen, Janet Timbie, and Edward Watts, in Peter Gemeinhardt, Lieve Van Hoof, and Peter Van Nuffelen (eds.), *Education and Religion in Late Antiquity: Reflections, Social Contexts, and Genres* (forthcoming, New York: Routledge, 2016).

[94] Clark, *Reading Renunciation* (1999), 20-1.

social norms. When, for instance, Basil accused Eustathius of falsely adopting ascetic dress, he followed previous Roman elites who expressed tension over the boundary between the "proper" asceticism of elites and the "subversive" asceticism of "others." Such discourse was by no means new to the fourth century. As James Francis has argued, second-century "pagan" elites such as Marcus Aurelius, Lucian, Philostratus, and Celsus valued ascetic self-denial, while at the same time ridiculing groups such as Cynics and Christians for adopting a style of asceticism they considered excessively rigorous, and thus antithetical to *paideia*.[95] Moreover, as Kate Cooper has shown, early Christians such as the authors of the second- and third-century *Apocryphal Acts* adapted the elite rhetoric of self-moderation in a way that both promoted biblical figures as ascetic heroes and challenged the social order that elites sought to uphold through their moderated asceticism.[96] As I will argue in this study, the Cappadocians and Julian participated in similar debates over traditional elite *sōphrosunē*, on the one hand, and "extremist" asceticism, on the other.

Because the Cappadocians' and Julian's asceticism was so closely tied up with their ideas about social class, recent scholarship on elite self-presentation in the ancient world offers valuable insight for this dissertation. Some of the most prominent sources in this field of inquiry deserve mention here. Notably, in her study on second-sophistic (ca. 50-250 CE) rhetoric, Maud Gleason has drawn on the work of Pierre Bourdieu to argue for the importance of *paideia* in forming and maintaining an ethos among orators that communicated their elite status to each other and to those around them:

---

[95] James A. Francis, *Subversive Virtue: Asceticism and Authority in the Second-Century Pagan World* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), esp. xiv, 50-1, 77-8, 157-8, 182.
[96] Kate Cooper, *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), 58-60.

> All well-born males were trained in adolescence, by competing with their peers, to display the "cultural capital" that distinguished authentic members of the elite from other members of society who might quite literally speak a different language. The star performers who attracted large audiences valorized *paideia* by making it appear to be the prize of a bruising competition for status dominance. By this kind of dramatization, enhanced by all the charms of symbolic violence, the gap between the educated and the uneducated came to seem in no way arbitrary, but the result of a nearly biological superiority.[97]

Gleason has also highlighted the importance of *paideia* in producing and displaying masculinity, an ideal that rhetors conceived of as "an achieved state" that took years of "training in both voice and body, both rhetoric and deportment," in order to display and defend an elite Roman *habitus*, as it was defined by "a complex web of cultural expectations about how the individual embodies manliness and how society 'reads' the signs of this embodiment."[98] As Gleason has argued, elite education in the Roman Empire was a continuous process of self-presentation that sought to communicate ideals of both status and gender.

Similarly, Thomas Schmitz' study of the Second Sophistic has examined *paideia* as a tool for producing and communicating ideals that legitimized ruling elites both within the upper classes and among the wider public.[99] According to Schmitz, the style of second-sophistic rhetoric, whose efforts to recreate the Attic of fifth-century Athens have led previous historians of antiquity to denounce the Second Sophistic as a stilted, archaic, and pedantic period of decline, actually served as a strategy of social distinction that sharpened barriers between elites and the rest of the population.[100] By performing such highly stylized speeches extemporaneously, Greek orators in early imperial Rome sought to signal a mastery of education that came not

---

[97] Gleason, *Making Men* (1995), xxi.
[98] Gleason, *Making Men* (1995), 159.
[99] Schmitz, *Bildung und Macht* (1997), 232-4.
[100] Schmitz, *Bildung und Macht* (1997), 67-96.

simply from school training, but also—and more importantly—from natural talent and inborn character.[101] As Schmitz has argued, the ideals of rhetoric in the Second Sophistic made legitimate *paideia* "not a learnable, retrievable knowledge…but an apparently effortless conduct, conforming to social conventions, along with this knowledge."[102] Like Gleason, Schmitz has stressed that educated elites used *paideia* to present themselves as natural claimants to the highest levels of the Roman social pyramid.

Second-sophistic rhetors' self-presentation required consistent control of speech, conduct, and demeanor because the declamations in which they engaged involved constant evaluation of a person's character. Physiognomy, the art of reading one's nature through their physical appearance, offered a language with which people could perform such evaluations of others.[103] In the highly-competitive world of public declamation, rhetors deployed this art to denounce their rivals. As Tamsyn Barton has demonstrated, it is no accident that physiognomic treatises tend to focus more on negative than on positive descriptions of bodies and characters—fundamentally, physiognomy was an art of invective.[104] Even beyond the world of public declamation, however, the perceived link between external appearance and internal nature heavily influenced mentalities in the ancient world. As Maud Gleason has observed, "everyone who had to choose a son-in-law or traveling companion, deposit valuables before a journey, buy slaves, or make a

---

[101] Schmitz, *Bildung und Macht* (1997), 136-59.
[102] Schmitz, *Bildung und Macht* (1997), 233: "…die legitime Kultur zum Maßstab des Gebildetseins nicht ein erlernbares, abrufbares Wissen machte, sondern den scheinbar mühelosen, den sozialen Konventionen konformen Umgang mit diesem Wissen."
[103] Gleason, *Making Men* (1995)*,* 55-73. For a general outline of physiognomy in the ancient world, see George Boys-Stones, "Physiognomy and Ancient Psychological Theory," in *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul: Polemon's* Physiognomy *from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam*, ed. Simon Swain (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 19-125. For discussions of Polemon's *Physiognomy* specifically, see Simon Swain, "Polemon's *Physiognomy*" in *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul* (2007), 125-201; Tamsyn S. Barton, *Power and Knowledge: Astrology, Physiognomics, and Medicine under the Roman Empire* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1992): 95-132.
[104] Barton, *Power and Knowledge* (1992), 113.

business loan became perforce an amateur physiognomist: he made risky inferences from human surfaces to human depths."[105] As I will demonstrate, the Cappadocians and Julian fashioned themselves as just such "amateur physiognomists" as they fought to assert themselves as "proper" philosophers, ascetics, and orthodox religious leaders in the second half of the fourth century.

Recent scholarship has emphasized the persistence of second-sophistic strategies of elite self-presentation in the late antique world. Virginia Burrus has drawn on Maud Gleason's work to argue that fourth-century trinitarian theology both was shaped by and transformed traditional Roman ideals of masculinity.[106] While not focusing on the theology which forms the bulk of Burrus' study, I too emphasize the relevance of Gleason's work on second-century rhetoric to interpret a later period in Roman history. The Cappadocians and Julian claimed that their philosophical asceticism distanced them from rhetorical competitions for "useless" secular glory, yet their writings continuously show their concern for shaping, controlling, and presenting self-images that signaled their proper mastery of *paideia*. In doing so, they revealed their connection —sometimes explicitly, and sometimes implicitly—to the cultural milieu of the educated elite. As Edward Watts has argued, "the later Roman educational environment encouraged students to develop a distinct personal identity that was shaped by the rituals and rhythms of both the specific teaching circle to which they belonged and the larger intellectual community in which they functioned."[107] I add that this statement holds not only for *Hellēnes* like Julian, who explicitly and enthusiastically linked their religious formation to their student days in Athens, but

---

[105] Gleason, *Making Men* (1995), 55.
[106] Virginia Burrus, *Begotten not Made: Conceiving Manhood in Late Antiquity* (Stanford, CA: University of California Press, 2000).
[107] Edward Watts, "The Student Self in Late Antiquity," in *Religion and the Self in Antiquity* (2005), 234-51, 236.

also for Christians like Basil, who directly opposed their religious formation to their education. All educated elite Romans deployed strategies of self-presentation to construct their identities in relation to their experience with *paideia*.

Even before the fourth century, moreover, some educated Christians presented themselves as well-cultivated elites. As Peter Brown has observed, Clement of Alexandria drew heavily on classical *paideia* in his construction of a Christian *habitus*:

> An instinctive sense of form, an alert sensitivity to others, and a deep belief that the body could convey messages as precisely as any words could do had lain at the heart of the pagan notion of moral refinement. The codes taught by philosophers, and applied to the needs of the public man by a cultivated urban aristocracy, were appropriated and transformed by Clement. They were taken back from the tense and power-conscious world of civic notables and applied to the more sheltered needs of the believing household.[108]

In his analysis on Clement's *Paidagōgos*, an instructional treatise aimed at teaching Christians proper conduct, Brown has directly quoted Pierre Bourdieu: "Clement, the gifted teacher, 'exhorts the essential while seeming to demand the insignificant'."[109] As Brown has shown, exhortations in the *Paidagōgos* to control every aspect of the body, including elements that may seem irrelevant to spirituality, such as table manners, sought to groom Christians to embody a refined *habitus* that mirrored the image of a Roman elite.[110] This refined *habitus* would have resonated well with the philosophical values promoted in the fourth century by educated elites like the Cappadocians and Julian.

These fourth-century elites, however, valued ascetic renunciation to a much greater degree than did Clement. While Clement presented Christianity as a process of forming a

---

[108] Brown, *Body and Society*, 2nd ed. (2008), 125-6.
[109] Brown, *Body and Society*, 2nd ed. (2008), 126, quoting Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (1977), 94.
[110] Brown, *Body and Society*, 2nd ed. (2008), 126-7.

cultivated elite *habitus*, later elites—both Christian and "pagan"—increasingly presented themselves as distinctly *un*-cultivated ascetics. Recent late antique scholarship has made considerable strides in understanding the performative elements of asceticism by drawing on the works of contemporary scholars of performance and identity such as Erving Goffman, Catherine Bell, and Judith Butler.[111] Drawing upon these scholars' works, Patricia Cox Miller, Teresa Shaw, and Georgia Frank have each analyzed late antique ascetic texts as literature that sought to enable readers to "see" the piety of ascetic heroes through vivid descriptions of ascetics' (often filthy) bodies.[112] Frank has even suggested that authors of travel narratives such as the early fifth-century *History of the Monks of Egypt* and the *Lausiac History* constructed an "ascetic physiognomy" in which pilgrims learned of ascetics' virtue by examining their heads and faces.[113] Rebecca Krawiec, Kristi Upson-Saia, and Arthur Urbano, moreover, have drawn on Bourdieu's social theory, performance theory, and studies of fashion to interpret the rhetoric surrounding clothing and hairstyles in early Christian asceticism.[114] Their work has shown that

---

[111] Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (New York: Doubleday, 1959), esp. 1-76; Catherine Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 37-46; Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 140; and *eadem*, "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory," *Theatre Journal*, 40:4 (1988), 519-31.

[112] Patricia Cox Miller, "Desert Asceticism and 'The Body from Nowhere'," *JECS* 2:2 (1994), 137-53; Teresa M. Shaw, "Wolves in Sheep's Clothing: The Appearance of True and False Piety," *SP* 29 (1996), 127-32; eadem, "*Askesis* and the Appearance of Holiness," *JECS* 6:3 (1998), 485-99; Georgia Frank, *The Memory of the Eyes: Pilgrims to Living Saints in Christian Late Antiquity*, TCH 30 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000).

[113] Georgia Frank, *The Memory of the Eyes* (2000), 134-70.

[114] Rebecca Krawiec, "'Garments of Salvation': Representations of Monastic Clothing in Late Antiquity," *JECS* 17:1 (2009): 125-50; *eadem*, "'The Holy Habit and the Teachings of the Elders': Clothing and Social Memory in Late Antique Monasticism," in Kristi Upson-Saia, Carly Daniel-Hughes, and Alicia J. Batten (eds.), *Dressing Judeans and Christians in Antiquity* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014), 55-73; Kristi Upson-Saia, *Early Christian Dress: Gender, Virtue, and Authority* (New York: Routledge, 2011); *eadem*, "Hairiness and Holiness in the Early Christian Desert," in *Dressing Judeans and Christians* (2014), 155-74; Arthur P. Urbano, "'Dressing a Christian': The Philosopher's Mantle as Signifier of Pedagogical and Moral Authority," *SP* 62 (2013), 213-29; *idem*, "Sizing up the Philosopher's Cloak: Christian Verbal and Visual Representations of the *Tribōn*," in *Dressing Judeans and Christians* (2014), 175-94.

even when Christian ascetics claimed to renounce fashion, analyzing clothing as an element of self-presentation can help illuminate the social and cultural value of this renunciation.

The Cappadocians' and Julian's ascetic writings offer parallels both to the cultivated, moderated *habitus* promoted by second-sophistic rhetors and Christians like Clement of Alexandria, as well as to the ragged, unkempt ascetics praised by later Christian authors. These men shared Clement's elite upbringing, and like this author, they believed that virtue consisted of implanting, molding, shaping, and reproducing a well-cultured *habitus* through education. At the same time, however, they shared fourth- and fifth-century ascetic authors' value of unkempt bodies and worn faces as markers of "genuine" sanctity. For the Cappadocians and Julian, the physical body indeed signaled the virtue of the soul within, yet the body's signals were more complex for these men than they were for elites of previous centuries. Their ascetic writings manage to convey both the importance of a traditional elite *habitus*, implanted in early childhood and cultivated through education, and the value of abandoning such a *habitus* to approach the Divine through ascetic praxis.

Moreover, the controversies in which the Cappadocians and Julians were enmeshed meant that for these men, much more was at stake in their efforts at self-presentation than just status or gender. While Brown has remarked that Clement took codes of conduct from "the tense and power-conscious world of civic notables" to the "more sheltered needs of the believing household," the Cappadocians and Julian inhabited an intellectual milieu that was anything but sheltered. As Susanna Elm has observed, educated elites in the fourth century, both Christian and Hellenic, shared a common concern over the importance of *paideia* in producing leaders of the

inhabited world (*oikoumenē*) who could lead people towards the correct God or gods.[115] This common concern is what made Christians like Gregory of Nazianzus so bitterly opposed to *Hellēnes* like Julian: since each believed in the necessity of *paideia* to lead people to the Divine, their disagreement over the nature of the Divine made them rival contestants to the cultural capital of *paideia*.[116] I argue that philosophical self-presentation was essential to this contest. Debate over legitimate philosophical *habitus* was a vital component in fourth-century competitions over the heritage of *paideia* and its relation to the Divine. By presenting themselves as elite philosophers whose self-moderation was a natural extension of their wisdom and virtue, the Cappadocians and Julian sought to communicate their mastery of the religious knowledge necessary to lead the wider population to the Divine, more than their masculinity or social ranking. The Cappadocians and Julian drew on longstanding techniques with which educated elites asserted their legitimate claims to social status, and applied these techniques to assert their legitimate claim to something even more important to them: religious orthodoxy/orthopraxy.

Ascetic Bodies

In order to understand the Cappadocians' and Julian's self-presentation as ascetics and philosophers in their battles over the cultural capital of *paideia*, it is worthwhile to discuss theories about the body in Late Antiquity. Traditional scholarship has viewed the philosophical asceticism of educated elites almost entirely as an exercise of the mind, while diminishing the importance of the body. Werner Jaeger, for instance, has remarked that while Gregory of Nyssa's concept of Christian *paideia* drew metaphorically on the notion of physical growth, the spiritual

[115] Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 480-3.
[116] Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 483-5.

growth of *paideia* was "specifically different from the development of the body."[117] Hadot, meanwhile, has described the Cappadocians' philosophy in terms of a sharp dualism, "less the life of a human being than that of a soul," in which "the goal was to flee the body in order to turn toward a transcendent, intelligible reality and, if possible, to reach this reality in mystical experience."[118] Such an approach has subordinated bodily discipline to mental exercises, classifying the latter as the chief concern of elites.

Recent studies of Late Antiquity, however, have complicated this body/soul dichotomy by emphasizing that "the body" was not a fixed transhistorical constant, but is intimately linked to the social and cultural values of the world it inhabits.[119] In his seminal work on sexual renunciation in early Christianity, Peter Brown has approached early Christian ascetics' views on sex as evidence not of their deep-seated hatred of the physical body, but rather as part of a wide array of political, social, cultural, and theological ideas about the places of male and female bodies in society as a whole.[120] As Brown has emphasized, modern scholars should not read ancient texts about the body and think that the authors of these texts viewed "the body" in the same way as do people in a modern western society.[121] Brown's study has significantly complicated the traditional interpretation of practices such as sexual renunciation, fasting, avoiding bathing, and sleep deprivation, as evidence of early Christian ascetics' efforts to destroy their bodies in order to "free" their souls.

---

[117] Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (1961), 87.
[118] Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life* (2002), 252.
[119] Patricia Cox Miller, *The Corporeal Imagination: Signifying the Holy in Late Ancient Christianity*, Divinations (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 15-7.
[120] Peter Brown, *The Body and Society*, 2nd ed. (2008). Brown was heavily influenced by Michel Foucault's work on ancient sexuality and its relation to the self: Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 3 vols., trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Random House, 1978-86).
[121] Brown, *The Body and Society*, 2nd ed. (2008), xxv.

Numerous other studies in early Christianity have advanced scholarly understanding of how ancient people conceived of the body in relation to the mind, soul, "self," and the wider world. Much of this scholarship has benefitted from situating early Christian thought within the intellectual world of ancient medicine and philosophy. As Aline Rousselle has demonstrated, ancient medical theories about men's and women's bodies did not come from objective biological observations, but rather were shaped by Greco-Roman social norms.[122] Such norms shaped early Christian texts as much as they shaped "pagan" writings. Dale Martin, for instance, has demonstrated the importance of ancient medical and philosophical conceptions of the human body to Paul's first letter to the Corinthians.[123] Martin has argued that ancient doctors and philosophers—these two professions overlapped considerably—did not believe in a dichotomy between the physical, material body and the incorporeal, immaterial soul. Rather, ancient theories allowed for significant overlap between the body and soul, particularly since most theorists believed that the human body contained a balance of all of the elements in the cosmos.[124] Teresa Shaw, meanwhile, has drawn on ancient social and medical perceptions of the body to illuminate understanding of male and female ascetics' fasting and the perceived connections between fasting and sexual renunciation—both were considered practices of preventing corruptions from entering the body—in early Christianity.[125] Shaw has rightly warned against perceiving a sharp divide between "physical" and "spiritual" practices in early Christian

[122] Aline Rousselle, *Porneia: on Desire and the Body in Antiquity*, 2nd ed., trans. Felicia Pheasant (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1993), esp. 5-77.
[123] Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995).
[124] Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (1995), 3-37.
[125] Teresa Shaw, *The Burden of the Flesh: Fasting and Sexuality in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998).

asceticism, since ancient authors did not perceive bodily practices as distinct from nourishing the soul.[126]

In antiquity, the senses occupied a particularly liminal territory in this perceived ambiguous space between body and soul. Ancient doctors and philosophers viewed the senses both as processes carried out by bodily organs, and as channels by which the incorporeal soul was molded. In a sermon *On Vainglory*, John Chrysostom characterized a youth's soul as a city, and the senses as gateways that needed to be guarded in order to prevent corruptions from entering into the soul.[127] Such a comparison reflected longstanding attitudes about the role of the physical senses in shaping a person's character. Recent studies on both the classical world and on early Christianity—and the considerable overlap between them—have explored ancient views about the physical senses—in particular, sight and sound—and their relationship to the soul.[128] From Plato in the fourth century BCE to John Chrysostom in the fourth century CE, most educated elites believed that what a person (particularly during childhood) saw and heard had a substantial—and often indelible—effect on his or her character. Elites therefore viewed education as a process of controlling and fortifying the eyes and ears of young students. Further, as Susan Ashbrook Harvey and Georgia Frank have argued, in Late Antiquity Christians increasingly viewed the senses as tools by which people could be educated in divine wisdom.[129]

---

[126] Shaw, *Burden of the Flesh* (1998), 23.
[127] *Inan. glor.* 346-65.
[128] See, for example, Frank, *The Memory of the Eyes* (2000); Blake Leyerle, *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives: John Chyrsostom's Attack on Spiritual Marriage* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2001); Ruth Webb, *Demons and Dancers: Performance in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008); *eadem*, *Ekphrasis, Imagination, and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009); Carol Harrison, *The Art of Listening in the Early Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013). While less has been done for the other senses, Susan Harvey has explored the significance of scent in early Christian literature: Susan Ashbrook Harvey, *Scenting Salvation: Ancient Christianity and the Olfactory Imagination*, TCH 42 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2006). For taste, see Teresa Shaw, *Burden of the Flesh* (1998), 53-64.
[129] Susan Ashbrook Harvey, "Locating the Sensing Body: Perception and Religious Identity in Late Antiquity," in *Religion and the Self in Antiquity* (2005), 140-63; Georgia Frank, "The Sensory Self in the Hymns of Romanos the Melodist," in *Religion and the Self in Antiquity* (2005), 164-79.

As I will argue, the Cappadocians and Julian similarly viewed the body's eyes and ears not simply as organs which processed external stimuli, but as essential elements in the production and reproduction of "proper" (i.e., "orthodox") philosophical *habitus*.

Not only did ancient authors generally assume that the boundaries between individuals' bodies and souls were porous, they also emphasized substantial connectivity between different bodies/souls within a community of men and women. As Dale Martin has emphasized, theories of disease—whether caused by an imbalance of the body's elements in relation to the rest of the world, or by an invasion of a foreign substance into the body—informed Paul's views of how individuals' sexual and dietary transgressions could corrupt the communal body of Corinthian worshippers.[130] In her study of the Coptic monk Shenoute of Atripe (d. 465), Caroline Schroeder has drawn on Martin's study to argue that this monastic leader "built upon late antique discourses of the body and gender to produce a Christian subjectivity informed by his ideology of the body."[131] This "ideology of the body" shaped Shenoute's beliefs both that individual monks and nuns in his community must practice asceticism to care for their own bodies, and that they must depend on one another as part of a corporate body that was distinguished by gender and hierarchy.[132] As I will show, a similar interplay between individual and communal body can be seen in the writings of the Cappadocians and Julian, particularly in those of Basil and Gregory of

---

[130] Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (1995), 139-249.

[131] Caroline T. Schroder, *Monastic Bodies: Discipline and Salvation in Shenoute of Atripe*, Divinations (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 158. Schroeder draws heavily on Foucault's work on the body as a locus for the construction and negotiation of power dynamics (Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan [New York: Vintage Books, 1995]) and on Douglas' work on the rhetoric of the body in her anthropological study of purity and corruption (Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: an Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* [New York: Praeger, 1966]). For more on gender in Shenoute's monastic writings, see also Rebecca Krawiec, *Shenoute and the Women of the White Monastery: Egyptian Monasticism in Late Antiquity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002). For a comparable study of individual and communal monastic bodies in the early middle ages, see also Lynda L. Coon, *Dark Age Bodies: Gender and Monastic Practice in the Early Medieval West*, Middle Ages Series (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

[132] Schroeder, *Monastic Bodies* (2007), 8-15, 158-62.

Nyssa, who sought to turn their ascetic community at Annisa into a structured body of "proper" Christian ascetics, neatly divided by gender and social status.

Not only have studies published in the past few decades reevaluated ancient perceptions of the body/soul and the relation between individual and communal bodies, but the very activity of writing about the body has also received more critical attention from historians. Elizabeth Clark, Patricia Cox Miller, and Virginia Burrus, for instance, have investigated the ways in which male Christian authors attempted to write about the bodies of ascetics—in particular, female ascetics—in an effort to turn their bodies from negative markers of temptation to positive markers of holiness.[133] Derek Krueger, moreover, has analyzed the act of writing as an ascetic performance, "a bodily practice resulting in the production of text."[134] As Krueger has argued, texts and bodies were considered to be closely linked in the minds of ancient authors dating back to Plato, who stated that every discourse (*logos*) is organized like a body (*sōma*).[135] Christian authors, moreover, took this notion one step further. The Gospel of John's statement that "the word became flesh and dwelt among us" (Jn 1:14) meant that for Christian authors, "holy men and women made Christ legible in their bodies—made their bodies text."[136] Indeed, this notion of body as text would have fit well into the world of ancient physiognomy, in which a person's

---

[133] Elizabeth A. Clark, The Lady Vanishes: Dilemmas of a Feminist Historian after the 'Linguistic Turn'," *Church History* 67:1 (1998), 1-31; Patricia Cox Miller, "The Blazing Body: Ascetic Desire in Jerome's Letter to Eustochium," *JECS* 1:1 (1993), 21-45; Virginia Burrus, *The Sex Lives of Saints: an Erotics of Ancient Hagiography*, Divinations (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004). Miller has also done significant work to highlight the transformation of ideas about the body's role (as well as the role of materiality in general) in late antique constructions of the "self": Patricia Cox Miller, "Shifting Selves in Late Antiquity," in *Religion and the Self* (2005), 15-39; *eadem*, *Corporeal Imagination* (2009), 3-9, 18-41.

[134] Derek Krueger, *Writing and Holiness: the Practice of Authorship in the Early Christian East*, Divinations (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 8.

[135] Krueger, *Writing and Holiness* (2004), 133-4. The quotation from Plato is *Phdr*. 264c: Ἀλλὰ τόδε γε οἶμαί σε φάναι ἄν, δεῖν πάντα λόγον ὥσπερ ζῷον συνεστάναι σῶμά τι ἔχοντα αὐτὸν αὑτοῦ, ὥστε μήτε ἀκέφαλον εἶναι μήτε ἄπουν, ἀλλὰ μέσα τε ἔχειν καὶ ἄκρα, πρέποντα ἀλλήλοις καὶ τῷ ὅλῳ γεγραμμένα.

[136] Krueger, *Writing and Holiness* (2004), 134.

physical appearance could be "read" by those who knew how to interpret it. As I will demonstrate, this interplay between text and body was certainly relevant to the Cappadocians and Julian, who wrote texts that emphasized the power of words—both written and spoken—to fortify or corrupt bodies and souls.

The works of recent scholars of Late Antiquity have highlighted that studies of ascetic/monastic bodies—both individual and communal—must be understood within the wider social, cultural, and theological contexts in which the texts about these bodies were produced. Accordingly, in this study I approach the Cappadocians' and Julian's discussions of asceticism with close attention to the overlap between body, text, and soul in the mentalities of ancient thinkers. For these fourth-century elites, asceticism was a bodily practice not simply because it involved "physical" acts such as fasting, sexual abstinence, modesty in dress, and deprivation of sleep. Even the "mental" acts of reading, contemplating, speaking, and writing were described as bodily exercises in which the organs of the body—in particular, the eyes, ears, and mouth—functioned as more than just neutral vessels through which ideas passed into and out of the soul. Indeed, because of this close overlap, it is difficult to distinguish between "physical" and "mental" elements of asceticism in Late Antiquity.

Yet while recent scholarship has emphasized the physical/mental overlap in late antique ascetic discourse, less has been done to connect it to the discourse of *paideia* in Late Antiquity. Attention to the close relationship between body and soul in *paideia*, however, helps to understand how and why educated elites like the Cappadocians and Julian presented their ascetic praxis as the natural result of their noble birth, training, and morals—in other words, their *habitus* of *paideia*. These men argued that their education imparted to them something more than

knowledge of texts, rhetorical abilities, or even moral behavior. Education, they believed, implanted a certain *habitus* deep within one's very being, one that noticeably influenced the formation of the "self" in both body and soul, and which a properly-educated leader could then teach to others. For the Cappadocians and Julian, asceticism involved constant molding of a *habitus* that reflected the ideals and behaviors of educated Roman elites. This molding, in turn, related to the efforts of these authors to define and defend boundaries between religious communities: members of the "right" communities received the "right" words and images into their bodies/souls, while members of the "wrong" communities either received the "wrong" words and images, or received the "right" words and images improperly.

Outline of Chapters

This dissertation is divided into five chapters, each of which presents a case study focusing on a particular element of the Cappadocians' and Julian's philosophical self-presentation. Chapter One, "Molded Bodies: Philosophical Habits and the Wax Tablet of the Soul," explores the rhetoric of habits in the early self-presentation of Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Julian—all of whom studied at Athens in the 350s. Each of these men fashioned himself as an authoritative philosopher by arguing that virtuous habits were implanted deep within his soul, whether by birth, early education, and/or ascetic praxis. Such implanting occurred, in their views, as a result of their ability to control their senses and voices. Each of these authors argued that by preventing "common" images and words from entering into his eyes and ears, and exiting from his mouth, he molded himself into an ideal philosopher by imprinting the "wax tablet" of his mind—a common educational metaphor in antiquity—with holy words

and images. In the late 350s and early 360s, the Cappadocians and Julian thus adapted longstanding perceptions of the power of *paideia* to imprint people with habits in order to assert their own qualifications as educated leaders.

While Basil, the Nazianzen, and Julian argued that their virtue was deeply imprinted within their souls, they also believed that this virtue should manifest itself on their bodies for others to see. Chapter Two, "Visible Bodies: Philosophical Appearance and Ascetic Humility," thus turns to examine the rhetorical presentations of their physical appearance. Each of these men boasted about his rejection of "luxurious" clothing and hairstyles, in favor of ragged clothing and unkempt hair, in order to signal himself as a philosopher whose apparent lack of concern over physical appearance qualified him as a teacher of wisdom. At the same time, these men stigmatized rivals—who adopted similar appearance, and would not have looked particularly different from them—as impostors who adopted a ragged appearance without practicing "correct" asceticism. In an environment in which intellectuals with competing philosophical and religious positions all valued similar physical categories as markers of a philosophical *habitus*, Basil, the Nazianzen, and Julian asserted themselves as physiognomists who could spot a genuine philosopher in a world filled with fraudulent charlatans and tricksters. The Cappadocians' and Julian's caricatures of impostor philosophers reveal their subscription to ancient techniques of self-presentation that emphasized the "naturalness" of educated elites' *habitus* while decrying that of allegedly non-elite rivals as an affected performance.

As the *habitus* of the educated Roman elite was chiefly masculine, the first two chapters explore presentations of an elite male ideal. Women, however, also factored in to the construction of this ideal. Chapter Three, "Female Bodies: Philosophy and Authority in Presentations of

Ascetic Christian Women," thus explores how Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa presented their own authority by attributing ideals of Christian philosophy to Gorgonia (the Nazianzen's sister), Nonna (the Nazianzen's mother), and Macrina (the Nyssen's sister). Both Gregorys applied their ideals of philosophical self-presentation to praising their sisters and mothers. While the discourse of *paideia* in the ancient world focused on teaching young boys how to conduct themselves, the Cappadocians' discourse of Christian *paideia* applied to women as well as men. In the Nazianzen's encomia of his sister Gorgonia and mother Nonna, and in the Nyssen's *Life* of his sister Macrina, each male author constructed an ideal Christian philosophy for women. This philosophy, however, looked different on a female body than it did on a male one. The Gregorys were concerned to emphasize that Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina were still modest elite women who did not subvert traditional gender boundaries (as, for example, Eustathius was accused of encouraging women to do). Informed by common ancient beliefs about the physical and intellectual differences between men and women, the Gregorys were decidedly reserved about the extent to which women could embody Christian *paideia*. While they presented their female relatives as philosophers, the image of female philosophy they painted was not that of an authoritative public teacher, but of a self-disciplined ascetic who avoided public contact. The emphasis on these ideals resulted in literary representations of Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina as well-controlled women who reflected well on their male relatives.

While the first three chapters focus on sources that describe individuals, both male and female, Chapter Four, "Community Bodies: Teaching and Learning Philosophy at Annisa," focuses on the construction of a philosophical community, using Basil's family retreat at Annisa

as a case study. I read Basil's and Gregory of Nyssa's ascetic writings in the 370s as part of these men's effort to construct their family retreat at Annisa as a place in which structured, hierarchical learning molded individuals into a proper philosophical community. Through the creation of a hierarchical curriculum of scriptural learning—with certain members memorizing all of the Scriptures, and others only learning what was commanded of them—and through a daily schedule of readings and recitations, Basil and Gregory of Nyssa turned Annisa into a school where not only individual bodies, but also the communal body, was molded to represent a new Christian *paideia*. Not everyone agreed with Basil and the Nyssen about what such a community should look like, however. As with the previous chapters, this chapter highlights the Cappadocians' unease about rival ascetics like Eustathius who gained substantial followings in the fourth century. In an effort to define and delimit what they considered "orthodox" Christian philosophy, Basil and Gregory of Nyssa sought to distinguish their Annisa community from rival ascetic communities in fourth-century Cappadocia whom they believed undermined social and gender hierarchies.

Since this model of ideal philosophers guiding structured communities of students relied on the presence of living leaders, what happened when these leaders died? Chapter Five, "Saintly Bodies: Memorializing Orthodox Christian Philosophers," approaches this question by focusing on Gregory of Nyssa's memorialization of bishops as properly-molded Christian philosophers who followed the patterns of self-presentation he and his fellow Cappadocians promoted. While Gregory of Nazianzus is more famous among modern scholars as an orator—in particular for his funeral oration to Basil—this chapter will focus on Gregory of Nyssa's oratorial skills to highlight the unique ways in which this youngest Cappadocian transformed the values of

philosophical self-presentation that he, the other Cappadocians, and Julian all advocated. Between his brother's death in 378 and the confirmation of pro-Nicene Christianity at the Council of Constantinople in 381, the Nyssen composed a number of panegyrical biographies, including one to his brother Basil, and another to the third-century saint Gregory Thaumaturgus of Pontus (modern-day northern Turkey). These memorials not only presented their subjects as Christian philosophers—philosophers who embodied Gregory's ideals of both Christian philosophy and pro-Nicene orthodoxy—they also provided a way for his audience to share in this virtue. Gregory of Nyssa presented his panegyrical biographies of Basil and Thaumaturgus as texts that imprinted the holy virtue of these leaders into the bodies and souls of his audience, who heard and imagined the saints, as well as into his own body/soul, as he spoke about them. In this way, the Nyssen shared the elite virtue of these Christian heroes with the wider population, and styled himself as the intermediary between the philosopher-saints of the past and the pious pro-Nicene Christian community of the present.

By drawing attention to the importance of philosophical self-presentation in the writings of the Christians Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa, and of the *Hellēn* Julian, this dissertation makes substantial new contributions to understanding religious debates in Late Antiquity. In the fourth-century Roman Empire, authors like the Cappadocians and Julian viewed their *paideia* as a marker not only of their social status, but also of their religious authority. For these men, this authority involved not only the reading or not reading of individual texts, but also the cultivation of a philosophical *habitus* in body and soul, in order to display a "natural" command of legitimate philosophy. The Cappadocians and Julian shared the common ancient assumption that education implanted attitudes and behaviors onto the body and into the soul. As

they fought against each other and against other theological and philosophical rivals over the boundaries of Christianity, Hellenism, and orthodoxy/orthopraxy, they similarly argued that education—whether through Christian or classical texts—implanted religious orthodoxy/ orthopraxy into people's bodies and souls. The Cappadocians and Julian thus helped to re-structure the *habitus* of elite Roman *paideia* into a symbol of legitimacy within the context of fourth-century religious controversies.

CHAPTER ONE
Molded Bodies: Philosophical Habits and the Wax Tablet of the Soul

At some point in 355, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the emperor Julian were each at Athens, the most prestigious school center of the fourth-century eastern empire. As Edward Watts has remarked, "if *paideia* bestowed a certain status on a man, Athenian *paideia* placed one on yet a higher pedestal."[1] At Athens, Basil and Gregory began their friendship, though whether either of them encountered Julian is uncertain. Regardless of their interaction with each other, however, each of these three young students would go on to become different kinds of elite leaders after they departed Athens. Julian would become Caesar in November of 355, and by 361 his troops proclaimed him Augustus, under which title he ruled the Roman Empire until his death in June of 363. Basil, after leaving Athens in 356 and briefly serving as a teacher of rhetoric, was ordained a priest in 362, and bishop in 370, of the church in his hometown of Caesarea. He also spent considerable time at his family's retreat at Annisa in Pontus, where he established himself as leader of a community of ascetic Christians. Gregory departed Athens soon after Basil, and succeeded his father as head of the church at Nazianzus, being ordained a priest in 361 before being selected to become bishop of Constantinople in 379 (a position he would relinquish after the Council of Constantinople in 381).

This chapter will explore how these three Athenian alumni constructed their authority as ascetics and philosophers in the years after their departure from Athens. I argue that each of them presented his philosophical virtue, manifest in ascetic praxis, as something deeply impressed

[1] Watts, *City and School* (2006), 24.

within his soul, in much the same way that ancients thought education was impressed deep within a young student's soul. Basil, Gregory, and Julian had all reached the pinnacle of Roman schooling at Athens, and each of them presented ascetic self-moderation as a cultivation of "proper" philosophy (whether such philosophy involved Christian or Hellenic worship). They constructed their asceticism as a type of learning, one that either replaced (in Basil's case) or complemented (in Gregory's and Julian's) the *paideia* in which these men were immersed as children. Further, they emphasized their asceticism as a process of teaching religious adherents "correct" habits by controlling what words and images entered and exited their eyes, ears, and mouths. In so doing, they drew on longstanding beliefs, usually tracing back to Plato and adopted by later Greek and Roman authors, about the ability of education to implant habits within a student's soul. They presented themselves as philosophers whose *habitus* was as deeply imprinted within their own souls as the *habitus* of *paideia* was thought to be impressed within the soul of an elite Roman student. Through this philosophical self-presentation, Basil, Gregory, and Julian sought to signal themselves as legitimate authorities—whether priests, emperors, or both—whose natural affinity for self-moderation corresponded to their proper religious affiliation.

Sight, Sound, Speech, and the "Wax Tablet" of the Soul

Ancient thinkers tended to view education as a process that molded youths to perform as "proper" elite men.[2] A common cognitive metaphor in antiquity likened a person's mind/soul (the two were generally considered similar) to a wax writing tablet, and information to the writing

[2] In this chapter, unless otherwise specified, I will speak about young students as male, since this was the default gender of elite students in antiquity. For more on educated women, see discussion in Chapter 3.

that was carved onto the tablet.[3] The metaphor first appeared in Greek literature in the fifth-century BCE, when the playwright Aeschylus (d. 456 BCE) made reference to the "recording tablets of the mind (*mnēmosin deltois phrenōn*)."[4] Two centuries later, in the *Theaetetus*, Plato deployed this metaphor to describe memory as a process by which a block of wax (*kērinon ekmageion*) contained in the soul became impressed (*apotupousthai*) with markings that came from an individual's sense perceptions (*aisthēsesi*) and thoughts (*ennoiais*), just as a signet ring marked hot wax.[5] Later Stoics also picked up on this metaphor. Sextus Empiricus (d. 210 CE) commented that according to Stoic philosophy, "appearance (*phantasia*) is an impression in the soul (*tupōsis en psuchēi*)."[6] While Sextus alleged that the third-century BCE founders of Stoicism disagreed on the nature of this comment—Cleanthes likened the "impression" directly to that of a signet ring on wax, while Chrysippus argued that such an analogy was too literal—the fact that Sextus included this debate in his text suggests that it was still current at the turn of the third century CE, half a millennium after the lives of the first Stoics.[7] For ancients, the notion that processes of cognition and recognition could be likened to the imprinting of images and/or words onto a wax tablet was as common as the modern western metaphor of "processing" verbal and visual information.

This "wax tablet" metaphor also affected how ancient thinkers thought about the effects of education on forming habits. Through education, ancient theorists believed, character, as well

---

[3] For the relation of the wax tablet metaphor to ancient theories of cognition, see Jocelyn Penny Small, *Wax Tablets of the Mind: Cognitive Studies of Memory and Literacy in Antiquity* (New York: Routledge, 1997).

[4] *Prom. vinct.* 789. ἐγγράφου σὺ μνήμοσιν δέλτοις φρενῶν.

[5] *Tht.* 191c-d. θὲς δή μοι λόγου ἕνεκα ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἡμῶν ἐνὸν κήρινον ἐκμαγεῖον…δῶρον τοίνυν αὐτὸ φῶμεν εἶναι τῆς τῶν Μουσῶν μητρὸς Μνημοσύνης, καὶ εἰς τοῦτο ὅτι ἂν βουληθῶμεν μνημονεῦσαι ὧν ἂν ἴδωμεν ἢ ἀκούσωμεν ἢ αὐτοὶ ἐννοήσωμεν, ὑπέχοντας αὐτὸ ταῖς αἰσθήσεσι καὶ ἐννοίαις, ἀποτυποῦσθαι, ὥσπερ δακτυλίων σημεῖα ἐνσημαινομένους.

[6] *Math.* 1.228. φαντασία οὖν ἐστι κατ' αὐτοὺς τύπωσις ἐν ψυχῇ.

[7] *Math.* 1.228-36.

as mental capability, was imprinted on the soul like words and images onto hot wax. As Plato observed in the *Republic*, leaders of an ideal *polis* should only imitate people of good character, because "imitations, if continued from youth far into life, settle down into habits and nature (*ēthē te kai phusin*) in the body, voice, and mind (*kata sōma kai phōnas kai kata tēn dianoian*)."[8] Accordingly, an upright person would be ashamed to "mold (*ekmattein*) himself into the types (*tupous*) of worse people."[9] The second-century CE treatise *On Educating Children*, apocryphally attributed to Plutarch, further drew on the "wax tablet" metaphor in discussing education as a habit-forming process. The author of this treatise emphasized that just as children's bodies must be cared for so that they grow properly, so too their characters (*ēthē*) must be regulated from a very early age:

> For youth is plastic and pliant (*euplaston kai hugron*), and lessons are infused deeply (*ta mathēmata entēketai*) into the souls of youth still tender (*tais toutōn psuchais hapalais eti*), but anything hardened is softened with difficulty. For just as seals are stamped in soft wax (*sphragides tois hapalois enapomattontai kērois*), so are lessons (*hai mathēseis*) impressed upon the souls of children when they are still young (*hai mathēseis tais tōn eti paidiōn psuchais enapotupountai*).[10]

The exhortation to regulate young children's characters (*ēthē*) through lessons (*mathēseis*) demonstrates how pseudo-Plutarch applied the "wax tablet" metaphor to moral formation in a way that stressed the particular importance of early youth, when the "wax" was still warm and easily pliable.

---

[8] *Resp.* 395d. ἢ οὐκ ἤσθησαι ὅτι αἱ μιμήσεις, ἐὰν ἐκ νέων πόρρω διατελέσωσιν, εἰς ἕθη τε καὶ φύσιν καθίστανται καὶ κατὰ σῶμα καὶ φωνὰς καὶ κατὰ τὴν διάνοιαν;

[9] *Resp.* 396d. δυσχεραίνων αὐτὸν ἐκμάττειν τε καὶ ἐνιστάναι εἰς τοὺς τῶν κακιόνων τύπους, ἀτιμάζων τῇ διανοίᾳ, ὅτι μὴ παιδιᾶς χάριν. See also *Leg.* 789e for the analogy of a young child to pliable wax.

[10] *Lib. educ.* 3e-f. ὥσπερ γὰρ τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος εὐθὺς ἀπὸ γενέσεως πλάττειν τῶν τέκνων ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστιν, ἵνα ταῦτ' ὀρθὰ καὶ ἀστραβῆ φύηται, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἐξ ἀρχῆς τὰ τῶν τέκνων ἤθη ῥυθμίζειν προσήκει. εὔπλαστον γὰρ καὶ ὑγρὸν ἡ νεότης, καὶ ταῖς τούτων ψυχαῖς ἁπαλαῖς ἔτι τὰ μαθήματα ἐντήκεται· πᾶν δὲ τὸ σκληρὸν χαλεπῶς μαλάττεται. καθάπερ γὰρ σφραγῖδες τοῖς ἁπαλοῖς ἐναπομάττονται κηροῖς, οὕτως αἱ μαθήσεις ταῖς τῶν ἔτι παιδίων ψυχαῖς ἐναποτυποῦνται.

This metaphor of the soul as a wax tablet on which material (both information as well as habits) was imprinted also connected to ancient views of the senses and the voice. If the soul was considered a wax tablet, then the eyes, ears, and mouth served as styli that wrote on the soul. Plato remarked that perceptions entered into the soul by means of the eyes and the ears, and it was through education (*paideia*) that these perceptions were turned into knowledge.[11] Over five centuries later, Clement of Alexandria combined the eyes, ears, and voice in his admonition that Christians must "entirely avoid all indecent sounds, spoken words, and sights."[12] Plato and Clement alike constructed the bodily functions of sight, sound, and speech as means of displaying the philosophical values of self-moderation and self-control. For elite Greeks and Romans, education was an effort to control what words and images went into students' bodies through the eyes and ears, and what words came out of their bodies through their speech. A person whose soul had been properly "molded" was thus one who properly controlled what he saw, heard, and spoke.

Ancient theories of sight, sound, and speech tended to support the notion that these bodily functions had a significant effect on a person's character, particularly during childhood, when the soul was moldable like hot wax. As the primary channels by which external stimuli were thought to enter the soul, the eyes and ears were both essential to learning and potentially dangerous, since destructive influences could enter the soul through these channels just as easily as constructive influences. While ancient theorists argued over whether sight occurred from an object shooting rays to the eyes (intromission), or from the eyes shooting rays out to an object

---

[11] *Tht*. 184c-186d, esp. 186b-c. οὐκοῦν τὰ μὲν εὐθὺς γενομένοις πάρεστι φύσειαἰσθάνεσθαι ἀνθρώποις τε καὶ θηρίοις, ὅσα διὰ τοῦ σώματος παθήματα ἐπὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τείνει: τὰ δὲ περὶ τούτων ἀναλογίσματα πρός τε οὐσίαν καὶ ὠφέλειαν μόγις καὶ ἐν χρόνῳ διὰ πολλῶν πραγμάτων καὶ παιδείας παραγίγνεται οἷς ἂν καὶ παραγίγνηται;

[12] *Paed.* 2.6.51. Πάντῃ οὖν ἀφεκτέον τῶν αἰσχρῶν ἀκουσμάτων καὶ ῥημάτων καὶ θεαμάτων.

(extramission), the common consensus was that vision created some sort of physical connection between viewing subject and viewed object, and that the images one saw physically imprinted one's soul.[13] Elite moralists, Christian and non-Christian alike, drew on this notion of tactile vision when advising against the spectacles of the theater: the immoral (and often sexually suggestive) performances of actors and dancers, they warned, would "stick" into the souls of the viewing audience and assail them well after the show had ended.[14] In a sermon against the theater, for instance, John Chrysostom warned a male spectator that when he left the theater, the seductive actress he viewed followed him home in his mind, lighting a fire within him like a "Bablyonian furnace."[15] Whether such admonitions had any influence on the general population's views of the spectacles, Chrysostom's admonitions offer a vivid example of how educated Roman elites played on the perceived power of sight to imprint on an individual's soul.

Accordingly, theorists of education tended to emphasize control of sight as an essential part of a student's development. In the *Timaeus*, Plato remarked that vision was the gods' greatest gift to humanity, because it gave people the ability to inquire into the nature of the universe by looking at the heavenly bodies.[16] Plato also commented on the instructive ability of earthly objects. In the *Republic*, he insisted that the ideal city needed to forbid craftsmen from

---

[13] Shadi Bartsch, *The Mirror of the Self: Sexuality, Self-Knowledge, and the Gaze in the Early Roman Empire* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 58-67; Frank, *Memory of the Eyes* (2000)*,* 123-4; Webb, *Demons and Dancers* (2008), 182-3; P.B. Duff, "Vision and Violence: Theories of Vision and Matthew 5:27-30," in Adela Yarbro Collins and Margaret M. Mitchell (eds.), *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy Presented to Hans Dieter Betz on his 70th Birthday* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 63-75; Andrew Stewart, *Art, Desire, and the Body in Ancient Greece* (New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 19. For more on the cultural significance of the gaze in Roman gender, sexuality, and power dynamics, see also the articles in David Fredrick (ed.), *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002).

[14] Blake Leyerle, *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives* (2001), esp. 67-70, and Webb, *Demons and Dancers* (2008), 183-7. In the *Republic*, Plato speaks extensively about the dangers of imitation for both performers and audience: see esp. *Resp.* 3 and 10.

[15] *CLT* 267.19-21: ἀλλὰ τῇ γνώμῃ, καὶ τῷ συνειδότι ἐγκαθημένην, καὶ ἀνάπτουσαν ἔνδον τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν κάμινον, μᾶλλον δὲ πολλῷ χαλεπωτέραν.

[16] *Ti.* 47a-b.

representing anything "malicious (*kakoēthes*), undisciplined (*akolaston*), unfree (*aneleutheron*), or misshapen (*aschēmon*)" in any images or buildings, lest the city's guardians be "bred (*trephomenoi*) among symbols of evil, as if grazing freely in a pasture of poisonous herbs and taking a little bit from many such herbs every day, they unknowingly accumulate a large mass of evil in their souls."[17] The idea that crafted images formed part of a child's moral formation continued beyond Plato well into Greek and Roman antiquity. While icons and statues of the divine could carry an ambiguous status between actual divinities and mere imitations and/or representations of them, educated elites often approached images as guides to proper moral and religious behavior.[18] The sophist Philostratus the Elder (d. 230), for example, wrote a treatise on images that sought to teach young students to "interpret paintings and to appreciate what is esteemed in them."[19] Such a view of image-interpretation as a means of imbuing moral character within children was rooted in the same theories that suggested that the sights of the theater imbued immorality in their viewers.

Even textual education had a significant visual component in antiquity. In the *Phaedrus,* Plato compared writing to painting: both media, he argued, present something to the reader's

---

[17] *Resp.* 401b-c. καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις δημιουργοῖς ἐπιστατητέον καὶ διακωλυτέον τὸ κακόηθες τοῦτο καὶ ἀκόλαστον καὶ ἀνελεύθερον καὶ ἄσχημον μήτε ἐν εἰκόσι ζῴων μήτε ἐν οἰκοδομήμασι μήτε ἐν ἄλλῳ μηδενὶ δημιουργουμένῳ ἐμποιεῖν, ἢ ὁ μὴ οἷός τε ὢν οὐκ ἐατέος παρ᾽ ἡμῖν δημιουργεῖν, ἵνα μὴ ἐν κακίας εἰκόσι τρεφόμενοι ἡμῖν οἱ φύλακες ὥσπερ ἐν κακῇ βοτάνῃ, πολλὰ ἑκάστης ἡμέρας κατὰ σμικρὸν ἀπὸ πολλῶν δρεπόμενοί τε καὶ νεμόμενοι, ἕν τι συνιστάντες λανθάνωσιν κακὸν μέγα ἐν τῇ αὑτῶν ψυχῇ.

[18] There is substantial scholarship on the ambiguous status of images in Greek and Roman antiquity. See, for example, Clara Auvray-Assayas, "Images mentales et représentations figurées: penser les dieux au Ier siècle av. n. è.," in *eadem* (ed.), *Images Romaines : actes de la table ronde organisée à l'Ecole normale supérieure, 24-26 octobre 1996*, Études de littérature ancienne 9 (Paris: Presses de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure, 1998), 299-310; Jaś Elsner, *Roman Eyes: Visuality and Subjectivity in Art and Text*; Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007), esp. 11-48, and J.-P. Vernant, "From the 'Presentification' of the Invisible to the Imitation of Appearance," in Froma I. Zeitlin (ed.), *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991), 151-63.

[19] *Imag.* Praef.3. ὁ λόγος δὲ οὐ περὶ ζωγράφων οὐδ᾽ ἱστορίας αὐτῶν νῦν, ἀλλ᾽ εἴδη ζωγραφίας ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὁμιλίας αὐτὰ τοῖς νέοις ξυντιθέντες, ἀφ᾽ ὧν ἑρμηνεύσουσί τε καὶ τοῦ δοκίμου ἐπιμελήσονται. For more on the connection between literary works such as Philostratus' and visual images in second-sophistic education, see Zahra Newby, "Reading Programs in Greco-Roman Art: Reflections on the Spada Reliefs," in fredrick (ed.), *The Roman Gaze* (2002), 110-48.

eyes, but cannot control whether or not the viewer understands them.[20] While Plato made this point to denounce writing as an inferior mode of communication to dialogue, the notion that writing and vision were closely linked enjoyed a long tradition in the ancient world. *Ekphrasis*, the practice of describing a work of art with words, was a fundamental element of ancient education from preliminary readings to advanced rhetoric, as students read texts and composed speeches that conjured images—both actual and imaginary—in the minds of their listeners.[21] Roman authors such as Cicero, Seneca, and Tacitus presented the lives of past heroes as images on which readers could gaze for exemplary models of virtue.[22] Meanwhile, Christians who denied the divine value of non-Christian imagery sought to promote similar positive qualities through seeing images of the biblical past, traveling to the Holy Land, viewing images of Christ and saints, and reading the Scriptures.[23] In antiquity, visual education occurred both through physical images and through the spoken and written word.

Alongside sight, sound was another sense that ancients commonly believed to shape the soul.[24] Many of the same warnings that Greek and Roman elites gave for controlling vision also applied to controlling hearing: after all, both the eyes *and* the ears were considered channels through which external stimuli could either edify or corrupt an individual. Philosophers and theorists of education warned against the harmful properties of certain kinds of music that could "soften"—and thus "feminize"—the souls of listeners. As Plato claimed in the *Republic*, music was important because it could easily mold the soul from the outside, either positively or

---

[20] *Phdr*. 275d-e.
[21] Webb, *Ekphrasis* (2009), esp. 7-9, 17-27.
[22] Bartsch, *Mirror of the Self* (2006), 126-7.
[23] Georgia Frank, *Memory of the Eyes* (2000), esp. 6-16; Miller, *The Corporeal Imagination* (2009), esp. 3-15; Laura Salah Nasrallah, *Christian Responses to Roman Art and Architecture* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), esp. 299-301.
[24] Studies of sound in antiquity are considerably less numerous than those of sight. For a good overview of ancient theories of sound, see Harrison, *Art of Listening* (2013).

negatively: "more than anything else rhythm and harmony sink into the inmost soul (*to entos tēs psuchēs*) and take strongest hold upon it (*errōmenestata haptetai*) by bringing gracefulness, and they make the soul graceful, if it is rightly nurtured (*traphēi*), and the opposite if it is not."[25] Plutarch's *On Hearing* also emphasized the formative nature of sound. Hearing, he claimed, was more rational (*logikōtera*) than emotional (*pathētikōtera*):

> For while many places and parts of the body make way for wickedness to enter through them and take hold of the soul (*hapsasthai tēs psuchēs*), the only hold upon the young for virtue is the ears (*ta ōta*), if they are pure (*kathara*) and unaffected by flattery and guarded from the beginning untouched by vile words (*logois…phaulois*).[26]

Indeed, Plutarch added, hearing was so crucial to the formation of virtue that the philosopher Xenocrates (d. 314-3 B.C.E.) argued that the ear-guards that boxers and wrestlers commonly wore were more necessary for children than for athletes: while the latter risked physical disfigurement through damaging their ears, the former risked much more dangerous moral damage.[27] Two centuries later, the Platonic philosopher Iamblichus wrote that the sixth-century BCE philosopher Pythagoras first instructed his followers in musical education (*tēn dia mousikēs paideusin*) in order to create "treatments for human temperaments and passions" and to gather together the "harmonies of the soul's powers."[28] Like Plato and Plutarch, Iamblichus attested to

---

[25] *Resp.* 401d-e. Ἆρ' οὖν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ὦ Γλαύκων, τούτων ἕνεκα κυριωτάτη ἐν μουσικῇ τροφή, ὅτι μάλιστα καταδύεται εἰς τὸ ἐντὸς τῆς ψυχῆς ὅ τε ῥυθμὸς καὶ ἁρμονία, καὶ ἐρρωμενέστατα ἅπτεται αὐτῆς φέροντα τὴν εὐσχημοσύνην, καὶ ποιεῖ εὐσχήμονα, ἐάν τις ὀρθῶς τραφῇ, εἰ δὲ μή, τοὐναντίον;

[26] *Audi.* 38a-b. ἔστι δὲ λογικωτέρα μᾶλλον ἢ παθητικωτέρα. τῇ μὲν γὰρ κακίᾳ πολλὰ χωρία καὶ μέρη τοῦ σώματος παρέχει δι' αὐτῶν ἐνδῦσαν ἅψασθαι τῆς ψυχῆς, τῇ δ' ἀρετῇ μία λαβὴ τὰ ὦτα τῶν νέων ἐστίν, ἂν ᾖ καθαρὰ καὶ ἄθρυπτα κολακείᾳ καὶ λόγοις ἄθικτα φαύλοις ἀπ' ἀρχῆς φυλάττηται.

[27] *Audi.* 38b. διὸ καὶ Ξενοκράτης τοῖς παισὶ μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς ἀθληταῖς ἐκέλευε περιάπτειν ἀμφωτίδας, ὡς ἐκείνων μὲν τὰ ὦτα ταῖς πληγαῖς, τούτων δὲ τοῖς λόγοις τὰ ἤθη διαστρεφομένων.

[28] *VP* 15.64. Ἡγούμενος δὲ πρώτην εἶναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὴν δι' αἰσθήσεως προσφερομένην ἐπιμέλειαν, εἴ τις καλὰ μὲν ὁρᾷη καὶ σχήματα καὶ εἴδη, καλῶν δὲ ἀκούοι ῥυθμῶν καὶ μελῶν, τὴν διὰ μουσικῆς παίδευσιν πρώτην κατεστήσατο διά τε μελῶν τινῶν καὶ ῥυθμῶν, ἀφ' ὧν τρόπων τε καὶ παθῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἰάσεις ἐγίγνοντο ἁρμονίαι τε τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεων, ὥσπερ εἶχον ἐξ ἀρχῆς, συνήγοντο, σωματικῶν τε καὶ ψυχικῶν νοσημάτων καταστολαὶ καὶ ἀφυγιασμοὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐπενοοῦντο.

the power that ancient thinkers believed hearing held over an individual's wellbeing, and to the necessity of controlling hearing in education.

While ancients described education as a process of molding students through the words and images that *entered* their bodies and souls through their eyes and ears, the speech that *exited* through their mouths formed an equally formative exercise. Not only was speaking essential to the highest stages of rhetorical education, ancients also commonly viewed the voice as a marker of a person's masculinity, natural talent, and extensive training—three crucial elements of the elite Roman *habitus* that was cultivated through *paideia*.[29] Even Plato, while he decried sophists for using rhetorical ability without concern for truth, commented in the *Republic* that "good speech (*eulogia*), suitability (*euarmostia*), decorum (*euschēmosunē*), and good rhythm (*euruthmia*) follow good nature (*euētheiai*)."[30] According to pseudo-Plutarch, moreover, the reverse was true: "those who practice speaking in a way to be pleasing and favorable to the vulgar mob also turn out in general to be incontinent in life and fond of pleasure."[31] The Christian author Clement of Alexandria also warned that improper speech revealed a person to be "common (*koinon*), barbaric (*ethnikon*), uneducated (*apaideuton*), licentious (*aselgē*)," and lacking all "decorum (*kosmion*) and moderation (*sōphrona*)."[32] Such injunctions show how integral proper speech (however defined) was to the ideal moderation of the educated elite.

These notions of sight, sound, and speech as channels that could shape the soul were still prominent among the educated elite of the later fourth century. At Athens, as well as earlier in their lives, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Julian would all have been exposed to the thought

---

[29] Maud Gleason, *Making Men* (1995), 103.
[30] *Resp.* 400d-e. εὐλογία ἄρα καὶ εὐαρμοστία καὶ εὐσχημοσύνη καὶ εὐρυθμία εὐηθείᾳ ἀκολουθεῖ.
[31] *Lib. educ.* 6b. ὁρῶ δ' ἔγωγε τοὺς τοῖς συρφετώδεσιν ὄχλοις ἀρεστῶς καὶ κεχαρισμένως ἐπιτηδεύοντας λέγειν καὶ τὸν βίον ὡς τὰ πολλὰ ἀσώτους καὶ φιληδόνους ἀποβαίνοντας.
[32] *Paed.* 2.6.49.

of Plato, Plutarch (and likely pseudo-Plutarch), and Iamblichus; Basil and Gregory, moreover, would likely have had at least some familiarity with Clement of Alexandria.[33] Further, the social backgrounds of these Athenian alumni reflected earlier authors' constructions of education as a marker of social status. As high-born elites, Basil, Gregory, and Julian believed that mastery of letters was their birthright, and that exhibiting this mastery to the world revealed the natural talent that made them suitable for leadership. In order to present themselves as leaders, each drew upon the idea that words and images could shape an individual's soul, and that as elites, their souls were more well-disposed to receive the "proper" words and images because of their ability to exercise self-moderation, particularly with their sight, hearing, and speech. Basil asserted that his ascetic retreat allowed him to "erase" the markings of his previous education from his soul and replace them with the imprints of scripturally based education.[34] Gregory and Julian, conversely, each claimed that their early upbringing instilled in them habits that predisposed them to become philosophic leaders.[35] All three of them, however, emphasized that education was a process of imprinting habits on an individual through controlling what the individual saw, spoke, and heard. Drawing on this conception, they each sought to assert their authority as religious leaders by claiming that they, through the "imprints" on the "wax" of their souls, possessed the natural inclination toward self-moderation that they claimed was required of all educated elites.

---

[33] Watts, *City and School* (2006), 4-6. For the familiarity of Julian, Basil, and Gregory, respectively, with these classical authors, see Jean Bouffartigue, *L'empereur Julien* (1992), esp. 76-8 170-97, 276-7. 285-93, 331-59; Hildebrand, *Basil of Caesarea* (2014), 38; John A. McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus* (2001), 57.
[34] *Ep.* 2.2. See discussion below.
[35] Gregory of Nazianzus: *Orr.* 1.6, 2.77. Julian: *Mis.* 351b-c. See discussion of each below.

Basil of Caesarea on Erasing and Re-Inscribing Habits

After departing Athens in 355, Basil taught rhetoric in his hometown of Caesarea in Cappadocia. Within a year, however, he departed this position in order to travel around the eastern Mediterranean in search of his mentor, Eustathius of Sebaste, a Christian who, though condemned at the council of Gangra in 340 for excessively strict ascetic practices, held close ties with Basil's family throughout the 340s and 350s.[36] Unable to connect with Eustathius, Basil eventually settled at his family retreat at Annisa in Pontus. Soon after, in 358, he sent a letter (*Ep.* 2) to his close friend Gregory of Nazianzus in which he described his life at Annisa: a life which, according to Philip Rousseau, offered "the circumstance in which [spiritual] purging might be achieved—the dismissal, above all, of desire, anger, fear, and grief."[37] This "purging" operated as a form of ideal learning at Annisa. Basil's letter to Gregory reveals how he envisioned retreat at Annisa as an opportunity to "erase" the soul's "wax tablet" of previous habits, and to re-inscribe new habits onto the soul. Basil constructed this re-inscribing as a process of molding habits in the same way that Greek and Roman elites viewed education. Moreover, by presenting his retreat as an opportunity to "unlearn" and "re-learn" habits, Basil constructed his ascetic praxis as a type of philosophy that both co-opted and surpassed the traditional elite cultural capital of *paideia*.

The language of Basil's *Ep.* 2 reflects ancient assumptions about education's ability to mold the soul just as writing molded wax. Basil, like Plato and pseudo-Plutarch before him,

---

[36] Susanna Elm, *Virgins of God* (1994): 134-136. In her recent edition/translation of Basil's *Asketikon*, Anna Silvas supports the idea that Eustathius was influential, but rejects Elm's view of a "homoiousian asceticism" that formed Makrina and Basil in their early years (Silvas, *Asketikon* [2005], esp. 53-60). Given the influence of "homoiousians" in Cappadocia in the mid-fourth century, along with the still-fluid nature of "orthodoxy" at this time, I am inclined more towards Elm's position. For more on Eustathius' influence on the Cappadocians' self-presentation, see Chapters 2 through 4.

[37] Philip Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (1994), 79.

conceived of learning as a process by which habits became impressed within an individual in a similar way that writing was impressed on wax. He presented the first step of his life at Annisa as an "erasure" of the heart, achieved through an "un-learning" of previous teachings:

> But withdrawal from the world is not to become outside of it bodily, but to break off the soul from care for the body and to become without city, home, possessions, love of companions, property, subsistence, business, and social interaction, [and to become] unlearned (*amathē*) of human teachings, ready to receive in the heart the impressions *(tupōseis)* created by divine teaching. And making the heart ready is the unlearning (*apomathēsis*) of the teachings from evil habit (*ponēras sunētheias*) that have possessed it. For it is not possible to write in wax (*en kērō grapsai*) without first wearing down (*prokataleananta*) the letters that have already been written, nor is it possible to supply the soul with divine teachings without removing its preconceptions derived from habit (*ethous*).[38]

Basil's contrast between the "impressions" of divine teaching and the traditional concerns of city life created a rhetorical distinction between his ascetic *habitus* and the traditional *habitus* of an educated elite Roman. To depart from the city and all of the accoutrements Basil associated with city life was to depart from the world of urban rhetoric, as rhetoric trained young men to exercise prominent roles in the management of their cities and homes.[39] By describing Annisa as a place to replace the habits of city life with divine teachings, Basil constructed ascetic retreat as a type of re-education that could supplant the traditional schooling of *paideia*. This re-education, however, relied on the presence of this traditional schooling. Not only did Basil's description imply the presence of previous learning that needed to be "washed away" from the mind, his very use of the "wax tablet" metaphor drew on longstanding elite notions about the effects of

---

[38] *Ep.* 2.2. Κόσμου δὲ ἀναχώρησις οὐ τὸ ἔξω αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι σωματικῶς, ἀλλὰ τῆς πρὸς τὸ σῶμα συμπαθείας τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπορρῆξαι καὶ γενέσθαι ἄπολιν, ἄοικον, ἀνίδιον, ἀφιλέταιρον, ἀκτήμονα, ἄβιον, ἀπράγμονα, ἀσυνάλλακτον, ἀμαθῆ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων διδαγμάτων, ἕτοιμον ὑποδέξασθαι τῇ καρδίᾳ τὰς ἐκ τῆς θείας διδασκαλίας ἐγγινομένας τυπώσεις. Ἑτοιμασία δὲ καρδίας ἡ ἀπομάθησις τῶν ἐκ πονηρᾶς συνηθείας προκατασχόντων αὐτὴν διδαγμάτων. Οὔτε γὰρ ἐν κηρῷ γράψαι δυνατὸν μὴ προκαταλεάναντα τοὺς ἐναποκειμένους χαρακτῆρας, οὔτε ψυχῇ δόγματα θεῖα παραθέσθαι μὴ τὰς ἐκ τοῦ ἔθους προλήψεις αὐτῆς ἐξελόντα.
[39] Cribiore, *The School of Libanius* (2007), 197-228.

education in forming habits. Thus, Basil's emphasis on unlearning habits corresponded less to a complete rejection, and more of a re-positioning, of the language of classical *paideia*.

Basil emphasized the importance of the eyes, ears, and tongue in this process of un-learning and re-learning habits. *Ep*. 2 emphasizes the role of these bodily organs in purifying the soul at Annisa:

> Tranquility (*hēsuchia*), the beginning of the cleansing for the soul (*katharseōs tēi psuchēi*), is when the tongue does not discuss (*mēte glōssēs lalousēs*) the affairs of people, the eyes do not observe (*mēte ophthalmōn…periskopontōn*) the pleasant complexion and shape of bodies, nor do the ears lower the tone of the soul (*mēte akoēs ton tonon tēs psuchēs ekluousēs*) by listening to songs designed for pleasure or to the words of jesters and buffoons, which especially tends to relax the tone of the soul.[40]

Just as Basil associated withdrawal (*anachōrēsis*) with removal from the world of the city and all of the works of an educated urban man, he associated tranquility (*hēsuchia*), another term for his retreat, with purification of the bodily channels of sight, sound, and speech. This description of purification relied on longstanding ancient assumptions about the ability of words and images to affect the soul both positively and negatively. Indeed, the comment that pleasurable songs "relaxed" the "tone of the soul" echoed ancient Stoic theories that the body and soul were held together by a "tension" between the body's physical matter and the surrounding air (*pneuma*).[41] In addition, Basil's association of a pure soul with one that did not see improper images, hear improper sounds, or speak improper words echoed the sentiments of previous Greeks and Romans like Plato, Plutarch, pseudo-Plutarch, and Clement of Alexandria, who had all opined

---

[40] *Ep.* 2.2. Ἡσυχία οὖν ἀρχὴ καθάρσεως τῇ ψυχῇ, μήτε γλώττης λαλούσης τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, μήτε ὀφθαλμῶν εὐχροίας σωμάτων καὶ συμμετρίας περισκοπούντων, μήτε ἀκοῆς τὸν τόνον τῆς ψυχῆς ἐκλυούσης ἐν ἀκροάμασι μελῶν πρὸς ἡδονὴν πεποιημένων, μήτε ἐν ῥήμασιν εὐτραπέλων καὶ γελοιαστῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὃ μάλιστα λύειν τῆς ψυχῆς τὸν τόνον πέφυκε.

[41] Christopher Gill, "Psychophysical Holism in Stoicism and Epicureanism," in R.A.H. King (ed.), *Common to Body and Soul: Philosophical Approaches to Explaining Living Behaviour in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (New York: de Gruyter, 2006), 209-31, 213-5.

about the ability of words and images to form habits in the soul. By describing Annisa as a place where he could avoid the "wrong" sights, sounds, and speeches, Basil thus presented his retreat as a means of implanting "right" habits within his soul.

Basil's description in *Ep*. 2 of achieving tranquility through controlling sight, sound, and speech is comparable to advice in his *Address to Young Men on How to Read Greek Literature*. The similarities between this text and *Ep*. 2 are worth exploring, in order to highlight how Basil's description of asceticism in the latter text reflected his assumptions about classical education in the former. In the *Address*, Basil advised youths to read classical Greek authors selectively and critically based on whether or not they extolled virtue that contributed to Christian life. The work's lack of internal references by which it can be dated precisely has made it difficult for modern scholars to interpret. While editors of the text such as Roy Deferrari and Mario Naldini dated the work to Basil's episcopal career in the 370s, later scholars such as John Rist and Raymond Van Dam have proposed an earlier date somewhere in the 360s, and Robert E. Winn has gone so far as to suggest that Basil composed the work even earlier, while he was still a teacher of rhetoric at Caesarea in 355-6.[42] The dating of the work is certainly significant, as it determines whether Basil's *Address* should be read as a Christian bishop's advice to young men in his congregation, a passive rebuttal to Julian's *Edict Against Christian Teachers*, or an admonition from a teacher to his young students.

---

[42] Roy J. Deferrari, "Address to Young Men on Reading Greek Literature," in *Saint Basil: The Letters* (vol. 4), eds. and trans. Roy J. Deferrari and Martin R.P. McGuire, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970), 365-435, 365; Mario Naldini, *Basilio di Cesarea: discorso ai giovani*, ed. Mario Naldini (Florence: Nardini Editore, 1984), 15-7; John M. Rist, "Basil's 'Neoplatonism': Its Background and Nature," in Fedwick (ed.), *Basil of Caesarea* (1981), 137-220, 219-20; Raymond Van Dam, *Kingdom of Snow* (2002), 182; Robert E. Winn, "Revising the Date of Authorship of Basil of Caesarea's *Ad Adolescentes*," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 44:1-4 (1999), 291-307, esp. 303-4. Philip Rousseau is agnostic on the matter, yet suggests a possible date in the 370s based on the tone of the letter (Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* [1994], 49).

Similarities between the *Address* and Basil's letter to Gregory in 358 strengthen the case for an earlier date, though exact dating is inconclusive. What is significant, however, is that the *Address* and *Ep*. 2 agree on the importance of learning in shaping an ideal Christian. Philip Rousseau noted that in *Ep*. 2, "the Scriptures offered the Christian…little that was different in pedagogical force from the moral exemplars of the classical canon that Basil would later describe in his *Ad adulescentes* [the common Latin title for the *Address*]."[43] Significantly, the pedagogical language in both these texts draws on ancient notions of forming habits through sight, sound, and speech. The connections between Basil's *Address to Young Men* and *Ep*. 2 show that even if Basil presented his retreat as an "erasure" of previous education, he associated similar practices of learning with both Athens and Annisa. Whether he wrote the *Address* before or after the letter to Gregory—and it seems more likely that he wrote these two texts around the same time—each text reveals the same ideals of impressing habits on the soul via the eyes, ears, and mouths of students.

In the *Address*, as in *Ep*. 2, Basil deployed the metaphor of the soul as wax, as he advised children to learn virtue (*aretēs*) early, since "the lessons of youth make deep impressions (*eis bathos ensēmainomena*), because of the plasticity (*di'hapalotēta*) of souls."[44] Moreover, just as in his letter to Gregory, so too in his *Address* he equated purity of the soul with "not feasting the eyes (*ophtalmous hestian*) on the unnatural displays of jugglers or on the sights of bodies which goad one to passion, and not permitting destructive melody (*diephtharmenēn melōdian*) to

---

[43] Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (1994), 81. Robert E. Winn argues that this letter must come after the *Address* because it does not incorporate any references to Greek literature as a means of achieving moral virtue (Winn, "Revising the Date of Basil of Caesarea's *Ad adulescentes*" [1999], 297). While possible, this argument is inconclusive, given the different contexts and audiences of Basil's letter to Gregory and the *Address to Young Men*.

[44] *Ad adul.* 5.5-9. Οὐ μικρὸν γὰρ τὸ ὄφελος, οἰκειότητά τινα καὶ συνήθειαν ταῖς τῶν νέων ψυχαῖς τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐγγενέσθαι· ἐπείπερ ἀμετάστατα πέφυκεν εἶναι τὰ τῶν τοιούτων μαθήματα, δι'ἀπαλότητα τῶν ψυχῶν εἰς βάθος ἐνσημαινόμενα.

control the soul through the ears (*dia tōn ōtōn*)."[45] Such music, Basil warned, led to "passions (*pathē*) sprung from slavery (*aneleutherias*) and lowliness (*tapeinotētos*)."[46] As a positive alternative to such corrupting tunes he recommended the kind of music "which is better and leads to better things, which they say David, the composer of the sacred psalms, used to calm the king down from his madness."[47] As Iamblichus had written of Pythagoras' philosophical community, so here did Basil advocate music as a means of allaying passions within a person's soul. In both his *Address* and *Ep*. 2, Basil thus linked molding the soul with control of the eyes, ears, and tongue.

Basil's advocacy of the Psalms as an ideal object of hearing also reflects his construction of the Scriptures as the ideal reading material for a Christian student. Both the *Address* and *Ep*. 2 describe reading as a visual process. His *Address* presented reading certain classical writings as a visual exercise that prepared the reader for the Scriptures. Through such preparation, Basil claimed, "we exercise (*progumnazometha*) the eye of the soul (*tōi tēs psuchēs ommati*) upon other writings, which are not altogether different, and in which we perceive the truth, as it were, in shadows and in mirrors."[48] Playing on Paul's claim that "we see through a mirror in a riddle (*di'esoptrou en ainigmati*)" and Plato's ideas of the uneducated seeing shadows in the allegory of the cave, Basil here presented reading as a means of "seeing" truth.[49] In this sense, reading was a

---

[45] *Ad adul.* 9.35-9. Κάθαρσις δὲ ψυχῆς, ὡς ἀθρόως τε εἰπεῖν καὶ ὑμῖν ἱκανῶς, τὰς διὰ τῶν αἰσθήσεων ἡδονὰς ἀτιμάζειν· μὴ ὀφθαλμοὺς ἑστιᾶν ταῖς ἀτόποις τῶν θαυματοποιῶν ἐπιδείξεσιν, ἢ σωμάτων θέαις ἡδονῆς κέντρον ἐναφιέντων, μὴ διὰ τῶν ὤτων διεφθαρμένην μελῳδίαν τῶν ψυχῶν καταχεῖν.

[46] *Ad adul.* 9.39-41. ἀνελευθερίας γὰρ δὴ καὶ ταπεινότητος ἔκγονα πάθη ἐκ τοῦ τοιοῦδε τῆς μουσικῆς εἴδους ἐγγίνεσθαι πέφυκεν. For more on the ambivalent nature of "lowliness" (*tapeinotēs*) in Cappadocian literature, see Chapters 2 and 3.

[47] *Ad adul.* 9.41-45. Ἀλλὰ τὴν ἑτέραν μεταδιωκτέον ἡμῖν, τὴν ἀμείνω τε καὶ εἰς ἄμεινον φέρουσαν, ᾗ καὶ Δαβὶδ χρώμενος, ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ἱερῶν ᾀσμάτων, ἐκ τῆς μανίας, ὥς φασι, τὸν βασιλέα καθίστη.

[48] *Ad adul.* 2.27-32. Ἕως γε μὴν ὑπὸ τῆς ἡλικίας ἐπακούειν τοῦ βάθους τῆς διανοίας αὐτῶν οὐχ οἷόν τε, ἐν ἑτέροις οὐ πάντη διεστηκόσιν, ὥσπερ ἐν σκιαῖς τισι καὶ κατόπτροις, τῷ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄμματι τέως προγυμναζόμεθα.

[49] 1 Cor. 13:12; *Resp.* 514a-516b.

means of learning and practicing proper sight. Before being able to view the ultimate truth of the Scriptures, however, he insisted that people needed to view sketches of truth in other writings. The *Address*, therefore, did not simply advise its audience on *what* works of Greek literature to read. On a more fundamental level, it taught its listeners *how* to read.[50] By teaching others how to read virtuously, Basil implied that he himself possessed this skill, and could teach it to others.

This visual reading exercise served to prepare the reader's mental eye to "see" virtue in text, which would prepare them for the kind of reading that he described to Gregory in *Ep*.2. When explaining to Gregory the importance of scriptural reading at Annisa, he drew attention to the mental images that arose when he read about the virtuous lives of past men, which "lie before us like certain living images (*eikones tines empsuchoi*) of life according to God, for the purpose of imitating (*tōi mimēmati*) their good works."[51] As "images" of past Roman heroes stood before the eyes of Latin authors like Cicero and Seneca, so for Basil did biblical figures such as Joseph, Job, David, and Moses stand as images of important virtues, such as self-moderation

[50] See also Andreas Schwab, "From a Way of Reading to a Way of Life: Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nazianzus about Poetry in Christian Education," in Ilinca Tanaseanu-Döbler and Marvin Döbler (eds.), *Religious Education in Pre-Modern Europe*, Studies in the History of Religions (Boston: Brill, 2012), 147-62, esp. 149-56. While Schwab argues persuasively for the *Address'* role in teaching a method of reading, he emphasizes this role in relation to classical poetry (chiefly Homer), and does not focus on reading as a visual exercise that contributes to Basil's ascetic self-presentation.

[51] *Ep.* 2.3. Μεγίστη δὲ ὁδὸς πρὸς τὴν τοῦ καθήκοντος εὕρεσιν ἡ μελέτη τῶν θεοπνεύστων Γραφῶν. Ἐν ταύταις γὰρ καὶ αἱ τῶν πράξεων ὑποθῆκαι εὑρίσκονται, καὶ οἱ βίοι τῶν μακαρίων ἀνδρῶν ἀνάγραπτοι παραδεδομένοι, οἷον εἰκόνες τινὲς ἔμψυχοι τῆς κατὰ Θεὸν πολιτείας, τῷ μιμήματι τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργων πρόκεινται.

(*sōphrosunēs*), manliness (*andreian*), and gentleness (*praotēti*).[52] For Basil, reading the Scriptures was a visual process comparable with a painter copying an image:

> And in general, just as painters, when they copy an image (*apo eikonos eikona graphōsi*), constantly gazing upon (*apoblepontes*) their exemplar strive to transfer the character from the original to their own work, so too must he who is eager to make himself perfect in all kinds of virtue gaze upon (*apoblepein*) the lives of saints as upon certain moving and acting statues (*pros agalmata tina kinoumena kai emprakta*) and make their excellence his own through imitation (*dia mimēseōs*).[53]

In this analogy of painters copying images, the Scriptures served as the original, and the reader served as the copy. Through *mimēsis*, the reader's body became a living example of the "images" of virtue in the Scriptures in the same way a painter produced a copy from an original. Sight was essential in this imitation. Just as a painter drawing a copy needed first to view the original, so must the reader gaze upon (*apoblepein*) the lives of past holy men. This presentation of reading as gazing relied on ancient notions about the close connection between viewing subject and viewed object. The Scriptures functioned like a rhetor who deployed *ekphrasis* to conjure images in the minds of his audience—in this case, the images conjured were examples of virtuous lives. The reader, in turn, connected with the images through sight and then copied them by imitating the heroes about which he read.

---

[52] *Ep.* 2.3. Καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐραστὴς τῆς σωφροσύνης τὴν περὶ τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ ἱστορίαν συνεχῶς ἀνελίσσει καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ τὰς σωφρονικὰς ἐκδιδάσκεται πράξεις, εὑρίσκων αὐτὸν οὐ μόνον ἐγκρατῶς πρὸς ἡδονὰς ἔχοντα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκτικῶς πρὸς ἀρετὴν διακείμενον. Ἀνδρείαν δὲ παιδεύεται παρὰ τοῦ Ἰώβ, ὃς οὐ μόνον, πρὸς τὰ ἐναντία τοῦ βίου μεταπεσόντος αὐτῷ πένης ἐκ πλουσίου καὶ ἄπαις ἀπὸ καλλίπαιδος ἐν μιᾷ καιροῦ ῥοπῇ γενόμενος, διέμενεν ὁ αὐτὸς ἀταπείνωτον πανταχοῦ τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς φρόνημα διασώζων, ἀλλ' οὔτε τῶν φίλων εἰς παραμυθίαν ἡκόντων ἐπεμβαινόντων αὐτῷ καὶ συνεπιτεινόντων τὰ ἀλγεινὰ παρωξύνθη. Πάλιν σκοπῶν τις πῶς ἂν πρᾶος ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ καὶ μεγαλόθυμος γένοιτο, ὥστε τῷ μὲν θυμῷ κατὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας κεχρῆσθαι, τῇ δὲ πραότητι πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, εὑρήσει τὸν Δαβὶδ γενναῖον μὲν ἐν τοῖς κατὰ πόλεμον ἀνδραγαθήμασι, πρᾶον δὲ καὶ ἀκίνητον ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἀντιδόσεσι. Τοιοῦτος καὶ Μωσῆς, μεγάλῳ μὲν τῷ θυμῷ κατὰ τῶν εἰς Θεὸν ἐξαμαρτανόντων διανιστάμενος, πραείᾳ δὲ τῇ ψυχῇ τὰς καθ' ἑαυτοῦ διαβολὰς ὑποφέρων.

[53] *Ep.* 2.3. Καὶ πανταχοῦ, ὥσπερ οἱ ζωγράφοι, ὅταν ἀπὸ εἰκόνος εἰκόνα γράφουσι, πυκνὰ πρὸς τὸ παράδειγμα ἀποβλέποντες τὸν ἐκεῖθεν χαρακτῆρα πρὸς τὸ ἑαυτῶν σπουδάζουσι μεταθεῖναι φιλοτέχνημα, οὕτω δεῖ καὶ τὸν ἐσπουδακότα ἑαυτὸν πᾶσι τοῖς μέρεσι τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀπεργάσασθαι τέλειον, οἱονεὶ πρὸς ἀγάλματά τινα κινούμενα καὶ ἔμπρακτα, τοὺς βίους τῶν ἁγίων ἀποβλέπειν καὶ τὸ ἐκείνων ἀγαθὸν οἰκεῖον ποιεῖσθαι διὰ μιμήσεως.

This reading, moreover, was likely not done in silence. For most of Greek and Roman antiquity, reading aloud was the norm, and Basil's ascetic retreat was likely no exception.[54] At Annisa, he recommended daily prayer along with scriptural reading as a way of linking voice and vision. His comments on prayer and speech offer particularly striking evidence of his adaptation of the elite discourse of *paideia* to ascetic life at Annisa. Prayer, he claimed, when following regular scriptural reading, "creates a visible (*enargē*) thought of God."[55] The word *enargē* related to the term *enargeia*, which in rhetorical treatises referred to the desired effect of *ekphrasis*: the presentation of vivid images in the minds of a speaker's audience.[56] Prayer, along with scriptural reading, thus served to engender positive images within the mind. In *Ep*. 2, moreover, Basil directly followed this description of prayer's *enargeia* with a series of guidelines for proper speech:

> One should take heed not to be unlearned in conversation (*peri tēn tou logou chrēsin mē amathōs echein*), but to ask questions without contentiousness and answer without self-display; neither interrupting the speaker when he is saying something useful, nor being eager to interject his own words for the sake of ostentation, but observing moderation both in speaking and in listening (*metra orizonta logō kai akoē*)…The middle tone of voice (*tonos…phōnēs ho mesos*) is to be preferred, so that one does not elude hearing through softness nor be vulgar by the strength of his extension. One should first reflect upon what one is going to say, and then deliver one's speech. One should be affable in conversation and agreeable in social intercourse, not resorting to wit as a means of gaining popularity, but depending upon the gentleness of gracious politeness.[57]

---

[54] For oral reading in the ancient world, see M.B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect: an Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993), 9-19 and Paul Henry Saenger, *The Space Between Words: the Origins of Silent Reading* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997), 1-19.

[55] *Ep.* 2.4. Εὐχὴ δὲ καλὴ ἡ ἐναργῆ ἐμποιοῦσα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔννοιαν τῇ ψυχῇ.

[56] Webb, *Ekphrasis* (2009), 87-106.

[57] *Ep.* 2.5. Καὶ πρῶτόν γε πάντων σπουδάζειν προσήκει περὶ τὴν τοῦ λόγου χρῆσιν μὴ ἀμαθῶς ἔχειν, ἀλλ' ἐρωτᾶν μὲν ἀφιλονείκως, ἀποκρίνεσθαι δὲ ἀφιλοτίμως, μὴ διακόπτοντα τὸν προσδιαλεγόμενον ὅταν τι χρήσιμον λέγῃ, μηδὲ ἐπιθυμοῦντα τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λόγον ἐπιδεικτικῶς παρεμβάλλειν, μέτρα ὁρίζοντα λόγῳ καὶ ἀκοῇ…Τόνος δὲ φωνῆς ὁ μέσος προτιμητέος, ὡς μήτε διαφεύγειν τὴν ἀκοὴν ὑπὸ σμικρότητος, μήτε φορτικὸν εἶναι τῷ μεγέθει τῆς διατάσεως. Προεξετάσαντα δὲ ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸ ῥηθησόμενον, οὕτω δημοσιεύειν τὸν λόγον. Εὐπροσήγορον ἐν ταῖς ἐντεύξεσι, γλυκὺν ἐν ταῖς ὁμιλίαις· οὐ διὰ τῆς εὐτραπελίας τὸ ἡδὺ θηρώμενον, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς εὐμενοῦς παρακλήσεως τὸ προσηνὲς ἔχοντα.

This passage is particularly significant for understanding Basil's translation of the social capital of *paideia* to his retreat at Annisa. While he claimed that his retreat was an "unlearning" of human teachings, Basil still expected ascetics at Annisa to be able to speak "learnedly." The descriptions of good speaking manners, indeed, reflects Clement of Alexandria's injunctions for Christians to avoid indecent speech.[58] Like Clement, Basil expected proper Christians to display a certain level of elite decorum.

Basil's advocacy of a moderated vocal tone—not too soft, not too loud—further echoed the social world of the Roman elite. Since the voice was so closely associated with certain qualities (such as masculinity) that education sought to display, proper vocal tone was commonly considered a key marker of elite *paideia* in the ancient world. Rhetors with vocal pitch that was too high or too melodic could be associated with "feminine" qualities that were ill-suited to the "masculine" world of Greek and Roman rhetoric.[59] While Basil did not explicitly make this association between vocal tone and gender in *Ep*. 2, he did take great care to describe his version of ideal speech, and a moderated tone formed an essential part of this description. Through his advocacy of a moderated vocal tone, Basil constructed an ideal ascetic *habitus* that revealed elite moderation not simply in an individual's actions, but even in his physical voice. As with his comments about proper sight and speech, the inclusion of vocal tone in *Ep*. 2 implied that Basil, as one who had withdrawn from the "world" to purify his soul at Annisa, possessed such an ideal *habitus*.

---

[58] *Paed.* 2.6.49-52.
[59] Gleason, *Making Men* (1995), 121-30.

At Annisa, this *habitus* was an endeavor that required the ascetic to work both day and night. In *Ep*. 2, Basil recommended light sleep that was easily broken with thoughts about God. Such sleep, he claimed, was the mark of one who had properly controlled his eyes and ears:

> For to be overcome by heavy torpor, in which the limbs are relaxed and play is given to foolish fantasies (*alogois phantasiais*), places those who sleep like this in daily death. On the contrary, what is daybreak for others is midnight for those who practice piety (*askētais tēs eusebeias*), when the quiet of night (*tēs nukterinēs hēsuchias*) grants most leisure to the soul, when neither the eyes nor the ears (*oute ophthalmōn oute ōtōn*) send harmful sounds or sights (*blaberas akoas ē theas*) against the heart, but the mind alone communes with God, corrects itself by the memory of past sins, sets up barriers for itself to deflect evil, and seeks God's aid for the completion of its longings.[60]

Basil's description of proper sleep showed that there was no rest to guarding the senses. To borrow Michel Foucault's remarks concerning Basil's near-contemporary John Cassian (d. 435), Basil was "interested in the movements of the body and the mind, images, feelings, memories, faces in dreams, the spontaneous movements of thoughts, the consenting (or refusing) will, waking and sleeping."[61] He valued the night as a time of tranquility (*hēsuchias*), a state which, at the beginning of *Ep*. 2, he claimed was acquired by controlling sight, sound, and speech. By calling for light sleep as a means of achieving such tranquility at Annisa, Basil sought to align himself with such practice, thus signaling himself as an ascetic whose philosophical self-moderation continued day and night.

---

[60] *Ep.* 2.6. Ὕπνοι κοῦφοι καὶ εὐαπάλλακτοι, φυσικῶς ἀκολουθοῦντες τῷ συμμέτρῳ τῆς διαίτης, κατ' ἐπιτήδευσιν δὲ ταῖς περὶ τῶν μεγάλων μερίμναις διακοπτόμενοι. Τὸ γὰρ βαθεῖ κάρῳ κατακρατεῖσθαι λυομένων αὐτοῦ τῶν μελῶν, ὥστε σχολὴν ἀτόποις φαντασίαις παρέχειν, εἶναι ἐν καθημερινῷ θανάτῳ ποιεῖ τοὺς οὕτω καθεύδοντας. Ἀλλ' ὅπερ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὁ ὄρθρος ἐστί, τοῦτο τοῖς ἀσκηταῖς τῆς εὐσεβείας τὸ μεσονύκτιον, μάλιστα σχολὴν τῇ ψυχῇ τῆς νυκτερινῆς ἡσυχίας χαριζομένης, οὔτε ὀφθαλμῶν οὔτε ὤτων βλαβερὰς ἀκοὰς ἢ θέας ἐπὶ καρδίαν παραπεμπόντων, ἀλλὰ μόνου καθ' ἑαυτὸν τοῦ νοῦ τῷ Θεῷ συνόντος καὶ διορθουμένου μὲν ἑαυτὸν τῇ μνήμῃ τῶν ἡμαρτημένων, ὅρους δὲ ἑαυτῷ τιθέντος πρὸς τὴν ἔκκλισιν τοῦ κακοῦ, καὶ τὴν παρὰ Θεοῦ συνεργίαν εἰς τὴν τελείωσιν τῶν σπουδαζομένων ἐπιζητοῦντος.

[61] Michel Foucault, "The Battle for Chastity," in *Ethics, Subjectivity, Truth*, vol. 1 (1997), 185-97, 191.

In *Ep*. 2, Basil sought to present his retreat at Annisa as a means by which he had successfully habituated himself to an ascetic Christian life devoted to God and the Scriptures. Because of his emphasis on habit, he drew on ancient theories about learning even when he claimed to withdraw from the world to which this learning was connected. The ideas of teaching and learning that he had been familiar with as both student and teacher were translated to his new life as an ascetic Christian at Annisa. *Ep*. 2 shows that he presented life at Annisa on the same terms as life in the grammatical and rhetorical schools of the ancient world. Like the ancient classroom, Annisa was a place for a person to mold a *habitus* based on what he saw, spoke, and heard. Thus, in 358, Basil's life at Annisa reflected less of a rejection than a relocation of the philosophical habits of classical *paideia*, in which he exercised the philosophical self-moderation of an educated elite outside the confines of the city in which Roman elites traditionally enjoyed the fruits of their education. By describing his practices of self-moderation at Annisa in terms of the habits that they formed, Basil sought to signal his natural affinity for ascetic praxis. In his self-presentation, asceticism was a series not of practices, but of habits, that were deeply etched onto the metaphorical wax tablet of his soul.

Gregory of Nazianzus on Ascetic Retreat, Noble Birth, and the Ideal Christian Priest

Like his friend Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus conceived of ascetic retreat as a means of contemplating God away from the distractions of city life, and like Basil, Gregory connected such retreat to elite status. Gregory, however, was even more clear about this connection. While Basil drew on an elite discourse to present his asceticism as a natural habit, Gregory drew on both his ascetic retreat and his birth to present himself as an ideal Christian priest. Some scholars have argued that Gregory's asceticism was more intellectual (and thereby less "physical") than

Basil's.[62] The close overlap, however, between "physical" and "intellectual" in ancient theories about the body/soul discourages such a distinction between Basil's and Gregory's ascetic praxis. To paraphrase Susanna Elm, the Nazianzen disagreed with Basil not on the value of ascetic retreat, but rather on its purpose. Basil's 358 letter to Gregory, Elm states, characterized a life of withdrawal in which contemplation of God was the goal *per se*. Gregory, meanwhile, valued such withdrawal as a means to further activity in the "world": for him, the contemplative life (*bios theōretikos*) served as preparation for the active life (*bios praktikos*).[63] Gregory presented his achievement of this contemplation/action balance by drawing on the same metaphor as Basil had done of the soul as a wax tablet that was "molded" with certain habits. Both Basil and Gregory drew on their background as highly-educated elites in order to present themselves as authority figures whose ascetic virtue was a natural function of the way they were properly "molded." Gregory, however, took this metaphor further by connecting his ascetic virtue to his qualification as a Christian leader. In his *Oration on the Priesthood* (*Oration* 2), given on Easter 363, Gregory presented his ascetic retreat as a means of purifying his eyes, ears, and tongue in order to become an ideal priest. At the same time, he implied that only a person (like him) who possessed proper birth could adequately achieve such ascetic purification.

Tradition has characterized *Oration* 2 as Gregory's apology for abandoning his ordination as a priest in favor of the peace and quiet of Annisa. The oration received the subtitle "*In Defense of His Flight to Pontus*" in the manuscript tradition of the text.[64] This oration, however, was less of a defense for skirting priestly responsibilities than a delineation of proper Christian leadership,

---

[62] McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus* (2001), 95-99; Van Dam *Families and Friends* (2003), 156-61.
[63] Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 219-22.
[64] While this oration has commonly been dated to 362, after a flight to Pontus between late 361 and early 362, Elm shows persuasively that the flight more likely occurred between late 362 and early 363, putting *Oration 2* in 363 (Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* [2012], 147-53).

in which Gregory argued that "only a philosopher could be a priest, because only he would lead his community appropriately and guide it to God and salvation."[65] In this *Oration* Gregory presented himself as unworthy of rulership in accordance with the idea, common among philosophers of antiquity, that those who refused power were the most ideal rulers.[66] In this self-presentation, he argued that a priest's authority depended the control of his sight, sound, and speech:

> How could I dare…clothe myself with the garb and name of a priest …before my eye was accustomed to gaze (*blepein*) healthily upon creation, with wonder only for the creator, but not injury to the mold? Before my ears were suitably opened to the education (*tēi paideiai*) of the Lord, and He had granted my ear able to hear without difficulty (*mē bareōs akouein*), but for a golden earring to be bound with precious sardius, that is, the speech of a wise man (*logon sophou*) in a well-hearing ear (*ous euēkoon*)? Before my mouth had been opened to draw in the Spirit (*to…anoigēnai kai helkusai pneuma*), or had been opened and filled with the Spirit of speaking mysteries and doctrines (*platunthēnai kai plērōthēnai tōi pneumati laloumenōn mustēriōn te kai dogmatōn*); before my lips had been bound—to speak according to wisdom—by divine sensation (*aisthēsei theiai*) and—as I would add—loosed in due season; before my tongue, awaking with glory, rising at dawn, and working until it was glued to my windpipe, had been filled with joy and turned into a plectrum of divine melody (*kai theias melōidias genesthai plēktron*)?[67]

Gregory's grandiloquent description of his own apparent unpreparedness emphasized his construction of ideal priesthood as something that was molded through the eyes, ears, and tongue. For him, the ideal priest needed to see, hear, and speak properly in order to become a vessel of divine teachings. His descriptions of sight, hearing, and speech all stressed the

---

[65] Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 156.
[66] Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 158-63.
[67] *Or.* 2.95. πῶς ἔμελλον θαῤῥῆσαι προσφέρειν αὐτῷ τὴν ἔξωθεν, τὴν τῶν μεγάλων μυστηρίων ἀντίτυπον· ἢ πῶς ἱερέως σχῆμα καὶ ὄνομα ὑποδύεσθαι, πρὶν ὁσίοις ἔργοις τελειῶσαι τὰς χεῖρας; πρὶν τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ἐθίσαι βλέπειν ὑγιῶς τὴν κτίσιν, καὶ εἰς θαῦμα μόνον τοῦ κτίσαντος, ἀλλὰ μὴ ζημίαν τοῦ πλάσαντος; πρὶν τῇ παιδείᾳ Κυρίου ἱκανῶς ἀνοιγῆναι τὰ ὦτα, καὶ προστεθῆναί μοι ὠτίον μὴ βαρέως ἀκούειν δυνάμενον, ἀλλὰ ἐνώτιον χρυσοῦν σαρδίῳ πολυτελεῖ δεθῆναι, λόγον σοφοῦ εἰς οὗς εὐήκοον; πρὶν τὸ στόμα, τὰ χείλη, τὴν γλῶσσαν, τὸ μὲν ἀνοιγῆναι καὶ ἑλκῦσαι πνεῦμα, ἢ πλατυνθῆναι καὶ πληρωθῆναι τῷ πνεύματι λαλουμένων μυστηρίων τε καὶ δογμάτων· τὰ δὲ αἰσθήσει θείᾳ, κατὰ τὴν σοφίαν εἰπεῖν, δεθῆναι, προσθείην δ' ἂν ὅτι καὶ ἐν καιρῷ λυθῆναι· τὴν δὲ πλησθῆναι ἀγαλλιάσεως, καὶ θείας μελῳδίας γενέσθαι πλῆκτρον, ἐξεγειρομένην τῇ δόξῃ, συνεξεγειρομένην ὄρθριον, καὶ μέχρι τοῦ κολληθῆναι τῷ λάρυγγι κάμνουσαν;

perceived close connection between the senses, the voice, and the soul that Basil had stressed in *Ep*. 2. Gregory implied that a proper priest must gaze "healthily" upon the world through his eyes and open his ears to the wisdom of the Lord. Additionally, the ability to "draw in" the Spirit (*pneuma*) through speech reflected ancient ideas that the air (*pneuma*) of speech could regulate a person's body and soul.[68] In so doing, the priest became a musical instrument (*plēktron*) that would create proper melody in the ears of those who listened to its speech. The ideal priest, in Gregory's words, became an instrument of God through the purity of the words and images that entered into his soul.

Ascetic retreat was an essential element in Gregory's construction of such an ideal priest. Like Basil, he presented retreat in terms of controlling the eyes, ears, and tongue. When he declared that he felt unprepared for the great duty of the priesthood, Gregory followed his friend in characterizing retreat to Annisa as a means of withdrawing the senses from city life:

> For nothing seemed to me so desirable as closing my senses (*musanta tas aisthēseis*), becoming outside the flesh and the world, drawing within myself, having no connection that was not entirely necessary with human affairs (*tōn anthrōpinōn*), and speaking (*proslalounta*) to myself and to God, to live above visible things (*huper ta horōmena*), and preserving within myself the ever-pure divine reflections unmixed with the wandering characters below and both being and always becoming a spotless mirror (*esoptron akēlidōton*) of God and the divine things, adding light to light, and something more clear to something more dark, already reaping by hope the good of the world to come, and accompanying the angels, even now being above the earth having abandoned it, and stationed on high by the spirit.[69]

---

[68] Gleason, *Making Men* (1995), 85.

[69] *Or.* 2.7. Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐδόκει μοι τοιοῦτον οἷον μύσαντα τὰς αἰσθήσεις, ἔξω σαρκὸς καὶ κόσμου γενόμενον, εἰς ἑαυτὸν συστραφέντα, μηδενὸς τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων προσαπτόμενον, ὅτι μὴ πᾶσα ἀνάγκη, ἑαυτῷ προσλαλοῦντα καὶ τῷ Θεῷ, ζῆν ὑπὲρ τὰ ὁρώμενα, καὶ τὰς θείας ἐμφάσεις ἀεὶ καθαρὰς ἐν ἑαυτῷ φέρειν ἀμιγεῖς τῶν κάτω χαρακτήρων καὶ πλανωμένων, ὄντως ἔσοπτρον ἀκηλίδωτον Θεοῦ καὶ τῶν θείων καὶ ὂν καὶ ἀεὶ γινόμενον, φωτὶ προσλαμβάνοντα φῶς, καὶ ἀμαυροτέρῳ τρανότερον, ἤδη τὸ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος ἀγαθὸν ταῖς ἐλπίσι καρπούμενον, καὶ συμπεριπολεῖν ἀγγέλοις, ἔτι ὑπὲρ γῆς ὄντα καταλιπόντα τὴν γῆν, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ἄνω τιθέμενον.

This passage offers a clear echo of Basil's description of ascetic retreat as a means of sensory control. Gregory characterized his flight to Annisa as a "closing of my senses" to the "outside" world and the flesh. He particularly emphasized the importance of visuality in his construction of the contemplative life, as he linked divine contemplation with spiritual illumination. As Jostein Børtnes has shown, Gregory, like Basil, believed that images (*eikones*) from the Scriptures served to prompt the memory of God in the mind of the reader.[70] His description of the purity of "divine reflections" as distinct from the "characters" of the world shows this same idea present in the *Oration on the Priesthood*. His self-fashioning as a "spotless mirror," moreover, connected to Basil's ideas of reading as a means of visualizing and reflecting divine virtue. Like Basil, Gregory viewed retreat from the "world" as a means of re-training the senses to perceive God.

Yet while Gregory followed Basil in presenting ascetic retreat as a purification of the senses, he deployed the "wax tablet" metaphor in a significantly different way than did Basil. As argued above, Basil conceived of his withdrawal to Annisa as a means of erasing the writings on the metaphorical wax tablet of the soul, and of replacing them with new, divine, writings. For Basil, re-inscribing new habits was a necessary, if difficult, part of ascetic retreat. Gregory, however, deployed the "wax tablet" metaphor in the context of a priest's pedagogical duties. Keeping one's self free from sin, he argued, was not enough for one who wished to "instruct others in virtue (*tous allous paideuin pros aretēn*)."[71] Accordingly, the ideal priest must "not only wash away (*exaleipsai*) the poor impressions (*tous phaulous…tupous*) from [his] soul, but also inscribe (*engrapsasthai*) better ones."[72] Gregory thus connected the "wax tablet" metaphor to

---

[70] Jostein Børtnes, "Rhetoric and Mental Images in Gregory," in Jostein Børtnes and Thomas Hägg (eds.), *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006), 37-57.

[71] *Or.* 2.14. εἰ καί τις ἁγνὸν ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας τηρήσειεν, ἢ ὡς μάλιστα, οὐκ οἶδα μὲν, εἰ καὶ τοῦτο αὔταρκες τῷ μέλλοντι τοὺς ἄλλους παιδεύειν πρὸς ἀρετήν.

[72] *Or.* 2.14. οὐδὲ τοὺς φαύλους ἐξαλεῖψαι τῆς ψυχῆς τύπους μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἀμείνους ἐγγράψασθαι.

education more explicitly than did Basil. For him, "washing away" poor impressions from the soul was not simply a necessary part of forming ascetic habits, but the first step towards becoming an ideal priest who could teach others in Christian *paideia*. In this way, Gregory developed Basil's use of the "wax tablet" metaphor as a symbol of authority for Christian leaders.

Gregory linked this authority closely to the social status of the educated elite. Much of his *On the Priesthood* attacked what he saw as the problem of people "no better than the common folk (*tōn pollōn*)" forcing themselves into the priesthood.[73] Such people, Gregory lamented, entered the priesthood while considering it "not an impression (*tupon*) of virtue, but a means of life."[74] Gregory's elite background shows clearly in this critique of "common" people who allegedly considered the priesthood a profession. Further, his language links the "wax tablet" metaphor with social status, as Gregory presented priestly office as an impression (*tupos*), echoing his call for priests to inscribe virtuous impressions on their souls. "Common" priests, in Gregory's view, did not appreciate the priesthood as an imprint of virtue. Such priests were "bad painters of the wonder of virtue (*tēs thaumasias aretēs kakoi zōgraphoi*)" and a bad model (*archetupon*) for other painters.[75] While Basil's *Ep*. 2 presented the Scriptures as a source of positive models from which ascetics could "paint" virtue in their minds, Gregory turned this metaphor into a critique of allegedly non-elite priests. In his mind, such priests, who did not

---

[73] *Or.* 2.8. ἠσχύνθην ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων, ὅσοι, μηδὲν τῶν πολλῶν ὄντες βελτίους, μέγα μὲν οὖν, εἰ καὶ μὴ πολλῷ χείρους, ἀνίπτοις χερσὶν, ὃ δὴ λέγεται, καὶ ἀμυήτοις ψυχαῖς τοῖς ἁγιωτάτοις ἑαυτοὺς ἐπεισάγουσι. For the connection between Gregory's language against "common" priests and Julian's language against Cynics, see Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 164-5.

[74] *Or* 2.8. ὥσπερ οὐκ ἀρετῆς τύπον, ἀλλ' ἀφορμὴν βίου τὴν τάξιν ταύτην εἶναι νομίζοντες.

[75] *Or.* 2.13. Πρῶτον μὲν δὴ τοῦτο, ὧν εἴπομεν, εὐλαβεῖσθαι ἄξιον, μὴ φαινώμεθα τῆς θαυμασίας ἀρετῆς κακοὶ ζωγράφοι, μᾶλλον δὲ ζωγράφων οὐ φαύλων ἴσως, τῶν δὲ πολλῶν φαῦλον ἀρχέτυπον.

accept priestly office as an imprint of their own virtue, served as improper models for their followers and were thus not qualified to lead.

According to Gregory, the overabundance of these "common" priests in his day created an excess of teachers who corrupted the souls of their students. "There will be no one left to rule," he warned, "when all are teachers, instead of being 'taught of God' (Jn. 6:45, Is. 54:13)."[76] Gregory linked this apparent glut of teachers to the multiple conflicting theological opinions of his day. Several people, he lamented, wandered from one teacher to another, listening to various lessons, with the result that they accepted and rejected all forms of teaching and ultimately received no real benefit:

> They are then carried and turned about here and there by one plausible idea after another, and drenched and trampled by all kinds of speech, having exchanged many teachers and many writings, easily throwing them to the winds as dust, at last they are wearied in both their hearing and understanding, and—oh the folly—they are equally annoyed with every kind of speech, and they inscribe a wretched print upon themselves *(mochthēron tupon heautois engraphousin)*, and they deride and despise our faith as unstable and unhealthy, turning unlearnedly (*apaideutōs*) from the speakers against the speech (*apo tōn legontōn epi ton logon*), just as if someone diseased in their eyes, or injured in their ears, were to accuse the sun of being dim and not shining, or the sounds of being dissonant and weak.[77]

Gregory's critique of wandering students here parallels the complaints Basil and Gregory of Nyssa levied against wandering monks, a point to which I will return in a later chapter.[78] For now, I wish to emphasize Gregory's continued deployment of the "wax tablet" metaphor to

---

[76] *Or.* 2.8. ὥστε ἔμοιγε δοκοῦσι, προϊόντος τοῦ χρόνου καὶ τοῦ κακοῦ, μηδὲ ἔχειν λοιπὸν ὧν ἄρξουσι, πάντων διδασκόντων ἀντὶ τοῦ διδακτοὺς εἶναι Θεοῦ.

[77] *Or.* 2.42. ἔπειτα ὑπὸ τῆς πιθανότητος ἄλλοτε ἄλλης περιφερόμενοι καὶ στρεφόμενοι, καὶ παντὶ λόγῳ καταπλυνθέντες καὶ πατηθέντες, πολλοὺς ἀμείψαντες διδασκάλους καὶ πολλὰ γράμματα, ὥσπερ χοῦν ἀνέμοις ῥᾳδίως ἀποβαλόντες, τέλος ἀποκαμόντες καὶ ἀκοὴν καὶ διάνοιαν, (ὢ τῆς ἀλογίας!) πρὸς πάντα λόγον ὁμοίως δυσχεραίνουσι, καὶ μοχθηρὸν τύπον ἑαυτοῖς ἐγγράφουσιν, αὐτῆς καταγελᾷν ἡμῶν καὶ καταφρονεῖν ὡς ἀστάτου καὶ οὐδὲν ὑγιὲς ἐχούσης τῆς πίστεως, μεταβαίνοντες ἀπαιδεύτως ἀπὸ τῶν λεγόντων ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον· ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς κακῶς διακείμενος, ἢ τὰ ὦτα διεφθαρμένος, κατηγοροίη τοῦ ἡλίου ἢ τῶν φωνῶν, τοῦ μὲν ὡς ἀμαυροῦ καὶ οὐ στίλβοντος, τῶν δὲ ὡς ἐκμελῶν καὶ ἀτόνων.

[78] See Chapter 4.

attack those he considered ill-fitted priests. When people wandered from one teacher to another, he argued, they inscribed a "wretched impression" upon their souls, in opposition to the "impression of virtue" a priest should bear.

This decrial of wandering students, moreover, was rooted in the elite world of *paideia*. Coming from Athens, Gregory knew that students formed identities around their teachers and that switching from one teacher to another often created conflict.[79] Similarly in Antioch, the sophist Libanius bemoaned the fact that students would sometimes abandon his classroom for the lessons of another teacher.[80] In his *Oration on the Priesthood*, Gregory transferred this idea of teacher loyalty to his conception of Christian leadership, where more was at stake. Among the communities of Athens, a surfeit of different instructors to choose from created conflict—both intellectual and physical—between student groups. Among the communities of Christians, however, such surfeit engendered theological conflict, where only one teaching could be right. For a priest such as Gregory, this theological conflict was far worse than student brawling, since in addition to physical altercations, it also endangered Christians' souls. Thus, the danger of people who wandered from one form of teaching to another related to his quarrels about "common" priests. As ill-suited teachers, "common" priests created a glut of misinformation that led their followers to wander, and such wandering stamped bad imprints onto their souls.

Gregory continued to deploy the "wax tablet" metaphor to assert the solidity of his own priestly qualifications. He likened Christian teachings to writings impressed on the wax tablet of the soul, and followed Basil in insisting that it was easier to carve these writings while the wax was still hot:

---

[79] Watts, "The Student Self in Late Antiquity," in *Religion and the Self in Antiquity* (2005), 234-52. Issues of group identity around a particular teacher often lay behind riots in Athens during the fourth-century, when violence was becoming more common in the town (Watts, *City and School* [2006], 42-3).
[80] *Or.* 43.8; Cribiore, *The School of Libanius* (2007), 191-96.

> And therefore, it is easier to cut (*kainotomein*) the truth into a fresh soul, like wax not yet engraved, than to write the pious word (*eusebē logon*) on top of letters (*graphein kata grammatōn*)—I mean wicked teachings and dogmas (*ponērōn legō didagmatōn kai dogmatōn*)—with the result that the former are mixed and disorganized by the latter. It is better to tread a smooth and well-trodden road than one jagged and untrodden, and to plough earth that the plough has often cleft and broken up; but it is better to write upon (*graphein*) a soul, which a wretched word (*logos…mochthēros*) has not yet engraved, and in which the letters of evil (*ta tēs kakias…grammata*) have not yet been deeply cut. For otherwise, there would be two tasks for the pious inscriber (*tōi theosebei kalligraphōi*): to wash over (*exaleiphein*) the previous impressions (*tous proterous tupous*), and to re-write (*metengraphein*) impressions that are more acceptable and worthy of remaining.[81]

Gregory's description of "cutting fresh" the "right" teaching into the souls of his audience is similar to Basil's language in both his letter to Gregory and in his *Address to Young Men*. Gregory, however, deploys the metaphor for a different purpose. The "pious word" that Gregory wished to inscribe on fresh souls likely referred to his version of pro-Nicene theology, as opposed to the "wretched word" of theological opponents such as Aëtius and Eunomius.[82] While Basil lauded retreat as a means of "washing away" previous Greek knowledge and inscribing new Christian letters, Gregory emphasized the superiority of having proper (Christian orthodox) teaching inscribed on one's soul in the first place: only those with "improper" teachings—i.e., heresy—required a washing. Basil would certainly have agreed with Gregory that it was easier to teach someone with no previous learning than to "un-teach" incorrect learning. Gregory's emphasis in his *Oration* 2, however, is significant. When Gregory described erasing and re-inscribing wax as a process of erasing heresy and replacing it with orthodoxy, he implied that ideal priests (like himself) were those who never required such an erasure. Basil's deployment of

---

[81] *Or.* 2.43. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ῥᾷον ἄρτι καινοτομεῖν ἀλήθειαν ψυχῇ, ὥσπερ κηρὸν οὔπω κεχαραγμένον, ἢ γράφειν κατὰ γραμμάτων, πονηρῶν λέγω διδαγμάτων τε καὶ δογμάτων, εὐσεβῆ λόγον, ὡς συγχεῖσθαι καὶ ἀτακτεῖν τοῖς προτέροις τὰ δεύτερα. Ὁδὸν μὲν γὰρ πατεῖν ἄμεινον τὴν λείαν καὶ τετριμμένην ἢ τὴν ἀτριβῆ καὶ τραχεῖαν, καὶ γῆν ἀροῦν ἢν πολλάκις ἄροτρον ἔτεμεν καὶ ἠμέρωσεν· ψυχὴν δὲ γράφειν, ἣν οὔπω λόγος ἐχάραξε μοχθηρὸς, οὐδὲ εἰς βάθος τὰ τῆς κακίας ἐνεσημάνθη γράμματα· δύο γὰρ ἂν οὕτω τὰ ἔργα γίνοιντο τῷ θεοσεβεῖ καλλιγράφῳ, ἐξαλείφειν τε τοὺς προτέρους τύπους, καὶ μετεγγράφειν τοὺς δοκιμωτέρους τε καὶ τοῦ μένειν ἀξιωτέρους.
[82] Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 211-2.

the metaphor of erasure implied that he himself washed away his previous "worldly" habits through ascetic retreat, while Gregory's deployment of the same metaphor implied that he—not tainted by heresy—did not need such washing. According to this presentation, Gregory situated himself as a suitable Christian leader whose soul had never been corrupted by "false" doctrines that needed to be erased.

Gregory presented himself as such a person by calling on not only his education, but also his noble birth. For the elite of the Greek and Roman world, noble birth was just as important a marker of *paideia* as schooling.[83] His praise of those who had received proper (Christian orthodox) education in their souls without having to wash off the improper lessons of heresy related to his presentation of his noble birth in his first *Oration*. In this *Oration*, delivered in fall of 362, he lauded his father as leader of the Church at Nazianzus.[84] His praise made clear that Gregory the Elder had "inscribed" his community with correct teachings:

> And he places at your disposal all that is his. O what generosity—or, to say what is more true, what love of children! [He has given you] his grey hairs, his youth, the temple, the high priest, the testator, the heir, the speeches which you longed for: and of these speeches, not those which flow out into the air in vain and stop at the hearing, but those which the Spirit writes (*graphei*) and engraves (*entupoi*) on tablets of stone—or rather of flesh (*sarkinais*)—not speeches engraved on the surface, nor those easily erased, but those impressed deeply (*eis bathos ensēmainomenous*), not by ink, but by grace (cf. 2 Cor 3.3).[85]

By praising his father's ability to impress Christian teachings upon his community, Gregory presented himself as an ideal teacher through his connection to his father. In ancient medical

---

[83] Bloomer, *The School of Rome* (2011), 67-70; Cribiore, *The School of Libanius* (2007), 129-34.
[84] Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 187-200.
[85] *Or.* 1.6. καὶ πάντα προστίθησιν ὑμῖν τὰ ἑαυτοῦ. Ὢ τῆς μεγαλοψυχίας, ἢ, τό γε ἀληθέστερον εἰπεῖν, τῆς φιλοτεκνίας· τὴν πολιὰν, τὴν νεότητα, τὸν ναὸν, τὸν ἀρχιερέα, τὸν κληροδότην, τὸν κληρονόμον, τοὺς λόγους, οὓς ἐποθεῖτε· καὶ τούτων οὐ τοὺς εἰκῆ, καὶ εἰς ἀέρα ῥέοντας, καὶ μέχρι τῆς ἀκοῆς ἱσταμένους, ἀλλ' οὓς γράφει τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ πλαξὶν ἐντυποῖ λιθίναις, εἴτουν σαρκίναις, οὐκ ἐξ ἐπιπολῆς χαρασσομένους, οὐδὲ ῥᾳδίως ἀπαλειφομένους, ἀλλ' εἰς βάθος ἐνσημαινομένους, οὐ μέλανι, ἀλλὰ χάριτι.

theory, the regulative power of *pneuma* on the external and internal body involved control over the heat and the viscosity of the body's liquids—including semen—regulated speech and hearing. A well-educated man, therefore, would have well-regulated semen that would produce a son (weaker semen produced daughters).[86] Gregory would have been exposed to contemporary medical theories through his education, and would likely have been familiar with theories that linked semen and masculinity. When he presented his father as an ideal teacher, Gregory thus attributed similar traits to himself. By receiving his father's blood, Gregory implied, he received the character of his father imprinted upon his soul from birth, and through this character, the ability to imprint others' souls with proper teaching.

In addition to his biological connection to his father, Gregory also emphasized his mother Nonna's early influence shaping him towards Christian virtue.[87] Through his mother's wishes, Gregory claimed, he had been led to contemplate divinity and devote himself to God even before he was born: "I was called from youth (so that I may speak of things unknown to most), and cast upon Him from the womb, and given as a gift from my mother's promise, and after this confirmed by dangers."[88] The promise his mother had planted within him was the yearning for God, a yearning which grew stronger through the trials and tribulations of his life and which led him to give everything to God: property, fame, health, and "even my very words, from which I only gained the advantage of despising them and having Christ as more honorable than them."[89]

---

[86] Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 196, esp. notes 53-6.
[87] For a more extensive analysis of Gregory's presentation of his mother, see Chapter 3.
[88] *Or.* 2.77. καίτοι προσεκλήθην μὲν ἐκ νεότητος, ἵν' εἴπω τι τῶν τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀγνοουμένων, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐπεῤῥίφην ἐκ μήτρας, καὶ ἐδόθην δοτὸς ἐκ μητρικῆς ὑποσχέσεως, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο τοῖς κινδύνοις ἐβεβαιώθην.
[89] *Or.* 2.77. καὶ ὁ πόθος συνηυξήθη, καὶ ὁ λογισμὸς συνέδραμε, καὶ πάντα ἔδωκα φέρων τῷ λαχόντι καὶ σώσαντι, κτῆσιν, περιφάνειαν, εὐεξίαν, τοὺς λόγους αὐτοὺς, ὧν τοῦτο ἀπήλαυσα μόνον, τὸ παριδεῖν καὶ ἐσχηκέναι ὧν Χριστὸν προετίμησα.

As a result of his mother's early devotion, Gregory declared, he was pre-disposed toward controlling his senses and training his mind to love God:

> And the words of God were made sweet as honeycombs to me, and I cried after understanding and lifted up my voice for wisdom (cf. Proverbs 2:3). It was possible, moreover, to moderate passion (*thumon metrēsai*), to bridle my tongue (*glōssan chalinōsai*), and to restrain my eye (*ophthalmon sōphronisai*), and to check my belly (*gastera paidagōgēsai*), and to trample the glory which remains below.[90]

Basil had claimed in his letter to Gregory that his eyes, ears, and tongue could be trained at Annisa to contemplate God. In his *Oration on the Priesthood*, however, Gregory connected his sensory and vocal control not simply to his retreat, but also—and, perhaps, more importantly—to the virtues of his parents. The same virtues of self-moderation (*metrēsai, chalinōsai*, *sōphronisai, paidagōgēsai*) commonly praised by educated elites, Gregory claimed, were already "inscribed" on his soul, thanks to the work of his mother and father. While he still valued retreat, he did not believe that separation from the world could achieve Christian virtue in itself: one had to be, as Gregory was, already inclined toward this virtue by birth.

While both Gregory and Basil came from wealthy elite Cappadocian families, Gregory stressed the importance of high birth in his intellectual formation much more than Basil did. The cultural capital of an educated elite Roman stemmed from both birth (nature) and training (nurture), and Gregory made it clear in his *Oration on the Priesthood* that he had benefitted from both of these qualities. Like Basil, he praised ascetic retreat as a place to purify sight, sound, and speech. He also followed his friend in describing Christian virtue with the metaphor of a wax tablet on which writing could be written, erased, and re-written. Gregory, however, did not draw on this metaphor to distinguish the teachings of the "world" from those of ascetic retreat, as Basil

---

[90] *Or.* 2.77. Καὶ ἡδύνθη μοι τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγια, ὡς κηρία μέλιτος· καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν ἐπεκαλεσάμην, καὶ τῇ σοφίᾳ ἔδωκα φωνήν μου. Καὶ τἄλλα δὴ ταῦτα, οἷον θυμὸν μετρῆσαι, καὶ γλῶσσαν χαλινῶσαι, καὶ ὀφθαλμὸν σωφρονίσαι, καὶ γαστέρα παιδαγωγῆσαι, καὶ δόξαν πατῆσαι τὴν κάτω μένουσαν.

had done. On the contrary, Gregory argued that ideal priests were those who never had to "erase" previous teachings from their souls. Others, corrupted by the misinformed and heretical instruction of "common" priests, became stamped with foul impressions and required such an erasure. Ideal priests (like himself), however, received the impressions of divine grace stamped into their souls from birth, and were ideally disposed to self-moderation by virtue of their parents. Gregory, then, deployed the notion that education was stamped deeply into the soul, like letters on wax, in order to assert his qualifications as an orthodox Christian priest by virtue of not only his ascetic self-moderation, but also his noble birth and elite education. When Gregory outlined his ideal priest in his *Oration on the Priesthood*, he drew on ancient assumptions about the social background of an ideal philosopher, and explicitly linked these assumptions to his self-presentation as a proper Christian leader.

The Emperor Julian on Classical Learning and the Ascetic Habits of a Hellenic Priest

Basil and Gregory both presented themselves as elite Christian authorities whose souls were properly impressed with ascetic habits. The emperor Julian adopted a very similar self-presentation, though with a different religious affiliation. Julian, like Basil and Gregory, connected his authority as a self-moderated philosopher with the habits that he had formed through his education and ascetic praxis. Moreover, Julian connected this self-moderation to his control of his senses and voice. Further, like Gregory, he asserted that such sensory and vocal control was a necessary part of a priest's duty—and he, as a self-moderated philosopher, was qualified to serve as head priest of the Roman Empire. Two of the emperor's texts, both written from Antioch in early 363, highlight these themes of self-presentation. First, Julian's *Misopōgōn*

("Beard-hater"), written in February 363, sarcastically insulted himself and praised the inhabitants of Antioch in a way that presented himself as a philosopher, and the Antiochenes as luxurious effeminates.[91] Second, a letter he wrote in early 363 to the high priest Theodoros (*Ep.* 89 in Bidez' edition) outlines what Julian envisioned to be the primary duties of a Hellenic priest. These two texts highlight how Julian presented himself as a philosopher whose self-moderation was a deeply-impressed habit, and how he conceived of this self-moderation as a necessary part of priestly service.

Julian wrote the *Misopōgōn* in response to mockery he received from the Antiochene citizens during his stay in the city from 362 to 363. As both Ammianus Marcellinus and the emperor himself wrote, this mockery was centered around his shaggy appearance, which the Antiochenes ridiculed as boorish and goat-like.[92] In the *Misopōgōn*, Julian sought to turn this ridicule around with a sarcastic self-critique. I will discuss Julian's appearance more extensively in the following chapter. For now, what is significant is how the emperor connected his ragged appearance to his character. He linked his shaggy beard directly to his ascetic habits of avoiding the theater and the hippodrome, sleeping on a hard bed, and abstemious diet.[93] These habits, he claimed, were instilled in him through his education, and were fundamentally incompatible with a soft, luxurious city like Antioch.[94] Explaining to his audience why he disdained to attend the theater, he insisted that he was educated to avoid such detrimental sights:

---

[91] For analysis of the praise and invective of the *Misopōgon*, see Nicholas Baker-Brian, "The Politics of Virtue in Julian's *Misopōgōn*," in *Emperor and Author* (2012), eds. Baker-Brian and Tougher, 263-80, and Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 327-31.
[92] *Mis.* 345d, 364b-c, 366c; Amm. Marc. 22.14.2-3.
[93] *Mis.* 339c-340c.
[94] For more on Greek-speaking critiques of the habits and customs of Syria, see Nathanael J. Andrade, *Syrian Identity in the Greco-Roman World* (New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 245-60.

> No, my temperament (*tropos*) does not allow me to gaze softly (*blepein hugron*), casting my eyes everywhere (*riptounta pantachou ta ommata*), in order that I may seem beautiful to you, not in soul but in face. For, as you judge, true beauty of soul consists in a soft life (*hugrotēs biou*). But my tutor (*paidagōgos*) taught me to look on the ground (*eis gēn blepein*) on my way to school (*eis didaskalou*), and as for a theater, I never saw one until I had more hair on my chin than on my head, and even at that age it was never on my own account and by my own wish.[95]

Julian attributed many of his habits as emperor to his boyhood tutor, Mardonios.[96] In this passage, he directly linked his attitude toward the theater to the temperament (*tropos*) his education had instilled in him. These habits involved knowing how to use his eyes: since his tutor had taught him to look directly at the ground, he claimed he could not look "softly" like the Antiochenes. Since he was not accustomed to such a soft effeminate gaze, Julian argued, he could not attend a location of soft effeminate gazing like the theater.

Julian presented this anti-theatrical temperament as a character trait that was impressed in his soul. Like Basil and Gregory, he deployed the "wax tablet" metaphor to describe this aspect of his self-moderation, which he claimed came from his early exposure to *paideia*. Indeed, Julian echoed not only contemporaries like Basil and Gregory, but also past educated Greeks like the author of *On Educating Children* who believed that the purpose of education was to train a young boy to talk, walk, and act like a proper free man. As Julian argued, Mardonios impressed such a *habitus* in him when he was young, and this *habitus* was fundamentally incompatible with the city of Antioch:

> Therefore forgive me. For I hand over to you instead of myself one whom you will more justly detest, I mean that curmudgeon my tutor who even then used to harass me by teaching

---

[95] *Mis*. 351a. ἐμὲ δὲ ὑγρὸν βλέπειν ῥιπτοῦντα πανταχοῦ τὰ ὄμματα κατόπιν, ὅπως ὑμῖν καλός, οὔτι τὴν ψυχήν, ἀλλὰ τὸ πρόσωπον ὀφθείην, ὁ τρόπος οὐ συγχωρεῖ. Ἔστι μὲν γάρ, ὡς ὑμεῖς κρίνετε, ψυχῆς ἀληθινὸν κάλλος ὑγρότης βίου· ἐμὲ δὲ ὁ παιδαγωγὸς ἐδίδασκεν εἰς γῆν βλέπειν ἐς διδασκάλου φοιτῶντα· θέατρον <δ'> οὐκ εἶδον πρὶν μᾶλλον κομῆσαι τῆς κεφαλῆς τὸ γένειον, ἐν ἐκείνῳ δὲ τῆς ἡλικίας ἰδίᾳ μὲν καὶ κατ' ἐμαυτὸν οὐδέποτε.
[96] Bouffartigue, *L'empereur Julien* (1992), 49.

> me to walk in one straight path, and now he is responsible for my quarrel with you. It was he who produced in my soul and as if it were impressed *(entupōsas)* what I did not then desire, though he was very zealous in implanting it, as though he were producing some charming characteristic: boorishness (*agroikian*) he called dignity (*semnotēta*), lack of taste (*anaisthēsian*) he called self-moderation (*sōphrosunēn*), and not yielding to one's desires or achieving happiness by that means he called manliness (*andreian*).[97]

The claim that his tutor implanted positive qualities (dignity, self-moderation, manliness) within his soul highlights how Julian deployed the "wax tablet" metaphor to present himself as a natural philosopher. According to the emperor, these qualities were imprinted on his soul by his boyhood tutor. What the Antiochenes allegedly mocked him for—boorishness, lack of taste, not yielding to his desires—were in fact the desired qualities of self-moderation praised by elite philosophers. By describing these qualities as traits imprinted on his soul, Julian declared that the ascetic *habitus* of an elite philosopher was a fundamental and unchangeable part of his character. In this way, Julian's philosophical self-presentation mirrored Gregory's in calling on noble birth and early education.

For Julian, a philosophical *habitus* was intimately connected with reading the Greek classics. In a speech that he placed in the mouth of Mardonios, Julian claimed that for a true man of *paideia* such as himself, reading provided far more sensory pleasure than the theater ever could:

> Never let the crowd of your comrades who flock to the theaters lead you to crave such spectacles. Do you desire horse races? There is one in Homer most cleverly described; take the book and study it. Do you hear the dancing pantomimes? Let them be: among the Phaeacians the youths dance in a more manly fashion (*andrikōteron*). And you have Phemios as a citharode and Demodokos as a singer. Moreover, there are in Homer also

---

[97] *Mis.* 351b-c. Συγγνωτέον οὖν ἐμοί· δίδωμι γὰρ ὃν ἀντ' ἐμοῦ δικαιότερον μισήσετε, τὸν φιλαπεχθήμονα παιδαγωγόν, ὅς με καὶ τότε ἐλύπει μίαν ὁδὸν ἰέναι διδάσκων, καὶ νῦν αἴτιός ἐστί μοι τῆς πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἀπεχθείας, ἐνεργασάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ καὶ ὥσπερ ἐντυπώσας ὅπερ ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἐβουλόμην τότε, ὁ δὲ ὡς δή τι χαρίεν ποιῶν μάλα προθύμως ἐνετίθει, καλῶν οἶμαι σεμνότητα τὴν ἀγροικίαν καὶ σωφροσύνην τὴν ἀναισθησίαν, ἀνδρείαν δὲ τὸ μὴ εἴκειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις μηδὲ εὐδαίμονα ταύτῃ γίνεσθαι.

> many plants more delightful to hear about (*terpnotera akousai*) than those that are visible…be assured that there is nothing more delightful to the sight (*opsei terpnoteron*) than these.[98]

In the persona of his former tutor, Julian insisted upon the superiority of Homer over all theatrical entertainment. Since Homer was the cornerstone of Greek education, he thus presented education as the supreme form of entertainment for a proper educated elite such as himself. Not only did he argue that Homer provided better descriptions of the entertainments a youth may desire in the theater (horse-racing, pantomiming, cithara, singing), he also labeled Homer's stories as more masculine than the theater. Additionally, Julian's argument that *hearing* the words of Homer provided a more vivid experience than *seeing* the shows of the theater echoed Plutarch's praise of hearing as a means of imprinting virtue onto the souls of children. By hearing Homer, Julian argued, a child would both receive greater entertainment *and* be imprinted with virtue more than he would by viewing the spectacles of the theater and circus.

Like Gregory, Julian conceived of such habits of self-moderation, imprinted onto a student's soul through education, as a necessary qualification for religious leaders. A letter to the high priest of Asia Minor Theodoros (*Ep.* 89) shows how he envisioned control of the eyes, ears, and mouth as necessary qualifications for a Hellenic priest. This letter further highlights how the emperor viewed education and religious worship to be intertwined. *Ep.* 89, in which Julian detailed the values and teachings that he believed an ideal priest should display, was written at the same time as his anti-Christian polemic *Against the Galileans*, and expounded the same ideal

---

[98] *Mis.* 351d. Μή σε παραπειθέτω τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἡλικιωτῶν ἐπὶ τὰ θέατρα φερόμενον ὀρεχθῆναί ποτε ταυτησὶ τῆς θέας. Ἱπποδρομίας ἐπιθυμεῖς; ἔστι παρ' Ὁμήρῳ δεξιώτατα πεποιημένη· λαβὼν ἐπέξιθι τὸ βιβλίον. Τοὺς παντομίμους ἀκούεις ὀρχηστάς; ἔα χαίρειν αὐτούς· ἀνδρικώτερον παρὰ τοῖς Φαίαξιν ὀρχεῖται τὰ μειράκια· σὺ δὲ ἔχεις κιθαρῳδὸν τὸν Φήμιον καὶ ᾠδὸν τὸν Δημόδοκον. Ἔστι καὶ φυτὰ παρ' αὐτῷ πολλῷ τερπνότερα ἀκοῦσαι τῶν ὁρωμένων…εὖ ἴσθι, τούτων οὐδὲν ὄψει τερπνότερον.

of education as a means to proper Hellenic religious behavior as was present in his famous legislation on teachers.[99] For Julian, a priest needed to be properly educated, since he served as mediator between the human world and the divine world by means of the learning that he acquired.[100] As a normative text that intended to define and regulate ideal behavior for a community leader, *Ep.* 89 reveals how Julian, like Basil and Gregory, conceived of self-control of the senses and voice to be an essential marker of a proper servant of the Divine.

In *Ep.* 89, Julian advocated priests to control their sight by avoiding theaters and by viewing divine images. Just as he had done in the *Misopōgōn*, so too in *Ep.* 89 Julian insisted that theatrical entertainments were antithetical to the ascetic *habitus* of a religious authority like himself or Theodoros: "no priest anywhere must be present at the licentious (*aselgesi*) theaters of today, nor allow one into his house, for this is altogether unfitting."[101] Not only should priests avoid theaters, they must also not corrupt themselves through any association whatsoever with theater performers: "let no priest enter a theater or have an actor or charioteer for a friend, and let no dancer or mime even approach his door."[102] This complete separation from the theater reflects ancient ideas about how sights could enter into and corrupt a viewer's soul. In Julian's eyes, a priest's philosophical self-moderation could not be reconciled with the licentious sights of the theater, just as his ascetic habits could not be reconciled with the Antiochenes' theatergoing habits. Julian, who conceived of his distaste for the theater as something deeply impressed within

---

[99] Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 321.
[100] Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 323-4.
[101] *Ep.* 89b 304b. Τοῖς ἀσελγέσι τούτοις θεάτροις τῶν ἱερέων μηδεὶς μηδαμοῦ παραβαλλέτω μήτε εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἰσαγέτω τὴν ἑαυτοῦ· πρέπει γὰρ οὐδαμῶς.
[102] *Ep.* 89b 304c. Μηδεὶς οὖν ἱερεὺς εἰς θέατρον ἐξίτω, μηδὲ ποιείσθω φίλον θυμελικὸν μηδὲ ἁρματηλάτην, μηδὲ ὀρχηστὴς μηδὲ μῖμος αὐτοῦ τῇ θύρᾳ προσίτω.

his soul, considered not only viewing the theater, but even associating with its performers, as a corruption that would be altogether unfitting for a Hellenic priest.

In place of the licentious sights of the theater, Julian instructed priests to view the images of the gods. For the emperor's ideal Hellenic priest, knowledge of the gods required knowledge of how properly to view them through the intermediary of visible objects. Priests, Julian claimed, must "always endeavor to think piously about the gods, gazing upon (*apoblepōn*) the temples and statues of the gods with a fitting honor and piety and worshipping the gods as if he saw them present."[103] In the emperor's conception of the ideal priest, viewing these images went hand in hand with having pious thoughts about the gods. Physical images of the gods—Julian included not only temples and statues but also the heavenly bodies in this category—were necessary as visual aids because humans, having bodies, needed to worship the gods bodily (*sōmatikōs*), even though the gods were bodiless (*asōmatoi*).[104] Julian thus emphasized to Theodoros that priests must interpret images of gods as visual intermediaries, in between the material and immaterial worlds. On the one hand, Julian insisted that the images were not themselves divine. Just as it would be foolish to envision an image of the emperor as the emperor himself, so it would be foolish to envision a statue of a god as an actual divinity. On the other hand, just as one who loves the emperor rejoices at the sight of his image, so "he who loves the gods happily gazes

---

[103] *Ep.* 89b 293a. Ἐκ δὴ τῶν τοιούτων ἠθῶν τε καὶ ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἕκαστος ἡμῶν ὁρμώμενος, εὐλαβείας τῆς εἰς τοὺς θεούς, χρηστότητος τῆς εἰς ἀνθρώπους, ἁγνείας τῆς περὶ τὸ σῶμα, τὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἔργα πληρούτω, πειρώμενος δε ἀεί τι περὶ τῶν θεῶν εὐσεβὲς διανοεῖσθαι, καὶ μετά τινος ἀποβλέπων εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ τῶν θεῶν καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα τιμῆς καὶ ὁσιότητος, σεβόμενος ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ παρόντας ἑώρα τοὺς θεούς.

[104] *Ep.* 89b 293b. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἡμᾶς, ὄντας ἐν σώματι, σωματικὰς ἔδει ποιεῖσθαι τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τὰς λατρείας, ἀσώματοι δέ εἰσιν αὐτοί, πρῶτα μὲν ἔδειξαν ἡμῖν ἀγάλματα τὸ δεύτερον ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου τῶν θεῶν γένος περὶ πάντα τὸν οὐρανὸν κύκλῳ περιφερόμενον. Δυναμένης δὲ οὐδὲ τούτοις ἀποδίδοσθαι τῆς θεραπείας σωματικῶς (ἀπροσδεῆ γάρ ἐστι φύσει), τρίτον ἐπὶ γῆς ἐξευρέθη γένος ἀγαλμάτων, εἰς ὃ τὰς θεραπείας ἐκτελοῦντες, ἑαυτοῖς εὐμενεῖς τοὺς θεοὺς καταστήσομεν.

upon (*apoblepei*) the statues and images of the gods, while feeling reverence and awe at the gods who look at him from the unseen world."[105] For Julian, instructing priests like Theodoros on how properly to worship the gods involved instructing them on how those with bodies should "see" the immaterial gods when they gazed upon their lifeless images. Such an injunction reflects how he, like Basil and Gregory, conceived of proper control of sight to be an essential marker of religious authority.

In Antioch in 363, Julian's advice to Theodoros on image interpretation was far from simply academic or theological. The emperor warned that if people believed that the material images and statues of gods were divine, rather than *representations* of the divine, then people would associate an attack on an image as a direct attack on the god represented:

> Therefore if any man thinks that because they have once been called images of the gods that they are incapable of being destroyed, it seems to me that he is altogether foolish, for surely in that case they were incapable of being made by humans. But what has been made by a wise and good man can be destroyed by a bad and unlearned man. And those beings that were fashioned by the gods as the living images of their invisible nature (*ta… zōnta agalmata…tēs aphanous autōn ousias*), I mean the gods who revolve in a circle in the heavens, remain imperishable for all time. Therefore let no one who sees and hears (*horōn kai akouōn*) that certain ones have insulted their images and their temples disbelieve in the gods.[106]

---

[105] *Ep.* 89b 294c-d. Ἀφορῶντες οὖν εἰς τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἀγάλματα, μήτοι νομίζωμεν αὐτὰ λίθους εἶναι μήτε ξύλα, μηδὲ μέντοι τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτοὺς εἶναι ταῦτα. Καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ τὰς βασιλικὰς εἰκόνας ξύλα καὶ λίθον καὶ χαλκὸν λέγομεν, οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ αὐτοὺς τοὺς βασιλέας, ἀλλὰ εἰκόνας βασιλέων. Ὅστις οὖν ἐστι φιλοβασιλεύς, ἡδέως ὁρᾷ τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως εἰκόνα, καὶ ὅστις ἐστὶ φιλόπαις, ἡδέως ὁρᾷ τὴν τοῦ παιδός, καὶ ὅστις φιλοπάτωρ, τὴν τοῦ πατρός· οὐκοῦν καὶ ὅστις φιλόθεος, ἡδέως εἰς τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἀγάλματα καὶ τὰς εἰκόνας ἀποβλέπει, σεβόμενος ἅμα καὶ φρίττων ἐξ ἀφανοῦς ὁρῶντας εἰς αὐτὸν τοὺς θεούς.

[106] *Ep.* 89b 294d-295a. Εἴ τις οὖν οἴεται δεῖν αὐτὰ μηδὲ φθείρεσθαι διὰ τὸ θεῶν ἅπαξ εἰκόνας κληθῆναι, παντελῶς ἄφρων εἶναί μοι φαίνεται· χρῆν γὰρ δήπουθεν αὐτὰ μηδὲ ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων γενέσθαι. Τὸ δὲ ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς σοφοῦ καὶ ἀγαθοῦ γενόμενον ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου πονηροῦ καὶ ἀμαθοῦς φθαρῆναι δύναται· τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν ζῶντα ἀγάλματα κατασκευασθέντα τῆς ἀφανοῦς αὐτῶν οὐσίας, οἱ περὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν κύκλῳ φερόμενοι θεοί, μένει τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον ἄϊδια. Μηδεὶς οὖν ἀπιστείτω θεοῖς, ὁρῶν καὶ ἀκούων ὡς ἐνύβρισάν τινες εἰς τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ τοὺς ναούς.

As Julian clarified further in the letter, these "certain ones" were Christians: the prophets of the Jews who "have not submitted their souls to be cleansed (*apokathērai*) by general studies (*tois enkukliois mathēmasin*) nor to open their tightly-closed eyes (*anoixai memukota lian ta ommata*) and clear the mist that hangs over them."[107] Indeed, the lack of divinity in images of the gods was a popular theme among Christian apologists, who drew on Greek *paideia* to present their own forms of worship as more rational than the "idolatry" of image-worship.[108] For Julian, the need to refute this charge of the gods' powerlessness was particularly pressing in light of a disaster that occurred during his stay at Antioch. In October of 362, a fire destroyed the temple of Apollo in the Antiochene suburb of Daphne. Since Julian had restored this temple, which a decade earlier his brother Gallus had turned into a shrine for the martyr Babylas, the destruction of the temple allowed Christians to claim that the fire was a vengeful act of God. Fifteen years later, John Chrysostom played upon this very theme in a sermon that contrasted the impotence of Apollo and Julian with the true power of Babylas and Christ.[109] The fire was also an important topic in Julian's *Misopōgōn*. In this text, Julian claimed that Apollo did not stop his temple from being destroyed because he had already departed it as a result of the Antiochenes' impiety.[110] Since he wrote his letter to Theodoros soon after the delivery of his *Misopōgōn*, the burning of this temple was certainly fresh in Julian's mind. He thus warned Theodoros that invectives against the gods' power corrupted people through sight and sound: those who saw and heard the

---

[107] *Ep.* 89b 295d. Οὐθὲν δέ, οἶμαι, κωλύει τὸν μὲν θεὸν εἶναι μέγαν, οὐ μὴν σπουδαίων προφητῶν οὐδὲ ἐξηγητῶν τυχεῖν· αἴτιον δὲ ὅτι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ψυχὴν οὐ παρέσχον ἀποκαθᾶραι τοῖς ἐγκυκλίοις μαθήμασιν, οὔτε ἀνοῖξαι μεμυκότα λίαν τὰ ὄμματα, οὐδὲ ἀνακαθᾶραι τὴν ἐπικειμένην αὐτοῖς ἀχλύν.
[108] Nasrallah, *Christian Responses* (2010), esp. 144-53, 201-12, 241-8, 277-95.
[109] Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 276-81, and Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places* (2014), 72-9.
[110] *Mis.* 361c. Ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν ἐδόκει καὶ πρὸ τοῦ πυρὸς ἀπολελοιπέναι τὸν νεὼν ὁ θεός, ἐπεσήμηνε γὰρ εἰσελθόντι μοι πρῶτον τὸ ἄγαλμα, καὶ τούτου μάρτυρα καλῶ τὸν μέγαν Ἥλιον πρὸς τοὺς ἀπιστοῦντας.

images and temples of the gods being attacked ran the risk of disbelieving in the gods represented. Thus, proper interpretation of these images was necessary for priests, so that they could instruct others how properly to view the images of the gods.

In addition to controlling his eyes by avoiding the theater and correctly interpreting divine images, Julian's ideal Hellenic priest needed to control his ears and mouth. Priests, the emperor insisted, must "purify (*hagneuein*) themselves of all unclean (*akathartōn*) and licentious (*aselgōn*) words and sounds (*rhēmatōn kai akroamatōn*)".[111] To elaborate this injunction, he set forth to Theodoros recommendations for priestly reading: comedians who wrote of the gods frivolously were forbidden, while philosophers who chose the gods as guides of education (*hēgemonas…tēs paideias*) were to be followed.[112] Additionally, he advised against reading Christian works which disparaged the gods.[113] Such careful reading was necessary, Julian insisted, because "a certain disposition (*diathesis*) is engendered in the soul through words (*hupo tōn logōn*), and little by little it arouses desires, and then suddenly kindles desires, against which, I think, one ought to arm oneself in advance."[114] This admonition highlights the ancient perception of the relationship between words and the soul. Like Basil, Julian was concerned with how reading texts affected a person's character, and thus offered a reading list for his ideal Hellenic priest.

---

[111] *Ep.* 89b 300c. Ἀγνεύειν δὲ χρὴ τοὺς ἱερέας οὐκ ἔργων μόνον ἀκαθάρτων οὐδὲ ἀσελγῶν πράξεων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ῥημάτων καὶ ἀκροαμάτων τοιούτων.

[112] *Ep.* 89b 300c-301b. Καὶ ὅπως εἰδέναι ἔχῃς ὃ βούλομαι φράζειν, ἱερωμένος τις μήτε Ἀρχίλοχον ἀναγινωσκέτω μήτε Ἱππώνακτα μήτε ἄλλον τινὰ τῶν τὰ τοιαῦτα γραφόντων. Ἀποκλινέτω καὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς κωμῳδίας ὅσα τῆς τοιαύτης ἰδέας· ἄμεινον μὲν γὰρ καὶ πάντα. Πρέποι δ' ἂν ἡμῖν ἡ φιλοσοφία μόνη καὶ τούτων οἱ θεοὺς ἡγεμόνας προστησάμενοι τῆς ἑαυτῶν παιδείας, ὥσπερ Πυθαγόρας καὶ Πλάτων καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης οἵ τε ἀμφὶ Χρύσιππον καὶ Ζήνωνα.

[113] *Ep.* 89b 301b.

[114] *Ep.* 89b 301c. ἐγγίνεται γάρ τις τῇ ψυχῇ διάθεσις ὑπὸ τῶν λόγων, καὶ κατ' ὀλίγον ἐγείρει τὰς ἐπιθυμίας, εἶτα ἐξαίφνης ἀνάπτει δεινὴν φλόγα, πρὸς ἥν, οἶμαι, χρὴ πόρρωθεν παρατετάχθαι.

The emperor insisted that spoken words were equally important for a Hellenic priest to control. Like Basil and Gregory, he connected philosophical self-moderation with control not only of the eyes and ears, but also of the voice. An error (*hamartēma*) of the tongue, Julian warned, was linked to an error of the mind (*dianoias*).[115] To prevent such an error, he told Theodoros that a priest must memorize and recite hymns to the gods, and to pray three times a day.[116] Without going so far as to speak of a "pagan church," these injunctions for priestly hymns and prayer certainly would have found parallel in the actions of a Christian priest such as Basil or Gregory.[117] This insistence on proper speech, both through the memorization of hymns and the regular schedule of prayer, can also be read alongside Julian's earlier commands to prevent corruption through words and sounds. According to Julian, by only reading classical authors who spoke favorably about the gods, priests would prevent corrupt words from entering their souls. In turn, their recitation of hymns and regular prayers would reinforce the purity of their souls—if an error of the tongue was linked with an error of the soul, then a pure tongue was linked with a pure soul. The pure speech of the priests would then cleanse the priests' audiences through their ears. Thus, Julian's concern for priestly speech connected to his concern for priests and their followers to prevent corruptions from entering their own and others' souls.

Julian's comments about his habits in the *Misopōgōn* and his injunctions for priests to control their vision, hearing, and speech in *Ep.* 89 point to the emperor's self-presentation as a

---

[115] *Ep.* 89b 301d. οὐδὲ γάρ, οἶμαι, ταὐτόν ἐστιν ἁμάρτημα γλώττης καὶ διανοίας, ἀλλ' ἐκείνην χρὴ μάλιστα θεραπεύειν, ὡς καὶ τῆς γλώττης ἐκείνῃ συνεξαμαρτανούσης.
[116] *Ep.* 89b 301d-302a.
[117] While G.W. Bowersock (*Hellenism in Late Antiquity*, Jerome Lectures 18 [Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1990], 12) and Polymnia Athanassiadi-Fowden (*Julian and Hellenism* [1980], 181, 188) argue for an organized "pagan church" that mirrored Christianity, Rowland Smith (*Julian's Gods* [1995], 110-13) contests that Julian's injunctions on reading and hymns reflected the emperor's personal preference, and not an empire-wide policy. While I do not suggest that Julian sought *Ep.* 89 to create any sort of organized priestly institution, I do think that his injunctions about recital of hymns were meant to be taken as normative for priests throughout the Empire.

philosopher. In the *Misopōgōn*, he asserted that his early education from his tutor Mardonios implanted habits of philosophical self-moderation within his soul, and that these habits made him fundamentally incompatible with licentious public displays of the theater and chariot races—in place of shows and games, the words of Homer gave him entertainment. In *Ep.* 89, he applied this logic to his construction of proper priestly behavior. Not only should priests entirely avoid the sights of public performances and performers, they must also fortify their vision with images of the gods and the texts of pious classical authors. Likewise, their ears and mouths must be filled with the pious hymns of the gods. The *Misopōgōn* and *Ep.* 89 thus offer complementary views of Julian's self-presentation. By referring to habits that he learned in his early education, Julian implied that he possessed such control of his sight, sound, and speech. By enjoining them upon Theodoros, he connected this sensory/vocal control to religious devotion. Julian presented his authority as both philosopher and religious leader—indeed, both were the same job in his mind—by asserting that because of the habits of self-moderation that he had learned, he was qualified to instruct others how to embody the *habitus* of a servant of the gods.

Conclusion

The educated elite of the fourth-century eastern Roman empire shared many values with educated Greeks and Romans of past centuries. Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Julian all praised education as a means of imprinting habits upon an individual's soul in the same way as a stylus or stamp imprinted texts and images into wax. For each of them, this imprinting involved the molding of traits that contributed to the construction of an educated elite man's status in antiquity: control over the senses—especially the eyes and ears—and the voice. For these three

authors, however, more was at stake in the world of the 350s and 360s. While they continued to value the philosophical ideals transmitted by their *paideia*, Basil, Gregory, and Julian were more concerned with religious authority and salvation than with nobility and masculinity. Surely, these two pursuits were not mutually exclusive—piety to the gods was always part of an elite philosopher's duty in antiquity, and nobility played an important role in the construction of religious authority. However, in the volatile climate of the fourth century, religious values were at the forefront of the debates among the highly educated.

It is thus not surprising that ideals of proper self-moderation appeared in texts that sought to regulate proper religious behavior. Basil's letter to Gregory, while describing an erasure of previous habits from his soul, emphasized the importance of speaking, hearing, and seeing as markers of his ascetic purification at his retreat in Annisa. Similarly, Gregory's *Oration on the Priesthood*, written after the Nazianzen had spent time with Basil at Annisa, advocated for the importance of these actions in constructing proper Christian priests. Gregory, however, stressed that unlike Basil's, his soul did not need to be re-written. While both Gregory and Basil were born into wealthy families, Gregory chose to attribute his moral character to his noble stock much more than Basil had done. Finally, Julian's *Misopōgōn*, as well as his letter to the high priest Theodoros, presented the emperor as an man who, through the habits instilled by his boyhood tutor, had cultivated self-moderation and could thus instruct others to do the same. Each of these three men, long after their years of schooling at Athens, presented themselves as religious authorities—whether Christian or Hellenic—based on the habits of self-moderation with which, they claimed, they had molded their souls through their ascetic praxis and immersion in *paideia*.

CHAPTER TWO
Visible Bodies: Philosophical Appearance and Ascetic Humility

Chapter One explored how Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the emperor Julian all presented themselves as religious authorities whose deeply-engrained ascetic habits revealed their legitimacy as philosophers. All three of them deployed the "wax tablet" metaphor to discuss their ascetic habits, drawing on ancient notions of proper sight, sound, and speech as channels by which the soul could be imprinted to construct their religious authority in the late 350s and early 360s. They argued that through their ascetic praxis, elite education, and noble birth, holy words and images were impressed upon their souls in a way that naturally molded them into philosophical leaders—whether Christian or Hellenic—who could teach others to follow the Divine.

This chapter will explore how each of these authors sought to communicate this authority through their physical appearance. For the educated elites of the ancient Greek and Roman Mediterranean, dress was a popular means of judging character.[1] The *habitus* that Basil, Gregory, and Julian advocated involved not simply imprinting habits within the soul, but also connecting these habits to specific bodily features—hairstyle, clothing, facial expressions, and movement. When Basil, Gregory, and Julian argued that their virtue was deeply impressed within their souls, they also asserted that this virtue was visible on their bodies. They each adopted and advocated styles of physical appearance that linked themselves with the image, dating back to Socrates, of

[1] Here, I follow Jonathan Edmonson and Allison Keith in taking "dress" to include not only clothing, but also cosmetics and hairstyles ("Introduction: From Costume History to Dress Studies," in *idem* (eds.), *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture* [Buffalo, NY: University of Toronto Press, 2008], 1-19, 7). For dress in ancient Greece and Rome, see also Karen Bassi, *Acting Like Men: Gender, Drama, and Nostalgia in Ancient Greece* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1999), esp. 99-143, Liza Cleland, Mary Harlow, and Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones (eds.), *The Clothed Body in the Ancient World* (Oakville, CT: Oxbow Books, 2005), and Cynthia S. Coburn and Maura K. Heyn (eds.), *Reading a Dynamic Canvas: Adornment in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008).

an ancient philosopher, whose commitment to intellect and divine service resulted in an apparent lack of concern for bodily care.

In the fourth century, however, several intellectuals of competing philosophical and theological positions adopted a similar appearance. In addition to the fact that both Christians like Basil and Gregory and *Hellēnes* like Julian advocated for similar features of bodily appearance, each of these men faced rivals *within* their religious groups who also sought to claim the look of a ragged philosopher. Basil, Gregory, and Julian all sought to assert their own appearance as a signal of their legitimate philosophical authority, while renouncing others' as a façade. In doing so, these elite authors presented their own authority not only by their appearance, but also by their ability to interpret others' appearance. As sociologist Erwing Goffman has remarked, "a competent performance by someone who proves to be an impostor may weaken in our minds the moral connection between legitimate authorization to play a part and the capacity to play it."[2] Basil, Gregory, and Julian all sought to strengthen the connection between performance of philosophical authority and legitimacy to carry this authority by exposing people who, in their minds, were impostors. These impostors, they argued, thought that philosophical authority came from growing out hair and wearing dirty clothes, and not from the knowledge and habits with which a genuine philosopher was molded. In other words, Basil, Gregory, and Julian accused their "impostor" rivals of treating bodily appearance as the *cause* of philosophical authority. In their rhetoric, however, genuine appearance was the *effect* of the properly cultivated philosophy.

Yet these elites' denunciation of rivals as impostors should not conceal the fact that they, too, were performers. The words of Erwing Goffman, "we all act better than we know how,"

---

[2] Goffman, *The Presentation of Self* (1959), 59.

would apply to each of them.[3] Their performances, however, relied on the illusion that the appearance they cultivated was not a performance, but simply the manifestation of their natural characters. Basil, Gregory, and Julian all promoted what I call here "cosmetic strategies," because each of them played upon the ambiguity of the Greek term *kosmein* ("to adorn") in their constructions of ideal philosophical appearance. In antiquity, as in modernity, the term "cosmetics" carried with it connotations of luxury that elite philosophers commonly rejected. At the same time, however, the Greek term *kosmein* was related to the term *kosmos* ("order, world"), a notion commonly praised by the educated elite, whose high upbringing taught them to see themselves at the pinnacle of the social order. While *kosmein* as "bodily adornment" was antithetical to the ascetic tendencies of late antique philosophers, the idea of *kosmos* as "order" was essential to the self-presentation of an educated elite Roman. Though Basil, Gregory, and Julian all followed centuries of tradition rejecting bodily adornment as a frivolous luxury incompatible with a philosophical *habitus*, they also advocated for the metaphorical "adornment" of the soul through philosophy, and associated such an adornment with a specific bodily appearance. Thus, it was not simply cosmetics that these men rejected in their advocacy of philosophical appearance, but a specific *type* of cosmetics that was traditionally associated with luxury—and, through luxury, effeminacy. Positioning themselves in between luxurious dandies and filthy bums, Basil, Gregory, and Julian deployed "cosmetic strategies" in order to present themselves as ideal philosophers whose bodies reflected both rejection of worldly luxury and orderly elite self-moderation.

---

[3] Goffman, *The Presentation of Self* (1959), 74.

Unkempt Philosophers and Elite Romans

In antiquity, the association between philosophy and unkempt bodily appearance dated back at least to Socrates in classical Athens. The common visual markers of a philosopher were a thick cloak (*tribōn* or *himation*), unkempt hair, and a long beard. Greek philosophers, particularly (but not exclusively) Cynics, adopted this sort of appearance in deference to Socrates and Diogenes, whom they believed challenged the classical Greek notion that physical beauty was necessary for inner virtue. By intentionally cultivating an unattractive look, such philosophers sought to disrupt the idea that beauty revealed brains.[4] Images of philosophers crouched in thought with furrowed brows even suggested the opposite: that the rigors of philosophy withered away the physical body.[5] In the *Phaedo*, Plato claimed that philosophers should despise the acquisition of fine cloaks and sandals and other such adornments (*kallōpismous*) of the body.[6] In the *Gorgias*, moreover, he described adornment (*he kommōtikē*) as a means of "covering" the soul with forms (*schēmasi*), colors, smoothness, and dress for the purpose of deception.[7] These admonitions highlight the connection that prominent classical Greek philosophers saw between clothing and character. According both to Socrates and his later admirers, extravagance in dress was not fitting for a philosopher.

In the second century CE, particularly following the reign of the philhellenic emperor Hadrian (117-138), this sort of philosophical look became prominent among educated elites, who

---

[4] Zanker, *The Mask of Socrates: the Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity*, trans. Alan Shapiro (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995), 39.

[5] Zanker, *The Mask of Socrates* (1995), esp. 90-136.

[6] *Phd.* 64d-e. Τί δὲ τὰς ἄλλας τὰς περὶ τὸ σῶμα θεραπείας; δοκεῖ σοι ἐντίμους ἡγεῖσθαι ὁ τοιοῦτος; οἷον ἱματίων διαφερόντων κτήσεις καὶ ὑποδημάτων καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους καλλωπισμοὺς τοὺς περὶ τὸ σῶμα πότερον τιμᾶν δοκεῖ σοι ἢ ἀτιμάζειν, καθ' ὅσον μὴ πολλὴ ἀνάγκη μετέχειν αὐτῶν; Ἀτιμάζειν ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ, ἔφη, ὅ γε ὡς ἀληθῶς φιλόσοφος.

[7] *Grg.* 465b. τῇ δὲ γυμναστικῇ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον τοῦτον ἡ κομμωτική, κακοῦργός τε καὶ ἀπατηλὴ καὶ ἀγεννὴς καὶ ἀνελεύθερος, σχήμασιν καὶ χρώμασιν καὶ λειότητι καὶ ἐσθῆσιν ἀπατῶσα, ὥστε ποιεῖν ἀλλότριον κάλλος ἐφελκομένους τοῦ οἰκείου τοῦ διὰ τῆς γυμναστικῆς ἀμελεῖν.

increasingly chose to portray themselves with shaggy beards and philosophers' cloaks.[8] Indeed, the Stoic philosopher Epictetus (d. 135), when asked under threat of death to shave his beard, famously retorted that "If I am a philosopher, I shall not shave."[9] For Epictetus, the beard was such an essential part of his philosophical *habitus* that he could not claim to call himself a philosopher without one. While this quote is far from an indication that all Romans considered the beard to be essential for a philosopher, it does reveal the connection between philosophy and an apparently unkempt image (here, shown through a long beard) that was common in Greek and Roman antiquity. The adoption of this kind of image could even have practical applications. Apuleius of Madauros, a Latin author who was educated in Athens, wore ragged hair as a defendant in court in order to portray himself as a humble philosopher instead of a fancy sophist.[10] Peregrinus, the subject of a satire by Lucian of Samosata (d. 180), allegedly adopted a similar strategy in order to deflect a charge of patricide: he grew out his hair and dressed like a Cynic, and successfully avoided conviction.[11] Evidently, the philosopher's dress carried with it enough cultural capital that both Apuleius and Peregrinus chose to adopt it when facing serious legal trouble.

Some contemporary Christians also adopted the unkempt image of the philosopher. Justin Martyr (d. 165 C.E.) and Tertullian (d. 225 C.E.) both praised the philosopher's appearance as

---

[8] Zanker, *The Mask of Socrates* (1995), esp. 217-47.

[9] *Diss.* 1.2.29. ἂν ὦ φιλόσοφος…οὐ διαξυρῶμαι.

[10] *Apol*. 4.6. *capillus ipse, quem isti aperto mendacio ad lenocinium decoris promissum dixere, uides quam sit amoenus ac delicatus, horrore implexus atque impeditus, stuppeo tomento adsimilis et inaequaliter hirtus et globosus et congestus, prorsum inenodabilis diutina incuria non modo comendi, sed saltem expediendi et discriminandi: satis ut puto crinium crimen, quod illi quasi capitale intenderunt, refutatur.* For analysis, see Keith Bradley, "Appearing for the Defence: Apuleius on Display," in *Roman Dress* (2008), 238-56, and Zanker, *The Mask of Socrates* (1995), 233-42.

[11] *Mort. Per.* 15. παρελθὼν γὰρ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῶν Παριανῶν—ἐκόμα δὲ ἤδη καὶ τρίβωνα πιναρὸν ἠμπείχετο καὶ πήραν παρήρτητο καὶ τὸ ξύλον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ ἦν, καὶ ὅλως μάλα τραγικῶς ἐσκεύαστο—τοιοῦτος οὖν ἐπιφανεὶς αὐτοῖς ἀφεῖναι ἔφη τὴν οὐσίαν ἣν ὁ μακαρίτης πατὴρ αὐτῷ κατέλιπεν δημοσίαν εἶναι πᾶσαν. τοῦτο ὡς ἤκουσεν ὁ δῆμος, πένητες ἄνθρωποι καὶ πρὸς διανομὰς κεχηνότες, ἀνέκραγον εὐθὺς ἕνα φιλόσοφον, ἕνα φιλόπατριν, ἕνα Διογένους καὶ Κράτητος ζηλωτήν.

they painted Christians as ideal philosophers.[12] In the *Dialogue with Trypho*, Justin wrote that his interlocutor originally identified him as a philosopher by his appearance (*schēma*).[13] Tertullian, meanwhile, wrote an entire treatise in defense of the *tribōn* (in Latin, the *pallium*). This garment, he declared, revealed philosophical virtue simply by its appearance: "even when eloquence rests…the very garment (*ipse habitus*) speaks aloud. Thus, a philosopher is audible as long as he visible…It is a great benefit of the *pallium*, when just the thought of it makes bad morals blush."[14] This item of clothing, Tertullian concluded, was most fitting for Christians: "rejoice, *pallium*, and exult! For now a better philosophy has deemed you worthy, from the moment you began to dress the Christian."[15] For Tertullian as well as for Justin, Christians were the most virtuous philosophers, and were thus most worthy of wearing the philosopher's clothing.

Clement of Alexandria discussed Christians' appearance more extensively. He, like Justin and Tertullian, called for Christians to adopt clothing and hairstyles that were identified with the philosopher's *habitus*. He argued that dyed clothes, fancy fabrics, cosmetics, and jewelry all went against philosophical virtue.[16] Such invectives against "adornment" were particularly directed at women, and had scriptural roots as well as classical: 1 Timothy commanded women "to dress (*kosmein*) themselves with modesty (*sōphrosunēs*) and restraint in befitting attire: no plaited hair, no gold ornaments, or pearls, or rich cloak."[17] For Clement, however, the cultivation

---

[12] Arthur P. Urbano, "'Dressing a Christian': The Philosopher's Mantle as Signifier of Pedagogical and Moral Authority," *Studia Patristica* 62 (2013): 213-30.

[13] *Dial. Tryph.* 1.2. Ἐδιδάχθην ἐν Ἄργει, φησίν, ὑπὸ Κορίνθου τοῦ Σωκρατικοῦ ὅτι οὐ δεῖ καταφρονεῖν οὐδὲ ἀμελεῖν τῶν περικειμένων τόδε τὸ σχῆμα.

[14] *Pall.* 6.2. *Verum, etsi eloquium quiescat…ipse habitus sonat. Sic denique auditur philosophus dum uidetur… grande pallii beneficium est, sub cuius recogitatu improbi mores uel erubescunt.*

[15] *Pall.* 6.2. *Gaude pallium et exsulta! melior iam te philosophia dignata est ex quo christianum uestire coepisti.*

[16] *Paed.* 2.11.102–2.12.129, 3.2.4-3.3.25, 3.11.53-3.12.101.3. For analysis of Clement's adoption of philosophical clothing, see Harry O. Maier, "Dressing for Church: Tailoring the Christian Self Through Clement of Alexandria's Clothing Ideals," *Religious Dimensions of the Self in the Second Century CE*, eds. Jörg Rüpke and Gregory D. Woolf (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 66-89.

[17] 1 Tim. 2.9. ὡσαύτως καὶ γυναῖκας ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς, μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ.

of modesty (*sōphrosunē*) was imperative for women and men alike. By adopting simple clothing, Christians adhered to the created nature that God had granted them: excessive embellishment (particularly for women, but also for men) would conceal the saving power of the Word that was within every created soul.[18] Like Plato, Clement viewed adornment as a means of concealing the soul's true nature and praised an unkempt image as the ideal form of appearance.

While Clement's admonitions on adornment applied to both men and women (and even focused more on women's embellishments), his comments on facial hair highlight his adoption of philosophical appearance especially for Christian men. He advised men to grow out their beards as a sign of their natural prowess: while God made woman smooth-skinned, he "adorned (*kosmēsas*) man like a lion, with a beard, and gave him a hairy chest as proof of his manhood and a sign of his strength and primacy."[19] The beard, Clement continued, was "the marker (*sunthēma*) of a man, and shows him unmistakably to be a man. It is older than Eve and a symbol (*sumbolon*) of man's stronger nature."[20] This valuation of facial hair highlights Clement's advocacy of philosophical appearance for Christians as a marker of both virtue and masculinity.

Educated Greek and Roman elites, then, attached a great deal of cultural capital to the unkempt image of a philosopher. Yet while shaggy beards, worn cloaks, and lack of adornment often served as symbols of capital, they did not always carry such a positive connotation. Elite Greek and Roman authors tended to view physical appearance on a spectrum, with luxury on one end, and boorishness on the other. Particularly in the Roman aristocracy of the late republic and early principate, elite men were expected to dress somewhere in the middle of this spectrum:

---

[18] Maier, "Dressing for Church," 79-81.

[19] *Paed.* 3.3.18. Ὁ γὰρ θεὸς τὴν μὲν γυναῖκα λείαν ἠθέλησεν εἶναι…τὸν δὲ ἄνδρα καθάπερ τοὺς λέοντας γενείοις κοσμήσας καὶ τοῖς λασίοις ἤνδρωσε στήθεσι· δεῖγμα τοῦτο ἀλκῆς καὶ ἀρχῆς.

[20] *Paed.* 3.3.19. Τοῦτο οὖν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τὸ σύνθημα, τὸ γένειον, δι' οὗ καταφαίνεται ὁ ἀνήρ, πρεσβύτερόν ἐστι τῆς Εὔας καὶ σύμβολον τῆς κρείττονος φύσεως.

either too much or too little care for one's appearance invited ridicule.[21] Cicero recommended men to cultivate an appearance that was "not too punctilious or exquisite, but just enough to avoid boorish and ill-bred slovenliness."[22] Seneca, too, praised a middle-ground of self-care, while also linking cultivation of the body to rhetorical style. While some orators tried too hard to adopt a refined speaking style, others produced boring speeches by avoiding refinement altogether.[23] Such extremes, Seneca claimed, were related to care of the body: "one man cultivates more than is just, the other neglects more than is just: the former shaves his legs, the latter not even his armpits."[24] In his second-century CE manual on rhetoric, moreover, Quintilian suggested that Roman elites, particularly orators, needed attire that was "distinguished and manly (*splendidus et virilis*): for either too much or too little care of the toga, shoes, and hair is reprehensible."[25] For elites who sought to cultivate a middle ground between luxurious and uncultivated, the shaggy hair and simple clothing of the philosopher could be interpreted as signs of boorishness and ignobility, instead of devotion to wisdom. Philostratus, for example, wrote of the sophist Markos of Byzantium that, even though he was particularly eloquent, "his beard and hair were always unkempt (*auchmērōs*), and hence most people thought he was too boorish (*agroikoteros*) to be a wise man."[26] Ironically, such "uncultivated" appearance could also carry charges of effeminacy: philosophers who grew out their hair and wore ragged clothing were

---

[21] Catharine Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 67-8, 96. For more on Roman elite discourse about luxurious clothing and its relation to categories of masculinity and femininity, see Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality* (1993), 63-97; Kelly Olson, *Dress and the Roman Woman: Self-Presentation and Society* (New York: Routledge, 2008); *eadem*, "Masculinity, Appearance, and Sexuality: Dandies in Roman Antiquity," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 23:2 (2014): 182-205; Upson-Saia, *Early Christian Dress* (2011), 15-32.

[22] *Off.* 1.130. *adhibenda praeterea munditia est non odiosa neque exquisita nimis tantum quae fugiat agrestem et inhumanam neglegentiam.*

[23] *Ep.* 114.12-13.

[24] *Ep.* 114.14. *alter se plus iusto colit, alter plus iusto neglegit; ille et crura, hic ne alas quidem vellit.*

[25] Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 11.3.137. *cultus non est proprius oratoris aliquis, sed magis in oratore conspicitur. quare sit, ut in omnibus honestis debet esse, splendidus et virilis: nam et toga et calceus et capillus tam nimia cura quam neglegentia sunt reprendenda.* For analysis of dress in Quintilian, see Glenys Davies, "What Made the Roman Toga *virilis*?" in *The Clothed Body in the Ancient World* (2005), 121-30.

[26] *VS* 528. γενειάδος δὲ καὶ κόμης αὐχμηρῶς εἶχεν, ὅθεν ἀγροικότερος ἀνδρὸς πεπνυμένου ἐδόκει τοῖς πολλοῖς.

often accused of being effeminates in disguise.[27] Even as elites valued rejection of luxury as a marker of philosophical wisdom, there was not consensus on how much rejection was *too* much.

Accordingly, educated elites who adopted the ragged appearance of the philosopher often sought to draw the line between those who bore this appearance legitimately and impostors who were covering up their true nature. This distinction between legitimate philosophers and impostors overlapped with the efforts of second-sophistic authors to define and defend an ideal linguistic, cultural, and historical "Greekness," in which "others"—particularly people from non-Greek provinces—could be painted as impostors who only imitated Greek culture without fully upholding the ideals of *paideia*.[28] In an oration defending his adoption of the philosopher's cloak (*Or.* 72), for instance, Dio Chrysostom (d. 115 CE) lamented that while nobody mocked the caps, turbans, and trousers of foreigners, everybody assailed those they saw dressed in the garb of philosophers, even though statues of the gods were dressed in philosophers' robes.[29] By distinguishing between the "exotic" clothing of foreigners and the philosophical clothing of Greek gods, Dio sought to label his own appearance as a marker of his legitimate embodiment of *paideia*.

Second-sophistic authors sought to classify philosophical appearance as a marker of social status, as well as of Greekness. Highly educated elites attributed the sort of devaluation of philosophers' clothing that Dio Chrysostom lamented to non-elites trying (unsuccessfully) to adopt the appearance of philosophers. The satirist Lucian, for example, bemoaned the existence of impostor philosophers who weakened the name of philosophy:

> I saw that many people (*pollous*) were not in love with philosophy, but desired the glory (*doxēn*) that comes with it, and in the external (*procheira*) and popular (*dēmosia*)

---

[27] Edwards, *Politics of Immorality* (1993), 73-4; Bartcsh, *Mirror of the Self* (2006), 5.
[28] Andrade, *Syrian Identity* (2013), 245-60.
[29] *Or.* 72.2-5.

> features, as many as are very easy to imitate—I mean beard, gait, and attire—they seem like good men, but in life and in deeds they speak against their appearance (*antiphthengomenous tōi schēmati*), pursue things contrary to you [i.e., philosophy], and corrupt the value of your profession.[30]

Lucian's decrial of the philosopher's external features as popular (*dēmosia*) links the impostor philosophers he attacked with non-elites: commoners (*pollous*) could adopt the "popular" features of the philosophical *habitus*, but lacked the true life and actions necessary for this profession.[31] An anecdote preserved in Aulus Gellius' *Attic Nights* concerning the famous Athenian orator Herodes Atticus (d. 177 CE) likewise shows how second-sophistic elites separated non-elites from the realm of "true" philosophy. When a begging Cynic came to his door, Herodes Atticus was said to have mockingly replied, "I see a beard and a cloak, I do not see a philosopher," and to have later complained to his friends that, "foul and shameful animals of this kind usurp the most sacred name of philosopher."[32] Such attacks sought to assert that even though philosophers were supposed to reject material wealth and cultivate an unkempt image, a genuine philosophical *habitus* was still the prerogative of the educated elite.

In this effort to separate "genuine" elite philosophers from common impostors, the entire visible body was subject to evaluation. Not only adornments like clothing and hairstyle, but also bodily features such as gait and facial expressions, could serve as indicators of a person's "true" character. As Anthony Corbeill has observed, walking was an essential element of physiognomic evaluation in ancient Rome:

---

[30] *Pisc*. 31. Ὁρῶν δὲ πολλοὺς οὐκ ἔρωτι φιλοσοφίας ἐχομένους ἀλλὰ δόξης μόνον τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος ἐφιεμένους, καὶ τὰ μὲν πρόχειρα ταῦτα καὶ δημόσια καὶ ὁπόσα παντὶ μιμεῖσθαι ῥᾴδιον εὖ μάλα ἐοικότας ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσι, τὸ γένειον λέγω καὶ τὸ βάδισμα καὶ τὴν ἀναβολήν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ βίου καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀντιφθεγγομένους τῷ σχήματι καὶ τἀναντία ὑμῖν ἐπιτηδεύοντας καὶ διαφθείροντας τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς ὑποσχέσεως.

[31] For more on Lucian's attacks on alleged impostor philosophers, see Andrade, *Syrian Identity* (2013), 261-87; Francis, *Subversive Virtue* (1995), 262-87.

[32] *NA* 9.2.4. *Video, inquit Herodes, barbam et pallium, philosophum nondum video*; 9.2.9. *Sed hoc potius, inquit, dolori mihi et aegritudini est, quod istiusmodi animalia spurca atque probra nomen usurpant sanctissimum et philosophi appellantur.*

> Types of walk provide a model for how ideology permeated Roman society at all levels. Moralizing texts of Cicero's day…assert that nature desires internal character to be manifested externally. Judging a human being according to physical movement was not simply a social construction that went unexamined. Rather, this notion, a notion upon which the entire study of physiognomy was based, depends upon what is essential—and not constructed—about being a human being. By simple observation, we recognize that proper care of the body undoubtedly affects clarity of thought and so, it follows, the soul must conversely affect the body. Beginning from this premise, a close empirical observation of nature—"science"—combined with a speculation on the origin of the world and its inhabitants—"philosophy"—becomes a powerful *political* tool, a way of separating us from them, a way of proving, from objective, external signs, who is naturally born to lead and who, misled, is simply dancing his way through politics.[33]

This perceived connection between movement, character, and ideology certainly applied in second-sophistic evaluations of false philosophers. When Lucian lamented that impostors besmirched the name of philosopher, he claimed that in addition to a beard and a cloak, they adopted the *gait* of a philosopher—this implied that there was a specific way to walk like a philosopher, that some people attempted to practice this walk, and that Lucian could spot a fraudulent performance.

In addition to the gait, facial expressions were a common target of critique for elites who sought to attack their opponents. As discussed in the previous chapter, ancients tended to view a strong connection between the eyes, the objects they viewed, and the soul. In addition to this perception of the eyes as channels by which information could enter and "mold" the soul, the eyes—and the expressions they made—were often considered indicators of a person's "true" nature.[34] At the same time, elites were concerned about the ability of facial expressions to conceal, as well as reveal, one's character.[35] A significant portion of physiognomic literature focuses on how to expose the "true" character behind people's facial expressions. Polemo's

---

[33] Anthony Corbeill, *Nature Embodied: Gesture in Ancient Rome* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004), 123. For more on the cultural evaluation of gait in ancient Rome, see *idem*, 107-39; Timothy M. O'Sullivan, *Walking in Roman Culture* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
[34] Corbeill, *Nature Embodied* (2004), 147-50.
[35] Corbeill, *Nature Embodied* (2004), 151-67.

second-century treatise *On Physiognomy*, for example, devoted more space on how to read the eyes than any other body part.[36] As was the case with walking, so too were facial expressions considered both "natural" markers of character and features that could be imitated—only a skilled observer could tell the difference.

Clement offers an excellent example of how gait and face functioned together in the construction of a philosophical *habitus*. He valued both walking and facial expressions as physical features that Christians must control: "we must take up a stance, a movement, a gait, a style of clothing, and altogether an entire life that is as free as possible."[37] Following in the footsteps of elites like Cicero and Seneca, Clement also treated these physical features as markers of proper gender status.[38] Women must "correct, as far as possible, their appearances (*schēmata*), gazes, gaits, and voices."[39] Men, meanwhile, needed to walk correctly to display their masculinity. As Clement advised, they "must abandon madness of walking, and choose a gait that is revered and leisurely, not lingering;" in contrast, those who swaggered about as if on a stage or were carried on litters revealed that they were "enfeebled by softness (*malakias*) of the soul."[40] Softness (*malakias*) was an effeminate quality that Clement could not allow in his ideal model of an educated male Christian: "there must be no mark of softness (*sēmeion…malakias*) visible on the face of a noble man, nor on any portion of his body. Let no disgrace of

---

[36] *Phys*. Chapter 1. This one chapter takes up about a third of the overall text.

[37] Clement, *Paed.* 3.11.59. Διὸ καὶ στάσιν καὶ κίνησιν καὶ βάδισμα καὶ ἐσθῆτα καὶ ἁπαξαπλῶς τὸν πάντα βίον ὅτι μάλιστα ἐλευθεριώτατον ἐπαναιρετέον.

[38] For more on walking and gender, see Corbeill, *Nature Embodied* (2004), 120-37; O'Sullivan, *Walking in Roman Culture* (2011), 11-33.

[39] Clement, *Paed.* 3.11.68. Ἐπανορθωτέον δὲ ὅτι μάλιστα καὶ τὰ σχήματα καὶ τὰ βλέμματα καὶ τὰ βαδίσματα καὶ τὰς φωνάς.

[40] Clement, *Paed.* 3.11.73. Ἀποσκορακιστέον δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τοῦ περιπάτου τὸ μανιῶδες, τὸ δὲ σεμνὸν καὶ τὸ σχολαῖον ἐκλεκτέον, οὐ τὸ βάδισμα τὸ μελλητικόν, οὐδὲ τὸ ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς σαλεύειν καὶ ἐξυπτιάζοντα παραβλέπειν εἰς τοὺς ἀπαντῶντας, εἰ ἀποβλέπουσιν εἰς αὐτόν, καθάπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς ἐμπομπεύοντα καὶ δακτυλοδεικτούμενον. Οὐδὲ ὑπὸ οἰκετῶν ἀναστρέφεσθαι χρὴ πρὸς τὸ σιμὸν ὠθουμένους, ὥσπερ τοὺς τρυφητικωτέρους ὁρῶμεν, ἐρρωμένους εἶναι δοκοῦντας, ὑπὸ μαλακίας δὲ ψυχικῆς διατεθρυμμένους.

unmanliness (*aschēmosunē tēs anandrias*) be found in his movements or in his habits."[41] For Clement, the ideal Christian adopted a level of self-moderation that manifested itself naturally not only in how the body was adorned, but even how the body moved.

In the fourth century, Basil, Gregory, and Julian all drew on ancient notions of the connection between external appearance and internal character in their efforts to present themselves as true philosophers and to expose their rivals as frauds. Just as Plato, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Clement had done, these elites advocated unkempt hair, shaggy beards, and thick cloaks as symbols of the virtue they cultivated in ascetic praxis. Yet even though they adopted an appearance that signaled their lack of concern for bodily image, Basil, Gregory, and Julian still placed ideal physical appearance in the middle of a spectrum. Their middle may have been different from that of a Cicero or Quintilian, but that should not obstruct the fact that they did indeed view their philosophical self-presentation as an ideal middle ground between extravagance and filth. Like second-sophistic authors such as Dio Chrysostom and Lucian, these fourth-century authors marked their own philosophical appearance as legitimate while branding others' as an imposture. They presented themselves as authorities who, as legitimate philosophers, could tell the difference between a true philosopher and a fraud. While Dio and Lucian defended this appearance as a sign of proper elite Greek *paideia*, however, Basil, Gregory, and Julian emphasized philosophical appearance as a marker of both elite *paideia* and religious orthodoxy. In their rhetoric, the "others" who fell into the extremes of luxury and boorishness corresponded to rival theological and philosophical groups. Thus, when these men asserted that they naturally carried the philosopher's appearance on their bodies, they also

---

[41] *Paed.* 3.11.73-4. Ἀνδρὸς δὲ γενναίου σημεῖον οὐδὲν εἶναι δεῖ περιφανὲς ἐν τῷ προσώπῳ μαλακίας, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐν ἑτέρῳ μέρει τοῦ σώματος. Μὴ τοίνυν μηδὲ ἐν κινήσεσιν μηδὲ ἐν σχέσεσιν εὑρεθείη ποθ' ἡ ἀσχημοσύνη τῆς ἀνανδρίας.

presented themselves as natural leaders of religious groups who could mark the dividing line between "true" and "false" religion.

Emperor Julian on Dandies, Cynics, and Philosophers

The majority of the coins that Julian issued when he was sole Augustus (particularly those coming from eastern mints) highlight his efforts to publicize his self-presentation as a philosopher.[42] These coins show the emperor with a long beard that was distinct from the smooth face of his Constantinian predecessors (whose image he had adopted as Caesar) and also noticeably different from the stubbly military beards of the tetrarchs. His written works offer stronger proof that he wished to signal himself as a philosopher-emperor by his appearance. As discussed in the previous chapter, Julian's *Misopōgōn* presented the emperor's shaggy appearance and ascetic habits as correlated, two sides of the same philosophical *habitus* that had been implanted in him by his tutor Mardonios. This *habitus*, the emperor claimed, was fundamentally incompatible with the luxurious customs of the Antiochenes. This section will show how Julian's self-presentation in the *Misopōgōn* related to his argument that his philosophical appearance was intimately connected to his imperial authority. In short, Julian presented his own image in the middle of a spectrum between luxury and boorishness, with Christian emperors on the side of luxury, and Cynic philosophers on the side of boorishness. Reading the *Misopōgōn* alongside the *Caesars*, a satirical dialogue of previous Roman emperors which Julian wrote in December of 362, highlights how the emperor aligned his own image with philosophy while branding his Constantinian predecessors as extravagant effeminates.

---

[42] For Julian's coins, see John Philip Cozens Kent et al. (eds.), *The Roman Imperial Coinage, Volume 8: the Family of Constantine* (London: Spink, 1981). For more on Julian's self-images as Augustus, see Eric R. Varner, "Roman Authority, Imperial Authoriality, and Julian's Artistic Program," in *Emperor and Author* (2012), 183-211.

Meanwhile, contrasting Julian's description of "genuine" philosophers in the *Misopōgōn* and *Caesars* with the attacks he levied against Cynics in 362 shows how he placed those whom he considered impostor philosophers on the opposite end of his spectrum. By positioning himself between luxurious dandies and filthy Cynics, Julian marked himself as an emperor whose legitimate embodiment of philosophy qualified him to rule.

As Nicholas Baker-Brian has demonstrated, Julian's *Misopōgōn* attacked not only Antioch, but also the former emperor Constantius, who had favored the city during his twenty-four year reign.[43] For Julian, the contrast between his own hairy body and the soft, smooth bodies of the Antiochene citizens thus paralleled a contrast between his own philosophical habits and the daintiness of his predecessor. As he jested in the *Misopōgōn*, his appearance made him an appropriate target for the Antiochenes' satire, since he wore on his chin a goat-like beard instead of making it "smooth and bare, as handsome youths wear theirs, and all women, who are endowed by nature with loveliness."[44] He directly attributed such boyish and effeminate smoothness to the men of Antioch, who "emulate your own sons and daughters by your luxurious living, or perhaps by your tenderness, and carefully make your temperament (*tropon*) smooth."[45] Since the *Misopōgōn* sent the message that Julian's entire *habitus*—both external appearance and internal character—were fundamentally incompatible with Antioch, his attribution of such an effeminate temperament (*tropos*) to the citizens of Antioch served as an assertion of his own masculinity, displayed on his chin. By extension, he accused Constantius of effeminate luxury—if the smooth-skinned Antiochenes hated Julian because the emperor's rough manly *habitus* was

---

[43] Nicholas Baker-Brian, "The Politics of Virtue in Julian's *Misopōgōn*," in *Emperor and Author* (2012), 273-7.
[44] *Mis.* 339a. Δίδωμι γὰρ αὐτὸς τὴν αἰτίαν ὥσπερ οἱ τράγοι τὸ γένειον ἔχων, ἐξὸν οἶμαι λεῖον αὐτὸ ποιεῖν καὶ ψιλόν, ὁποῖον οἱ καλοὶ τῶν παίδων ἔχουσιν ἅπασαί τε αἱ γυναῖκες, αἷς φύσει πρόσεστι τὸ ἐράσμιον.
[45] *Mis.* 339a. Ὑμεῖς δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ γήρᾳ ζηλοῦντες τοὺς ὑμῶν αὐτῶν υἱέας καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας ὑπὸ ἁβρότητος βίου καὶ ἴσως ἁπαλότητος τρόπον λεῖον ἐπιμελῶς ἐργάζεσθε, τὸν ἄνδρα ὑποφαίνοντες καὶ παραδεικνύντες διὰ τοῦ μετώπου καὶ οὐχ ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς ἐκ τῶν γνάθων.

incompatible with their soft city, it only stood to reason that if they loved Constantius, it was because this smooth-skinned emperor adopted an appearance and practices more compatible with their inclinations. Julian thus contrasted himself, a virtuous ascetic philosopher-emperor, with his Christian predecessor, a clean-shaven effeminate.

Julian followed this satirical critique of his own beard with a description of the rest of his physical appearance, further connecting his rugged hairiness to his authority as emperor. The beard, he remarked, was only one marker out of several on his body that demonstrated his masculinity and his philosophical virtue:

> But as though the mere length of my beard were not enough, the squalor (*auchmos*) is also on my head, and I seldom have my hair cut or my nails, while I nearly always have black fingers from using a pen. And if you would like to learn something that is a secret, my breast is shaggy and overgrown like the breasts of lions who rule over (*basileuousi*) the wild beasts, and I have never in my life made it smooth, so ill-conditioned and shabby am I, nor have I made any other part of my body smooth or soft (*malakon*).[46]

Julian's detailing of his hairy head and chest inverted the critique of the emperor's beard as "goat-like": rather, the lion, who ruled over (*basileuein*) beasts, was a more suitable choice for a masculine emperor (*basileus*) like himself. Like Clement of Alexandria, Julian presented the lion as the most suitable animal for a man to resemble, and described both his beard and his chest-hair as part of a leonine mane. His use of the verb *basileuein* ("to rule"), moreover, directly linked the lion's role as ruler of animals with his role as ruler of people. Further, his hair was not the only element of his body which he connected to his legitimacy as a ruler: his ink-stained fingers alluded to his continuous writing, which marked both his intellectual activity and his

---

[46] *Mis.* 339b-c. Ἐμοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἀπέχρησε μόνον ἡ βαθύτης τοῦ γενείου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ πρόσεστιν αὐχμός, καὶ ὀλιγάκις κείρομαι καὶ ὀνυχίζομαι, καὶ τοὺς δακτύλους ὑπὸ τοῦ καλάμου τὰ πολλὰ ἔχω μέλανας. Εἰ δὲ βούλεσθέ τι καὶ τῶν ἀπορρήτων μαθεῖν, ἔστι μοι τὸ στῆθος δασὺ καὶ λάσιον ὥσπερ τῶν λεόντων, οἵπερ βασιλεύουσι τῶν θηρίων, οὐδὲ ἐποίησα λεῖον αὐτὸ πώποτε διὰ δυσκολίαν καὶ μικροπρέπειαν, οὐδὲ ἄλλο τι μέρος τοῦ σώματος εἰργασάμην λεῖον οὐδὲ μαλακόν.

persistence in keeping up with imperial correspondence.[47] By linking his shaggy chest with lions and describing the squalor of his ink-stained fingers, Julian asserted that he, a manly and hard-working philosopher, was more devoted to ruling the Empire than to caring for his body.

In Julian's mind, it was this commitment to rule that made the Antiochenes so adverse to him—his hairy appearance was only a symptom, not the cause, of their animosity. In Antioch, he complained, his ascetic customs could not be received as easily as they had been when he was leading the army on the Rhine frontier:

> But whereas the boorishness (*agroikia*) of the Celts used to put up easily with these ways of mine, a prosperous and jolly and crowded city naturally resents them, in which there are numerous dancers and flute players and more actors than ordinary citizens, and no respect at all for those who govern. For it is fitting for the "unmanly" (*tois anandrois*) to blush, but for "manly" (*andreiois*) people like you it is fitting to begin your revels at dawn, to spend your nights in pleasure, and to show not only by your words but by your deeds also that you despise the laws.[48]

The emperor did not actually conceive of his ascetic habits as boorish—they were only boorish compared to the excess of the city of Antioch. The contrast between the uncouthness of northern barbarians and the effeminate luxury of urban centers was certainly nothing new in Greek and Roman literature. Authors like Tacitus and Dio Chrysostom praised the simple habits of northern barbarians in order to critique what they saw as excessive luxury and corruption in Roman cities.[49] For Julian, however, the contrast between boorish Celts and luxurious Antiochenes took on extra significance in his self-presentation as a legitimate ruler. The emperor argued that a city like Antioch, with all of its theatrical performances, naturally resented rulers. The habits of the

---

[47] For Julian's diligence in working through the night, see also Amm. Marc. 25.4.4-6.

[48] *Mis.* 342a-b. Ἀλλ' ἡ Κελτῶν μὲν ταῦτα ῥᾷον ἔφερεν ἀγροικία, πόλις δὲ εὐδαίμων καὶ μακαρία καὶ πολυάνθρωπος εἰκότως ἄχθεται, ἐν ᾗ πολλοὶ μὲν ὀρχησταί, πολλοὶ δὲ αὐληταί, μῖμοι δὲ πλείους τῶν πολιτῶν, αἰδὼς δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀρχόντων. Ἐρυθριᾶν γὰρ πρέπει τοῖς ἀνάνδροις, ἐπεὶ τοῖς γε ἀνδρείοις, ὥσπερ ὑμεῖς, ἕωθεν κωμάζειν, νύκτωρ ἡδυπαθεῖν, ὅτι τῶν νόμων ὑπερορᾶτε μὴ λόγῳ διδάσκειν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἔργοις ἐνδείκνυσθαι.

[49] Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 330-1; Andrade, *Syrian Identity* (2013), 250-60.

Antiochenes, whom Julian called "manly" only in sarcasm, were antithetical to the law and order that he promoted as emperor. Given this city's affinity for Julian's predecessor, this was a particularly strong claim to make—if luxurious habits were naturally opposed to strong leaders, then Constantius could not have been a very strong leader.

This opposition of Julian's habits to Constantius' was intimately linked to the rhetoric of philosophical appearance in the *Misopōgōn*. The Antiochenes' luxury, he argued, was as related to their bodily appearance as his own ascetic praxis was to his shaggy body: "all of you are handsome and tall and smooth and beardless, for young and old alike you are emulous of the happiness of the Phaeacians, and rather than righteousness you prefer 'changes of garment and warm baths and beds' (*Od*. 8.249)".[50] Julian contrasted the Antiochenes' preference for fashion and comfort with his own cosmetic strategy:

> Did you really suppose that your boorishness and inhumanity and clumsiness would harmonize with these things [the habits of Antioch]? O most unlearned and most quarrelsome of all people, is it so senseless then and simple, that puny soul of yours which the lowborn call temperate (*to legomenon hupo tōn agennestatōn sōphron*) and which you think it your duty to adorn and embellish with self-moderation (*kosmein kai kallōpizein sōphrosunēi*)?[51]

Once again, Julian's critiques of his appearance inverted his self-fashioning: he did not think his way of life revealed boorishness, inhumanity, or clumsiness, nor that his soul was temperate only to the "low-born." His own adornment and embellishment (*kosmein kai kallopizein*), he claimed, was self-moderation (*sōphrosunē*), which marked him as an educated elite whose embodiment of philosophy qualified him to rule. In Julian's rhetoric, the Antiochenes' preference for theaters,

---

[50] *Mis.* 342c-d. καλοὶ δὲ πάντες καὶ μεγάλοι καὶ λεῖοι καὶ ἀγένειοι, νέοι τε ὁμοίως καὶ πρεσβύτεροι ζηλωταὶ τῆς εὐδαιμονίας [καὶ] τῶν Φαιάκων, Εἵματά τ' ἐξημοιβὰ λοετρά τε θερμὰ καὶ εὐνὰς ἀντὶ τῆς ὁσίας ἀποδεχόμενοι.
[51] *Mis.* 342d. Τὴν δὴ σὴν ἀγροικίαν καὶ ἀπανθρωπίαν καὶ σκαιότητα τούτοις ἁρμόσειν ὑπέλαβες; οὕτως ἀνόητόν ἐστί σοι καὶ φαῦλον, ὦ πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀμαθέστατε καὶ φιλαπεχθημονέστατε, τὸ λεγόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγεννεστάτων σῶφρον τουτοὶ ψυχάριον, ὃ δὴ σὺ κοσμεῖν καὶ καλλωπίζειν σωφροσύνῃ χρῆναι νομίζεις;

fine clothing, and luxurious comforts corresponded to their disdain of proper rulers like himself. The emperor presented his shaggy appearance as a natural marker of his philosophical *habitus*, and deployed this *habitus* to assert his legitimacy as a philosopher-emperor. If the people of Antioch viewed Julian as a dirty bum, it was because this city, which had favored the smooth-shaven Christian emperor Constantius for over two decades, could not recognize a good emperor when they saw one.

Julian's *Symposium or Kronia* (today known as the *Caesars*) offers additional evidence of the emperor's contrast between his own philosophical appearance and the luxurious effeminacy of his Christian predecessors. In this satirical dialogue, in which the gods judged previous Roman emperors at a banquet celebrating the *Saturnalia*, Julian applied his ideal of philosophical appearance to the emperor Marcus Aurelius (r. 160-180), whom he praised as a model for his own rulership.[52] Summoned by the gods to account for his deeds as emperor, Julian wrote, Marcus revealed the proper physical appearance of a philosopher:

> Then Marcus was summoned and came in looking excessively dignified and showing his eyes and his face humbled from his toils, displaying unconquerable beauty because of the very fact that he showed himself unkempt and unadorned (*akompson kai akallōpiston*): for he wore a very long beard, his garments were plain and moderate (*ta himatia lita kai sōphrona*), and from lack of nourishment his body was very shining and transparent, like, I think, the purest and most stainless light.[53]

---

[52] *Ep. ad Themistium* 253a; AM 16.1.4. See also David Hunt, "Julian and Marcus Aurelius," in Doreen Innes, Harry M. Hine, and C.B.R. Pelling (eds.), *Ethics and Rhetoric: classical essays for Donald Russell on his seventy-fifth birthday* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 287-98, Elm, *Sons of Hellenism*, 285-6, Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate,* 101-2; *idem*, "The Emperor Julian on His Predecessors," *Yale Classical Studies 27: Later Greek Literature* (1982), 159-72.

[53] *Caes.* 317c-d. Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ ὁ Μάρκος κληθεὶς παρῆλθε, σεμνὸς ἄγαν, ὑπὸ τῶν πόνων ἔχων τά τε ὄμματα καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ὑπό τι συνεσταλμένον, κάλλος δὲ ἄμαχον ἐν αὐτῷ τούτῳ δεικνύων, ἐν ᾧ παρεῖχεν ἑαυτὸν ἄκομψον καὶ ἀκαλλώπιστον· ἥ τε γὰρ ὑπήνη βαθεῖα παντάπασιν ἦν αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια λιτὰ καὶ σώφρονα, καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἐνδείας τῶν τροφῶν ἦν αὐτῷ τὸ σῶμα διαυγέστατον καὶ διαφανέστατον ὥσπερ αὐτὸ οἶμαι τὸ καθαρώτατον καὶ εἰλικρινέστατον φῶς.

By appearing "unkempt and unadorned" (*akompson kai akallōpiston*), with a thick beard and plain clothing, Marcus displayed Julian's ideal philosophical appearance. Just as Julian described himself in the *Misopōgōn* as adorned and embellished (*kosmein kai kallopizein*) with self-moderation (*sōphrosunē*), so too did he emphasize that Marcus adopted a cosmetic strategy befitting a philosopher, with an unkempt and unadorned body and clothing that revealed moderation. Moreover, Julian's praise of Marcus' pure and shining body linked his hairstyle and clothing to ascetic praxis—lack of nourishment made Marcus shine. By praising Marcus' appearance as dignified and shining, Julian implied that a true emperor should carry a philosophical *habitus* that revealed its virtue through shaggy hair, simple clothing, and ascetic praxis.

Conversely, Julian painted his uncle Constantine as a dandy. When Constantine came before the gods to account for his deeds, they knew his extravagant nature because of his "hair and form" (a reference to Homer's Paris, the original dandy in Greek literature).[54] In contrast to Marcus' appearance before the gods as an unkempt philosopher, Constantine was well-kempt and well-coiffed. Moreover, Julian made clear in his dialogue that his uncle's appearance corresponded to his failures as an emperor. At the end of the dialogue, all of the emperors joined their god or gods of choice. Previous "good" emperors flocked to "good" gods: Alexander the Great (an honorary Roman emperor at the symposium) to Herakles, Augustus to Apollo, and Marcus (the best emperor in the dialogue) to Zeus and Kronos. Constantine, however, ran to Luxury (*Truphē*), who after "receiving him softly (*malakōs*), embracing him in her arms, dressing (*askēsasa*) him in colorful garments (*peplois*) and embellishing (*kallōpisasa*) him," led

---

[54] *Caes*. 335b. Ἀνακαγχάσας οὖν ὁ Σειληνὸς μέγα· «Ἀλλ' ἦ τραπεζίτης εἶναι,» ἔφη, «θέλων ἐλελήθεις σεαυτόν, ὀψοποιοῦ καὶ κομμωτρίας βίον ἔχων; ᾐνίττετο δ' αὐτὰ πάλαι μὲν ἥ τε κόμη τό τε εἶδος, ἀτὰρ νῦν καὶ ἡ γνώμη σοῦ κατηγορεῖ.» The reference to Paris is *Il.* 3.55: ἥ τε κόμη τό τε εἶδος ὅτ' ἐν κονίῃσι μιγείης.

him off to Incontinence (*Asōtia*), and with her Jesus.[55] Constantine, upon hearing Jesus' declaration that he will receive all seducers, murderers, and other sorts of infamous people, ran to him with his sons. Julian's message is clear. Not only was Constantine wicked for adopting Christianity, but his adoption of a luxurious, effeminate appearance went alongside this sacrilege naturally. The description of Luxury hugging Constantine softly (*malakōs*), dressing him in *peploi*, and embellishing (*kallōpisasa*) him especially stressed the Christian emperor as the antithesis of Marcus, who embodied Julian's ideal of a manly philosopher-emperor. Just as he had done in the *Misopōgōn*, so in the *Caesars* Julian contrasted his own self-presentation as a philosopher and servant of the gods with the effeminate luxury of his Christian predecessors.

The *Misopōgōn* and the *Caesars* aligned philosophical *habitus*—shaggy hair and simple clothing, corresponding to ascetic praxis, wisdom, and devotion to the gods—with "good" emperors (Julian and Marcus), while lambasting Christian emperors (Constantine and Constantius) as soft dandies. On the spectrum between boorish lack of cultivation and luxurious over-cultivation, Julian placed Christian emperors on the latter end. Julian argued that both Constantine and Constantius—as well as Constantius' favored city of Antioch—preferred soft, smooth faces and fancy clothes to the strict ascetic self-moderation that he himself embodied. Yet Julian was also concerned to denounce people on the other end of this spectrum of cultivation. While he jokingly called himself boorish in the *Misopōgōn*, his anti-Cynic orations (*Orations* 6, *Against the Uneducated Cynics* and 7, *Against the Cynic Herakleios*), written in Constantinople in early 362, show his concern to brand others as boorish. In these orations, he sought to

---

[55] *Caes.* 336a. Ὁ δὲ Κωνσταντῖνος, οὐχ εὑρίσκων ἐν θεοῖς τοῦ βίου τὸ ἀρχέτυπον, ἐγγύθεν τὴν Τρυφὴν κατιδὼν ἔδραμε πρὸς αὐτήν· ἡ δὲ ὑπολαβοῦσα μαλακῶς καὶ περιβαλοῦσα τοῖς πήχεσι πέπλοις τε αὐτὸν ποικίλοις ἀσκήσασα καὶ καλλωπίσασα, πρὸς τὴν Ἀσωτίαν ἀπήγαγεν, ἵνα καὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν εὑρὼν ἀναστρεφόμενον καὶ προαγορεύοντα πᾶσιν.

distinguish himself from rival philosophers who claimed the cultural capital of philosophy for themselves by sporting an unkempt appearance.

Julian railed against Cynics because they threatened his status as leader of "Hellenic orthodoxy" who was fit to guide others to the gods.[56] The first oration, *Against the Cynic Herakleios*, attacked a philosopher in Constantinople who tried to advise the emperor, although he (according to Julian) failed to uphold the philosophical values of earlier Cynics like Diogenes and Crates.[57] The second, which was not directed against an individual, served as a general guide to philosophy that treated all schools of philosophy as fundamentally unified.[58] In both of these orations, Julian drew on common Cynic stereotypes that mocked these philosophers' appearance while questioning their virtue.[59] By drawing on these stereotypes to brand others as impostors, Julian presented himself as a legitimate philosopher-emperor. In Julian's mind, the Cynics he met were uncultivated boors, who cared more for the squalor of their unkempt appearance than for the actual wisdom of philosophy. Because of their lack of true philosophy, the emperor argued, these impostors were not fit to advise a genuine philosopher-emperor like himself.

In *Against the Uneducated Cynics*, Julian mocked Cynics for caring more about their external appearance than about true wisdom. Specifically, Julian attacked people who "imitating a true Cynic] take up his *tribōn* and the hairstyle, like the pictures of the men," even though they ridiculed more ascetic Cynic behaviors like taking cold baths and eating raw meat.[60] The

---

[56] Arnaldo Marcone, "The Forging of an Hellenic Orthodoxy: Julian's Speeches against the Cynics," in *Emperor and Author* (2012), 239-51.

[57] *Or.* 7.234c-d. Τοῦτο εἴτε μῦθος εἴτε ἀληθής ἐστι λόγος οὐκ οἶδα· τὸ παρὰ σοῦ δὲ πεποιημένον, τίνα βούλει τὸν Πᾶνα, τίνα δὲ εἶναι τὸν Δία, εἰ μὴ τοῦτον ὡς ἐσμὲν ἐγώ τε καὶ σύ, σὺ μὲν ὁ Ζεύς, ἐγὼ δὲ ὁ Πάν; For analysis of *Against Herakleios*, see Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 108-18.

[58] Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 136-9.

[59] Rowland Smith, *Julian's Gods* (1995), 49-90.

[60] *Or.* 6.190d. Τὸν γοῦν τοιούτου τρίβωνα καὶ τὴν κόμην, ὥσπερ αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν, ἀπομιμούμενος εἶθ' ὃ μηδὲ αὐτὸς ἀξιάγαστον ὑπολαμβάνεις, τοῦτο εὐδοκιμεῖν οἴει παρὰ τῷ πλήθει;

emperor complained that while Diogenes' appearance was secondary to his knowledge and practice of philosophy, the Cynics of his day cared for the wrong parts of their bodies:

> Then is it not absurd for a man to take into account such parts, I mean hair or nails or filth or such unpleasant accessories, rather than those parts that are most precious and important, in the first place, for instant, the organs of perception (*ta aisthētēria*), and among these more especially those which are the cause of our understanding (*suneseōs*), namely the eyes and ears (*ophthalmous, akoas*)? For these push the soul to intelligent thought, whether it be buried deep in the body and they enable it to purify itself more readily and to use its pure and steadfast faculty of thought, or whether, as some think, it is through them that the soul enters in as though by channels.[61]

By arguing that contemporary Cynics' excessive concern for hair, nails, and bodily filth superseded their care of their eyes and ears, Julian drew a distinction between these philosophers' external appearance and the character that lay underneath. As the previous chapter discussed, Julian, as well as Basil and Gregory, treated the eyes and ears as channels by which information could shape the soul, for good or for ill. By neglecting these sensory channels, the Cynics in Julian's oration were separated from the "genuine" ascetic praxis of philosophy, which purified the soul through sight and sound. Moreover, the separation between Cynics' external appearance and internal character served to expose these rivals as frauds, who failed to achieve philosophical self-moderation. While the *Misopōgōn* continually linked Julian's filthy appearance with his ascetic habits and imperial duties, *Against the Uneducated Cynics* argued that Cynics who displayed an unkempt appearance did so at the expense of true ascetic habits.

---

[61] *Or.* 6.189b-c. πότερον οὐ γελοῖός ἐστιν <ὁ> μέρη νομίσας ὄνυχας ἢ τρίχας ἢ ῥύπον καὶ τὰ δυσώδη τῶν περιττωμάτων, ἀλλ' οὐ τὰ τιμιώτατα καὶ σπουδαῖα, πρῶτον μὲν τὰ αἰσθητήρια καὶ τούτων αὐτῶν ἄττα συνέσεως ἡμῖν ἐστι μᾶλλον αἴτια, οἷον ὀφθαλμούς, ἀκοάς; Ὑπουργεῖ γὰρ ταῦτα πρὸς φρόνησιν εἴτε ἐγκατορωρυγμένῃ τῇ ψυχῇ, ὡς ἂν θᾶττον καθαρθῆναι δύναιτο τῇ γε ὡς ἀρχῇ [καὶ] ἀκινήτῳ τοῦ φρονεῖν δυνάμει, εἴτε, ὥσπερ τινὲς οἴονται, καθάπερ δι' ὀχετῶν τοιούτων εἰσφερούσης τῆς ψυχῆς.

For Julian, who declared his philosophy as a marker of his imperial authority, such impostors were a particular threat to his self-presentation. Cynics who only donned the façade of philosophy were particularly dangerous, Julian insisted, because they delegitimized "true" philosophers:

> Do you not know how they lure away the young from philosophy by continually murmuring against one and then another of all the philosophers in turn? The genuine disciples of Pythagoras and Plato and Aristotle are called sorcerers and sophists and lunatics and druggists. If anywhere among the Cynics one is really virtuous he is regarded with pity.[62]

A childhood anecdote about his companion Iphikles provided an example of the pity thrown on such "really virtuous" Cynics. After his tutor, Mardonios, saw Iphikles wearing unkempt (*auchmēran*) hair, tattered rags, and a wretched cloak (*himation pantapasi phaulon*) in the middle of winter, he deplored him for abandoning his parents and his education by going about in public like a common beggar.[63] While Julian conceived of Iphikles as a genuine philosopher, he lamented that the impostor Cynics of his day lessened the cultural value of his companion's appearance. Indeed, a year after his delivery of *Against the Uneducated Cynics*, Julian himself would be ridiculed in Antioch for bearing a style of appearance very similar to that of the young Iphikles. Because this garb (in Julian's mind) was supposed to signal ascetic habits and philosophical virtue, it was particularly problematic when impostors blurred this signal, and particularly necessary for genuine philosophers like himself to re-assert their authority.

---

[62] *Or.* 6.197d-198a. Οὐκ οἶσθα ὅπως τοὺς μὲν νέους τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἀπάγουσιν ἄλλα ἐπ' ἄλλοις τῶν φιλοσόφων θρυλλοῦντες; Οἱ Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλάτωνος καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους χορευταὶ γνήσιοι γόητες εἶναι λέγονται καὶ σοφισταὶ καὶ τετυφωμένοι καὶ φαρμακεῖς· τῶν Κυνικῶν εἴ πού τις γέγονε σπουδαῖος, ἐλεεινὸς δοκεῖ.

[63] *Or.* 6.198a-b. μέμνημαι γοῦν ἐγώ ποτε τροφέως εἰπόντος πρός με, ἐπειδὴ τὸν ἑταῖρον εἶδεν Ἰφικλέα αὐχμηρὰν ἔχοντα τὴν κόμην καὶ κατερρωγότα τὰ στέρνα ἱμάτιόν τε παντάπασι φαῦλον ἐν δεινῷ χειμῶσι· «Τίς ἄρα δαίμων τοῦτον εἰς ταύτην περιέτρεψε τὴν συμφοράν, ὑφ' ἧς αὐτὸς μὲν ἐλεεινός, ἐλεεινότεροι δὲ οἱ πατέρες αὐτοῦ, θρέψαντες σὺν ἐπιμελείᾳ καὶ παιδεύσαντες ὡς ἐνεδέχετο σπουδαίως, ὁ δὲ οὕτω νῦν περιέρχεται, πάντα ἀφείς, οὐθὲν τῶν προσαιτούντων κρείττων;»

Julian concluded his oration *Against the Uneducated Cynics* with a sketch of positive attributes that allegedly false Cynics failed to uphold, and which therefore rendered their external appearance as an imposture. A true Cynic, the emperor insisted, must ask himself "whether he enjoys expensive food, whether he cannot do without a soft bed, whether he is weaker than honor or glory, whether he wishes to be seen, and even though this is an empty honor, he still thinks it worthwhile."[64] By implication, impostor philosophers adopted these worldly comforts. In this attack, Julian managed to place the Cynics of his day on *both* ends of his spectrum between boorishness and luxury, both uncultivated *and* over-cultivated. Their appearance signaled them as filthy bums, yet their habits aligned them more with the Antiochene dandies he would so vehemently assail a year later. This disjunction between appearance and habit functioned as a subversion of the connection that elites commonly acknowledged between these two features. In response, Julian emphasized the necessity for one's physical appearance to correspond with, not conceal, his way of life:

> Therefore let him who wishes to be a Cynic not adopt merely their *tribōn* or wallet or staff or their hairstyle, as though he were like a man walking unshaved and illiterate in a village that lacked barbers' shops and schools, but let him consider that reason (*logon*) rather than a staff, and a way of life (*enstasin*) rather than a wallet, are the markers (*gnōrismata*) of the Cynic philosophy.[65]

The emperor sought to label dress and accoutrement as the effects, *not* the causes, of genuine philosophical virtue. Ironically, a year after this oration, Julian satirically described himself in the *Misopōgōn* as entering Antioch "unshaven and long-bearded, like those who are at a loss for a

---

[64] *Or.* 6.200c. Ἀλλ' ἐπανίωμεν ἐπ' ἐκεῖνο πάλιν ὅτι χρὴ τὸν ἀρχόμενον κυνίζειν αὐτῷ πρότερον ἐπιτιμᾶν πικρῶς καὶ ἐξελέγχειν καὶ μὴ κολακεύειν, ἀλλὰ ἐξετάζειν ὅτι μάλιστα αὐτὸν ἀκριβῶς εἰ τῇ πολυτελείᾳ τῶν σιτίων χαίρει, εἰ στρωμνῆς δεῖται μαλακῆς, εἰ τιμῆς ἢ δόξης ἐστὶν ἥττων, εἰ τοῦτο ζηλοῖ τὸ περιβλέπεσθαι καί, εἰ <καὶ> κενὸν εἴη, τίμιον ὅμως νομίζει.

[65] *Or.* 6.201a. Ὅστις οὖν κυνίζειν ἐθέλει μήτε τὸν τρίβωνα μήτε τὴν πήραν μήτε τὴν βακτηρίαν καὶ τὴν κόμην ἀγαπάτω μόνον, ἵν' ὥσπερ ἐν κώμῃ βαδίζῃ κουρείων καὶ διδασκαλείων ἐνδεεῖ ἄκαρτος καὶ ἀγράμματος, ἀλλὰ τὸν λόγον ἀντὶ τοῦ σκήπτρου καὶ τὴν ἔνστασιν ἀντὶ τῆς πήρας τῆς κυνικῆς ὑπολαμβανέτω φιλοσοφίας γνωρίσματα.

barber."[66] Yet as he passionately argued in the *Misopōgōn*, his appearance was *connected* to his deeper habits. Conversely, the Cynics of his day, instead of embodying true philosophical virtue, followed "the worthless life of women."[67] Thus, the emperor labeled Cynics, in spite of their hirsute appearance, in the same effeminate category as the luxurious Antiochenes in the *Misopōgōn* and the dandy Constantine in the *Caesars*. In the emperor's mind, impostor philosophers cared too much about not caring for their appearance—this was as much of a deviance from the philosopher's self-moderation as the smooth-shaven, well-dressed *habitus* he attributed to Christians.

Indeed, Julian's link between impostor Cynics and Christians was even clearer in his oration *Against Herakleios*. While Julian presented some Christians, like his imperial predecessors, as smooth-shaven effeminates, he was well aware that other Christians gained status as philosophical leaders by adopting an unkempt appearance and ascetic praxis. In his oration *Against Herakleios*, the emperor likened the Cynics of his day to "those whom the impious Galileans call monks (*apotaktitas*), who by making small sacrifices, gain much or rather everything from all sources, and in addition secure honor and crowds of bodyguards and servants."[68] To Julian, such Cynics were especially like monks because they abandoned their homelands and wandered about, thus subverting the social order of the city.[69] Significantly, in the emperor's rhetoric, both contemporary Cynics and Christian monks were impostors because they considered their appearance to be the cause, not the effect, of their philosophical habits. Both

---

[66] *Mis.* 349c. Πόλει γὰρ προσιὼν ἐλευθέρᾳ, τὸν αὐχμὸν τῶν τριχῶν οὐκ ἀνεχομένῃ, ὥσπερ οἱ κουρέων ἀποροῦντες ἄκαρτος καὶ βαθυγένειος εἰσέδραμον.

[67] *Or.* 6.203b. γυναικῶν ἀθλίων τεθαύμακας φιλῶν νεκρὸν βίον.

[68] *Or.* 7.224b. Πάλαι μὲν οὖν ὑμῖν ἐθέμην ἐγὼ τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα, νυνὶ δὲ αὐτὸ ἔοικα καὶ γράψειν· ἀποτακτίτας τινὰς ὀνομάζουσιν οἱ δυσσεβεῖς Γαλιλαῖοι· τούτων οἱ πλείους μικρὰ προέμενοι πολλὰ πάνυ, μᾶλλον δὲ τὰ πάντα πανταχόθεν ξυγκομίζουσι, καὶ προσκτῶνται τὸ τιμᾶσθαι καὶ δορυφορεῖσθαι καὶ θεραπεύεσθαι.

[69] *Or.* 7.224c. For more on elite rhetoric against wandering monks, see Chapter 3.

groups wanted to gain cultural capital without sacrificing comfort and luxury. Thus, the emperor aligned Christian monks with the same practices he attributed to Christian emperors: even though monks made small sacrifices, the same desire for luxury lay underneath their unkempt appearance. In Julian's rhetoric, Christian monks, like "false" Cynics, occupied both extremes of the elite spectrum of appearance.

Julian's *Misopōgōn*, *Caesars*, and anti-Cynic orations come together to present a clear picture of the emperor's efforts to present himself as a legitimate bearer of philosophical appearance. The rhetoric of the *Misopōgōn* shows this self-presentation most vividly, as the emperor painted himself as a legitimate philosopher-emperor to a city that preferred its treatment under his predecessor Constantius. Even before his unfortunate stay at Antioch, however, Julian was constructing a rhetorical distinction between his own philosophical appearance and the extravagance of his opponents. The *Caesars* drew a sharp contrast between Marcus Aurelius, whose unkempt and unadorned appearance marked Julian's ideal cosmetic strategy, and Constantine, who was luxuriously adorned like Paris. The anti-Cynic orations, moreover, branded Cynics as impostors who, in spite of their adoption of philosophical garb, practiced the same kind of licentiousness as the Antiochenes he attacked in the *Misopōgōn*. In this respect, it is not surprising that Julian linked Cynics and Christian monks—to him, both groups were guilty of a similar fraud. By distancing Cynics and monks from the cultural capital of the philosopher's appearance, Julian claimed this appearance for himself: while *they* grew out their hair and wore rough cloaks to gain attention, *he* did so only as a result of his ascetic habits and philosophical virtue. In this way, the emperor positioned himself in the middle of a spectrum of appearance, caring neither too little nor too much for his body. Others fell to one (or both) ends of this spectrum, but he, caring more for his actions than his looks, bore the philosopher's appearance

legitimately. Julian argued that he, unlike his profligate relatives Constantine and Constantius, displayed an appearance that came from his natural affinity to philosophy—and thus his natural authority to rule.

Basil of Caesarea and the *Habitus* of Humility

Much like the emperor Julian, Basil presented himself as an ideal philosopher by wearing shaggy hair and simple clothing. This Christian, however, deployed unkempt appearance for different purposes. While Julian described his shaggy hair as a marker of his leonine masculinity and imperial authority, Basil emphasized humility in his description of the philosopher's appearance. The Greek term *tapeinotēs* ("lowliness") was traditionally a negative quality—something like "baseness"—among the educated elite. Indeed, Basil himself warned in his *Address to Young Men* that harmful music led to lowliness (*tapeinotētos*).[70] Yet when discussing Christian ascetic life (Basil's ideal version of philosophy), Basil drew on the Scriptures to make this term a positive marker—"humility."[71] For Basil, the shaggy hair and simple clothing of the philosopher signaled not only the Christian ascetic's wisdom, but also his willingness to lower himself before God. In *Ep*. 2, as well as in moral homilies, he marked physical appearance as the natural result of a humble spirit. Even in advocating humility, however, Basil showed his elite background by presenting himself as a man who could tell the difference between true and false appearance. When he split with his former mentor Eustathius in the 370s, he drew a rhetorical distinction between the true humility of an orthodox ascetic and the façade of humility that he attributed to Eustathius, whom he classified as a heretic. In this way, Basil presented lowliness

[70] *Ad. Adul*. 9.39-41. See discussion in Chapter One.
[71] Positive scriptural references to *tapeinos*: Matt 11:29; Luke 1:52; Rom 12:16; 2 Cor 7:6, 10:1; Jas 1:9, 4:6; 1 Pet 5:5.

(*tapeinotēs*) as a positive quality that only appeared among genuine (i.e., Christian orthodox) ascetics. Such "humble" ascetics, in Basil's rhetoric, were ideal philosophers.

Basil's *Ep*. 2 shows how he emphasized gaze, dress, and gait as markers of a proper philosopher in a manner that would have been familiar to educated Greeks and Romans of previous centuries. As he wrote to Gregory, "a gloomy eye cast down to the earth, a neglected figure (*schēma*), squalid (*auchmēra*) hair, and filthy clothing follow a humble and downcast (*tapeinōi kai katabeblēmenōi)* spirit."[72] The order here is significant: by writing that bodily features *follow* a humble and downcast spirit, Basil emphasized that the appearance was the *effect* of an ascetic's virtue, not the other way around. Moreover, he contrasted the ascetic's humble appearance with effeminate luxury in a similar way as Julian had opposed his own appearance to that of the Antiochenes. Basil warned Gregory that wearing the belt too high was effeminate (*gunaikōdes*), and that bright-colored clothing was akin to womanly embellishment (*gunaikeiōi kallōpismōi*).[73] In *Ep*. 2, the Christian ascetic's appearance marked both his humble character and his masculinity, distinguishing him from effeminate luxury.

At the same time that he advocated humble appearance, however, Basil advocated ascetics to adopt bodily features that would reveal elite decorum. In *Ep*. 2, he called for a moderation in walking that paralleled his advocacy of the middle tone of voice: "the gait should be neither sluggish, for that would argue feebleness of the soul, nor on the other hand should it be excessively timid, for that would reveal that [the soul's] impulses were rash."[74] Like Clement,

---

[72] *Ep.* 2.6. Ἔπεται δὲ τῷ ταπεινῷ καὶ καταβεβλημένῳ φρονήματι ὄμμα στυγνὸν καὶ εἰς γῆν νενευκός, σχῆμα ἠμελημένον, κόμη αὐχμηρά, ἐσθὴς ῥυπῶσα.

[73] *Ep.* 2.6. Χιτὼν διὰ ζώνης προσεσταλμένος τῷ σώματι· τὸ μέντοι ζῶσμα μήτε ἄνω τῶν λαγόνων, γυναικῶδες γάρ…Τὸ γὰρ τὰς ἐν ἐσθῆτι εὐχροίας περισκοπεῖν ἴσον ἐστὶ γυναικείῳ καλλωπισμῷ, ὃν ἐκεῖναι ἐπιτηδεύουσιν ἀλλοτρίῳ ἄνθει παρειὰς καὶ τρίχας ἑαυτῶν καταβάπτουσαι.

[74] *Ep.* 2.6. καὶ τὸ βάδισμα μήτε νωθρόν, ὡς ἔκλυσιν τῆς ψυχῆς κατηγορεῖν· μηδ' αὖ σφοδρὸν καὶ σεσοβημένον, ὡς ἐμπλήκτους αὐτῆς τὰς ὁρμὰς ὑποφαίνειν.

Basil advocated Christians to walk in a way that revealed the quality of their souls, and like Clement, the moderate gate he described revealed his acknowledgement of elite ideals of self-moderation. While at Annisa, a downcast gaze, messy hair, and dirty clothing may have been markers of a humble spirit, Basil still called for ascetics at this retreat to move their bodies in a manner befitting an elite gentleman.

Basil's homilies offer further evidence of his adaptation of the philosopher's appearance for Christian ascetics. Delivered throughout his presbyterial and episcopal career, these homilies show how Basil praised unkempt appearance not only to members of his Annisa retreat, but also to his wider congregation.[75] In a homily *On Humility*, for instance, Basil praised humility as something that was imprinted in the soul—much as he described his own habits in *Ep*. 2—and that manifested itself in a person's appearance and behavior:

> But how shall we, casting off the deadly weight of pride, descend to saving humility (*tapeinophrosunēn*)? If we practice (*askōmen*) such a thing in all circumstances, and we overlook nothing so that we are harmed by nothing. For the soul becomes similar to its customs, and it is stamped (*tupoutai*) and formed (*schēmatizetai*) to the things that it does. Let your figure (*schēma*), your cloak, your gait, your posture (*kathedra*), your manner of eating, your preparation of bedding, your home, and all of the apparel within your home be furnished to show thrift. And let your speech, your song, your manner of speaking to your neighbor, let all of these things aim towards modesty rather than pride. Do not strive, I beg you, for sophistic boastings in speech, for sweet-sounding songs, or for arrogant and overweight conversations.[76]

---

[75] These homilies are particularly difficulty to date precisely: Paul J. Fedwick, "A Chronology of the Life and Works of Basil of Caesarea," in *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic* (1981), 3-20, 9-10. For the overlap in audience between Basil's homilies and ascetic writings, see Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (1994), 191.

[76] *Hum*. 537.14-28. Πῶς οὖν εἰς τὴν σωτήριον ταπεινοφροσύνην καταβησόμεθα, τὸν ὀλέθριον ὄγκον τῆς ὑπερηφανίας καταλιπόντες; Ἐὰν διὰ πάντων ἀσκῶμεν τὸ τοιοῦτο, καὶ μηδὲν παρορῶμεν ὡς οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο βλαβησόμενοι. Τοῖς γὰρ ἐπιτηδεύμασιν ὁμοιοῦται ψυχὴ, καὶ πρὸς ἃ πράττει, τυποῦται, καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα σχηματίζεται. Ἔστω σοι καὶ σχῆμα, καὶ ἱμάτιον, καὶ βάδισμα, καὶ καθέδρα, καὶ τροφῆς κατάστασις, καὶ στρωμνῆς παρασκευὴ, καὶ οἶκος, καὶ τὰ ἐν οἴκῳ σκεύη πάντα πρὸς εὐτέλειαν ἠσκημένα· καὶ λόγος, καὶ ᾠδὴ, καὶ ἡ τοῦ πλησίον ἔντευξις, καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς μετριότητα μᾶλλον ἢ πρὸς ὄγκον ὁράτω. Μή μοι κόμπους ἐν λόγῳ σοφιστικοὺς, μηδὲ ἐν ᾠδαῖς ἡδυφωνίας ὑπερβαλλούσας, μηδὲ διαλέξεις ὑπερηφάνους καὶ βαρείας.

Here, Basil constructed a *habitus* of humility (*tapeinophrosunē*) which, much like Clement's ideal Christian *habitus*, exhibited the manners and conduct of an educated elite. For Basil, however, the emphasis on ascetic praxis was much greater. Significantly, he argued that humility was a status achieved through practice (*askōmen*), and imprinted and formed (*tupoutai, schēmatizetai*) on the soul, much as he described his own ascetic retreat as imprinting the soul in *Ep*. 2. Basil's *habitus* of humility intertwined practices—eating, sleeping, home furnishing, speech— with physical features—appearance, dress, gait, posture. The latter, he implied, naturally corresponded with the former.

Similarly, in a homily *On Fasting* Basil linked physical appearance with behavior. The face of one fasting, he claimed, was fashioned (*kekosmēmenon*) with moderate pallor, and "the eye is meek, the gait is controlled (*katestalmenon*), the face is thoughtful, not prideful with an unchecked laugh, [and there is] harmony of speech and purity of heart."[77] These features highlight how practice and fashion corresponded in Basil's cosmetic strategy. For a fasting Christian, Basil claimed, pallor was fashioned in a way that, when paired with proper facial expression, gait, and speech, revealed an ascetic's virtue. These features, paralleled in *On Humility* as well as in *Ep*. 2, were common features of the philosopher's appearance in antiquity. In praising fasting, Basil called for self-moderation of all the body's features, not simply the stomach. In this way, the ascetic *habitus* Basil praised in his homilies was analogous to Julian's portrayal of Marcus Aurelius in the *Caesars*: properly adorned by lack of embellishment, showing the virtue of philosophy with clothing and facial expression. In both *Ep*. 2 and his homilies, Basil attributed these physical features to Christian ascetics. By doing so, he claimed

---

[77] *Ieiun*. 177.23-7. Νηστεύοντος σεμνὸν τὸ χρῶμα, οὐκ εἰς ἐρύθημα ἀναιδὲς ἐξανθοῦν, ἀλλ' ὠχρότητι σώφρονι κεκοσμημένον· ὀφθαλμὸς πραὺς, κατεσταλμένον βάδισμα, πρόσωπον σύννουν, ἀκολάστῳ γέλωτι μὴ καθυβριζόμενον, συμμετρία λόγου, καθαρότης καρδίας.

the capital of philosophy—achieved through his own ascetic praxis and visible on his body—for himself.

While Basil praised philosophical appearance as a natural marker of ascetic virtue, however, his relationship with his former mentor Eustathius led him to draw a distinction between legitimate philosophers and impostors, just as Julian had done in his anti-Cynic orations. Eustathius played a key role in Basil's own ascetic formation, even though he was condemned twice—once at Neocaesarea in 339 and once at Gangra in 340—for his perceived excessively harsh asceticism.[78] When Basil left Athens in 355, he traveled through Syria, the Levant, and Egypt in search of his mentor.[79] The two remained friends at the start of Basil's ecclesiastical career, and Eustathius visited Basil's family at Annisa well into the 360s.[80] In the 370s, however, the two split over a trinitarian dispute: Basil believed that Eustathius downplayed the divinity of the Holy Spirit, while Eustathius accused Basil of combining the persons of the Father and Son.[81] As Philip Rousseau has argued, this split required Basil to rewrite his past, downplaying the influence of Eustathius on his early ascetic formation.[82] I add that in addition to rewriting his past, Basil also rewrote the significance of physical appearance to ascetic virtue. When Eustathius turned from humble ascetic to impostor heretic, Basil needed to make sure that his former mentor's clothing did not signify the same humility he praised in his ascetic writings.

---

[78] Elm, *Virgins of God* (1994), 134-136; Silvas, *Asketikon* (2005), 25-28 and 53-60. For the dating of the Council of Gangra, see Silvas, *Asketikon* (2005), 59 and 486 n. 1.
[79] *Ep.* 1.
[80] Silvas, *Asketikon* (2005), 64-6.
[81] Rousseau, *Basil of Caesare*a (1994), 239-45; Elm, *Virgins of God* (1994), 203-4; Silvas, *Asketikon* (2005), 54-5.
[82] Philip Rousseau, "Basil of Caesarea: Choosing a Past," in *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity* (1990), 37-58. See also discussion in Introduction.

In one respect, Basil's task was not difficult: Eustathius' condemnation at Gangra in 340 was in large part due to his garment.[83] In addition to his supposed threat to social norms and priestly authority, this council accused Eustathius of introducing "strange clothing in subversion of the common kind of clothing," which led slaves to abandon their masters; thus, the bishops at Gangra believed that Eustathius' clothing challenged elite authority.[84] Additionally, the council claimed, Eustathian dress subverted gender norms: women were assuming men's clothing and cutting their hair short.[85] In response, the council declared that "if any man, on account of supposed practice (*askēsin*), uses a philosopher's mantle (*peribolaiōi*), and, as if he were maintaining righteousness from this, despises those who wear ordinary cloaks (*bērous*) and use other common and customary clothing, let him be anathema."[86] Women were also anathematized for exchanging their own clothing for that of men, and for cutting their hair.[87] The bishops at Gangra sought to create a standard of clothing for ascetics that reflected elite norms of moderation: "we unreservedly praise simplicity and thrift (*litotēta kai euteleian*) of clothing, only to serve the care of the body, and we do not approve of relaxed (*eklutous*) and wanton (*tethrummenas*) excesses in clothing."[88] These condemnations shaped Christians' memory of

---

[83] For the Greek text and English translation of the council, see Silvas, *Asketikon* (2005), 486-94. For particular analysis of the council's efforts to regulate gendered dress, see Kristi Upson-Saia, *Early Christian Dress* (2011), 69-75, and Urbano, "Dressing the Christian" (2013), 224-6.

[84] Council of Gangra, Praef. 4. ξένα ἀμπηιάσματα ἐπὶ καταπτώσει τῆς κοινότητος τῶν ἀμφιασμάτων συνάγοντες.

[85] Gangra, Praef. 7. καὶ γυναῖκες παρὰ τὸ σύνηθες ἀντὶ ἀμφιασμάτων γυναικείων ἀνδρικὰ ἀμφιάσματα ἀναλαμβάνουσαι, καὶ ἐκ τούτων οἰόμεναι δικαιοῦσθαι. πολλαὶ δὲ καὶ ἀποκείρονται προφάσει θεοσεβείας τὴν φύσιν τῆς κόμης τῆς γυναικείας.

[86] Gangra, 12. Εἴ τις ἀνδρῶν διὰ νομιζομένην ἄσκησιν περιβολαίῳ χρῆται, καὶ ὡς ἂν ἐκ τούτου τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἔχων, καταψηφίσοιτο τῶν μετ'εὐλαβείας τοὺς βήρους φορούντων, καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ κοινῇ καὶ ἐν συνηθείᾳ οὔσῃ ἐσθῆτι κεχρημένων, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

[87] Clothing: Gangra, 13. Εἴ τις γυνὴ διὰ νομιζομένην ἄσκησιν μεταβάλλοιτο ἀμφιάσμα, καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰωθότος γυναικείου ἀμφιάσματος, ἀνδρεῖον ἀναλάβοι, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Hair: Gangra, 17, Εἴ τις γυναικῶν διὰ τὴν νομιζομένην ἄσκησιν, ἀποκείροιτο τὰς κόμας, ἃς ἔδωκεν ὁ Θεὸς εἰς ὑπόμνησιν τῆς ὑποταγῆς, ὡς ἀναλύουσα τὸ πρόσταγμα τῆς ὑποταγῆς, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

[88] Gangra, Conclusion. καὶ λιτότητα καὶ εὐτέλειαν ἀμφιασμάτων, δι'ἐπιμέλειαν μόνον τοῦ σώματος, ἀπερίεργον ἐπαινοῦμεν. τὰς δὲ ἐκλύτους καὶ τεθρυμμένας ἐν τῇ ἐσθῆτι προόδους οὐκ ἀποδεχόμεθα.

Eustathius well into the fifth century, as the church historians Socrates and Sozomen both characterized this ascetic's garment as strange. Socrates claimed that Eustathius' father had deposed him from the priesthood because he "donned a style unfitting for the priesthood," and that as an ascetic Eustathius had adopted the appearance (*schēma*) of a philosopher and made his followers wear a "strange style" of clothing.[89] Sozomen, meanwhile, wrote of the Eustathians that "they did not suffer to wear the customary tunics and dresses, but made use of strange and unaccustomed clothing."[90] A young Basil thus studied with a mentor who was accused of wearing outlandish clothing that, according to opponents, subverted the accepted norms of elite culture.

Eustathius' reputation for subversive dress provided a framework for Basil to denounce his former mentor after the two had split over theological differences. In order to explain his previous association with Eustathius, Basil both highlighted his former mentor's appeal as a philosopher and unmasked him as a heretical impostor. In his denunciation of Eustathius in 375, Basil admitted that as a youth, he admired this ascetic and his followers because of the clothing that they wore. When he was young, he wrote, he thought that "things visible were indicative of things invisible," and attributed Eustathian ascetics' base clothing to their piety:

> Since, therefore, the secret thoughts of each of us are invisible, I thought that lowliness of dress (*to tapeinon tou endumatos*) was an indication of lowliness of mind (*tēs*

---

[89] Soc. *HE* 2.43.1. Εὐστάθιος δὲ ὁ τῆς ἐν Ἀρμενίᾳ Σεβαστείας οὔτε εἰς ἀπολογίαν ἐδέχθη, διότι ὑπὸ Εὐλαλίου τοῦ ἰδίου πατρὸς καὶ ἐπισκόπου Καισαρείας τῆς ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ ἤδη πρότερον καθῄρητο, ἐπειδὴ ἀνάρμοστον τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ στολὴν ἠμφίεστο; 2.43.4. Αὐτός τε φιλοσόφου σχῆμα φορῶν καὶ τοὺς ἀκολουθοῦντας αὐτῷ ξένῃ στολῇ χρῆσθαι ἐποίει, καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας κείρεσθαι παρεσκεύαζεν.

[90] Soz. *HE* 3.14.33. …καὶ χιτῶνας μὲν συνήθεις καὶ στολὰς μὴ ἀνεχομένους ἀμφιέννυσθαι, ξένῃ δὲ καὶ ἀήθει ἐσθῆτι χρωμένους καὶ ἄλλα πλεῖστα νεωτερίζοντας.

> *tapeinophrosunēs*); and sufficient for my assurance was the thick cloak (*to pachu himation*), the girdle, and the sandals of untanned hide.[91]

Yet because of their appearance, Basil continued, he was unaware of the "attacks against doctrine" that they professed in secret.[92] Here, Basil's portrayal of his young self echoes Julian's story about his schoolmate Iphikles in *Against the Uneducated Cynics*, as both accounts serve to show how frauds could damage the reputation of "genuine" philosophers. By presenting himself as a naïve young man who thought that humble clothing (*to tapeinon tou endumatos*) signified a humble mind (*tapeinophrosunē*), Basil classified Eustathius and his followers as impostors: they, evidently, possessed the former without the latter. Yet because they wore humble clothing, they were able to draw in young followers interested in ascetic life. Basil's account of his earlier attraction to Eustathius' circle thus disrupted the perceived link between humble appearance and "true" humility.

This disruption, however, served to connect philosophical appearance with religious orthodoxy in Basil's self-presentation. He claimed that he followed Eustathius because he believed that the visible body signaled a person's internal character—judging by his comments in *Ep*. 2 and in his homilies, this was not a naïve assumption. In *On Humility*, after all, Basil argued that the *habitus* of humility (*tapeinophrosunē*) manifested itself in clothing, as well as in action. In his denunciation of Eustathius, however, Basil implied that the link between garb and virtue only applied to "correct" Christians. According to this argument, heretics like Eustathius could

---

[91] *Ep.* 223.3. Τούτου γοῦν ἕνεκεν θεασάμενός τινας ἐπὶ τῆς πατρίδος ζηλοῦν τὰ ἐκείνων ἐπιχειροῦντας, ἐνόμισά τινα βοήθειαν εὑρηκέναι πρὸς τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ σωτηρίαν, καὶ ἀπόδειξιν ἐποιούμην τῶν ἀφανῶν τὰ ὁρώμενα. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἄδηλα τὰ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ ἑκάστου ἡμῶν, ἡγούμην αὐτάρκη μηνύματα εἶναι τῆς ταπεινοφροσύνης τὸ ταπεινὸν τοῦ ἐνδύματος, καὶ ἤρκει μοι πρὸς πληροφορίαν τὸ παχὺ ἱμάτιον καὶ ἡ ζώνη καὶ τῆς ἀνεψήτου βύρσης τὰ ὑποδήματα.

[92] *Ep.* 223.3. Ὅθεν οὐδὲ τὰς περὶ τῶν δογμάτων διαβολὰς προσιέμην, καίτοι πολλῶν διαβεβαιουμένων μὴ ὀρθὰς ἔχειν περὶ Θεοῦ τὰς ὑπολήψεις, ἀλλὰ τῷ προστάτῃ τῆς νῦν αἱρέσεως μαθητευθέντας τὰ ἐκείνου λάθρᾳ κατασπείρειν διδάγματα· ὧν ἐπειδὴ οὐδέποτε αὐτήκοος ἐγενόμην, συκοφάντας ἡγούμην τοὺς ἀπαγγέλλοντας.

not possess the humble spirit of an ascetic Christian—if they sported philosophical appearance, it was to only conceal their heresy. In Basil's rhetoric, the clothing for which Eustathius had been condemned at Gangra became the means by which this ascetic drew young Basil toward heretical doctrine. In this way, Basil aligned philosophical appearance with his version of Christian orthodoxy by accusing a theological rival who also presented himself as a philosopher of imposture.

Basil, like Julian, drew upon a long rhetorical tradition that linked physical appearance, particularly clothing, with character traits. Appearance thus became for him another "stylus" that imprinted *habitus* onto the body and soul of a Christian ascetic. As he argued in *Ep*. 2 and his moral homilies, the philosopher's unkempt hair and clothing naturally corresponded to ascetic praxis in order to reveal the ideal Christian's humility (*tapeinophrosunē*). Even with an unkempt image, however, Basil's ideal Christian could still be recognized as a well-bred elite—his emphasis on gait, manner, and conduct came naturally alongside his recommendations for ragged clothing. For Basil, moreover, ideals of physical appearance were wrapped up in his construction of Christian orthodoxy. His falling out with Eustathius led him to draw a rhetorical distinction between his own "proper" humility and his former mentor's "false" humility. By narrating his early association with Eustathius as the tale of a young man misled by heretics in disguise, Basil implied that only for "real" (orthodox) Christians did appearance correspond with virtue. For Basil, then, the the *habitus* of humility was reserved for those who subscribed to his version of Christian orthodoxy.

Gregory the Physiognomist-Priest and the Identification of False Philosophers

In his self-presentation as a philosopher-priest, Gregory of Nazianzus valued similar categories of unkempt appearance as did Basil and Julian. As discussed in the previous chapter, Gregory argued that his birth and his education "imprinted" priestly habits within his soul. Likewise, he presented ascetic praxis as a means of "imprinting" proper appearance upon the body. As Basil and Julian had done, Gregory emphasized that such an appearance was only legitimate if it corresponded to action—people who sought to adopt philosophical appearance without proper action were impostors who subverted the perceived link between looks and character. Gregory, however, drew an even starker contrast between "legitimate" elite priests like himself and non-elite impostors who donned priestly garb without possessing the right *habitus*. In addition to his general rants against allegedly fraudulent priests who entered the priesthood without proper training, Gregory's attacks against the Hellenic emperor Julian and the Christian philosopher Maximus highlight how he asserted himself as a physiognomist who could tell the difference between genuine philosophers and impostors. In different circumstances, nearly two decades apart, Gregory branded his rivals as phony philosophers by caricaturing their attempts to bear philosophical appearance.

Gregory followed Basil in linking philosophical appearance with ascetic habits. He sketched some key physical features of a bishop in *On Himself and the Bishops*, a poem written shortly after his departure from Constantinople in 381. The ideal bishop, he claimed, "is stamped with the honorable impressions of the flesh (*tupois…sarkōn esphragistai timiois*) worn down by prayer and countless toils," including sleeping on cold dusty ground, constant vigils and

psalmody, an abstemious diet, and floods of tears.[93] "In cold, in hunger, in petty rags," he continued, "he yearns to put on immortality as his clothing (*enduma*),"[94] and "he has enclosed… his body's beauty…with the secret adornment (*kosmēmati*) of iron chains."[95] Gregory classified physical appearance as part of the *habitus* of a bishop (Gregory's ideal philosopher): just as sight, sound, and speech all stamped "impressions" on the soul, so did ascetic habits leave similar impressions on the flesh. This cosmetic strategy followed that of Basil and Julian in marking asceticism as the proper adornment (*kosmēma*) of a philosopher. Like Basil's ideal ascetic Christian or the self-styled ascetic emperor Julian, such a bishop "wore" the "makeup" of his labors on his body and soul. Gregory, moreover, added additional significance to the bishop's philosophical appearance: it was not simply self-moderation that the bishop revealed through his appearance, but *immortality*. For Gregory, this "clothing" of immortality, imprinted through ascetic praxis, signaled Christian bishops as the genuine philosophers of God.

Gregory, however, did not view most Christian bishops in terms of this ideal. Both *On Himself and the Bishops* as well as his orations complained about poorly-educated, non-elite bishops devaluing the Church. He classified such bishops as impostors in much the same way Julian classified Cynics—impostors who donned philosophical appearance for attention, without possessing the habits that should correspond to the garb.[96] In *On Himself and the Bishops*, he claimed that a "false" bishop "dresses gold on top of bronze, and changes colors like a chameleon. He has the beard (*pōgōn*), the downcast disposition (*katēphes ēthos*), the inclined neck, the subdued voice, the contrived sincerity, the sluggish gait (*nōthron badisma*); wise in all

---

[93] *DSE* 586-7. Τύποις τε σαρκῶν ἐσφράγισται τιμίοις / ᾽Εσκληκότων εὐχῇ τε καὶ πολλοῖς πόνοις. Lines 575-85 recount the toils of sleep, vigils, prayer, psalmody, diet, and tears.

[94] *DSE* 590-1. ΄Ρίγει τε, πείνῃ, καὶ στενοῖς ῥακώμασι / Ποθῶν λαβεῖν ἔνδυμα τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν.

[95] *DSE* 602-4. Οὗτος τὸ καλὸν σῶμα (πῶς γὰρ οὐ καλὸν / Τὸ τῶν ἀρίστων) μαργάροις συνέκλεισε, / Δεσμοῖς σιδηροῖς, λαθρίῳ κοσμήματι.

[96] See also Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 164-5, and the discussion in Chapter One.

respects, except for the mind (*phrenos*)."[97] Like Lucian, Gregory lamented that people imitated philosophical appearance illegitimately. While genuine bishops imprinted their flesh with ascetic praxis, frauds performed the *habitus*—even the gait and character—without the proper virtue beneath. The *Oration on the Priesthood* offered similar ridicule of ill-trained philosopher-priests:

> If we have furnished ourselves with two or three expressions of pious authors (and that by hearsay, not by study), if we have had a brief experience of David, or clad ourselves properly in a little cloak (*tribōnion*), or at least are philosophers up to the belt, or have girt about us some form and appearance (*plasma kai opsin*) of piety—bah! what eminence and effrontery this is [to enter the priesthood in this way]![98]

Similarly, in his *Second Oration against Julian* (*Oration* 5), delivered in 365, the Nazianzen described Hellenic philosophers as "making a fine show of their cause, drawing out their thick beards and trailing before our eyes that well-kempt little cloak (*kompson…tribōnion*)."[99] In Gregory's rhetoric, fraudulent philosophers—whether ill-trained Christian priests or non-Christians—subverted the ascetic philosopher's cosmetic strategy. Instead of wearing the adornment of asceticism, impostors wore a well-kempt (*kompson*) little cloak, thus defying the image of a philosopher as unkempt (*akompsos*) that Basil, Julian, and Gregory all advocated. The implication was that those who had only a cursory knowledge of the texts Gregory believed necessary for the priesthood, or those who claimed philosophy outside of Christianity, became impostors when they donned philosophical garment: to bear the philosopher's appearance legitimately required both expertise with elite *paideia* and proper religious affiliation.

---

[97] *DSE* 648-52. Ἔπειτα χαλκὸς χρυσὸν ἠμφιεσμένος, / Ἢ καὶ χαμαιλέοντος ἔκστασις χρόας, / Πώγων, κατηφὲς ἦθος, αὐχένος κλάσις, / Φωνὴ βραχεῖα, πιστὸς ἐσκευασμένος, / Νωθρὸν βάδισμα, πάντα, πλὴν φρενὸς, σοφὸς.

[98] *Or.* 2.49. ἂν δύο ἢ τρία ῥήματα τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἐξασκήσωμεν, καὶ ταῦτα ἐξ ἀκοῆς, οὐκ ἐντεύξεως, ἢ τῷ Δαβὶδ βραχέα καθομιλήσωμεν, ἢ τὸ τριβώνιον εὖ περιστειλώμεθα, ἢ μέχρι τῆς ζώνης φιλοσοφήσωμεν, εὐσεβείας τι πλάσμα καὶ ὄψιν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς περιχρώσαντες· βαβαὶ τῆς προεδρίας καὶ τοῦ φρονήματος!

[99] *Or.* 5.5. Πρὸς ταῦτα τί φήσουσιν οἱ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου σοφοὶ, καὶ τὰ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀποσεμνύνοντες, οἱ τὰς βαθείας ὑπήνας ἕλκοντες, καὶ τὸ κομψὸν περισύροντες ἡμῖν τριβώνιον; For date/analysis of *Oration* 5, see Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 445-77.

The reign of the emperor Julian made it particularly necessary for Gregory to stress *both* elite culture *and* religious affiliation as requirements for legitimate philosophical appearance. As discussed in the introduction, Julian's controversial teaching legislation kindled tension in the minds of many elite Christians over the extent to which they should absorb themselves in the "pagan" culture of ancient Greece and Rome. Gregory, who argued that Christians were in fact the ideal heirs to classical *paideia*, strove to delegitimize not only Julian's legislation, but also Julian himself, in order to separate the emperor from the cultural capital of philosophy. To do so, he drew on the language of physiognomy to brand the emperor as an impostor. In a famous passage of his *Second Oration Against Julian*, Gregory presented an account of the first time he saw Julian at Athens in 355:

> At that time, therefore, I remember that I became no bad diviner of the man, though I was not one of the naturals concerning these things. But his inconsistency of behavior and excess of excitability made me a prophet (that is, if he is the best prophet who knows how to guess shrewdly). A sign (*sēmeion*) of no good seemed to me to be his unsteady neck, his shoulders always quivering (*pallomenoi*), shrugging up and down, his eye excited and cast around, gazing insanely, his feet unsteady and stumbling, his nostrils breathing insolence and disdain (*muktēr hubrin pneōn kai periphronēsin*), the shapes of his face ridiculous and expressing the same feelings, his bursts of laughter unrestrained and gusty, his nods of assent and dissent without any reason, his speech stopping short and interrupted by breath (*koptomenos pneumati*), his questions without any order and unintelligent, his answers not at all better than his questions, following one on top of the other, and not definite, nor returned in the regular order of instruction (*taxei… paideuseōs*).[100]

---

[100] *Or.* 5.23. Τότε τοίνυν οὐ φαῦλος ἐγὼ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς εἰκαστὴς οἶδα γενόμενος, καίτοι γε οὐ τῶν εὖ πεφυκότων περὶ ταῦτα εἷς ὤν. Ἀλλ' ἐποίει με μαντικὸν ἡ τοῦ ἤθους ἀνωμαλία, καὶ τὸ περιττὸν τῆς ἐκστάσεως· εἴπερ μάντις ἄριστος, ὅστις εἰκάζειν οἶδε καλῶς. Οὐδενὸς γὰρ ἐδόκει μοι σημεῖον εἶναι χρηστοῦ αὐχὴν ἀπαγὴς, ὦμοι παλλόμενοι καὶ ἀνασηκούμενοι, ὀφθαλμὸς σοβούμενος καὶ περιφερόμενος, καὶ μανικὸν βλέπων, πόδες ἀστατοῦντες καὶ μετοκλάζοντες, μυκτὴρ ὕβριν πνέων καὶ περιφρόνησιν, προσώπου σχηματισμοὶ καταγέλαστοι τὸ αὐτὸ φέροντες, γέλωτες ἀκρατεῖς τε καὶ βρασματώδεις, νεύσεις καὶ ἀνανεύσεις σὺν οὐδενὶ λόγῳ, λόγος ἱστάμενος καὶ κοπτόμενος πνεύματι, ἐρωτήσεις ἄτακτοι καὶ ἀσύνετοι, ἀποκρίσεις οὐδὲν τούτων ἀμείνους, ἀλλήλαις ἐπεμβαίνουσαι καὶ οὐκ εὐσταθεῖς, οὐδὲ τάξει προϊοῦσαι παιδεύσεως.

This passage has been particularly intriguing to scholars of both Gregory and Julian interested in unmasking the reality behind Gregory's rhetorical description of the emperor's physiognomy.[101] However, there is more to say here about Gregory than about the object of his rhetorical attack. Susanna Elm has emphasized that Gregory's deciphering of Julian's character from appearance contributed to the Nazianzen's self-fashioning as a physician of the soul.[102] Teresa Shaw, moreover, has commented on how Gregory, by describing Julian's appearance in this passage, presented himself as a physiognomist who could distinguish real persons of virtue from impostors.[103] By recounting this past meeting with Julian, Gregory sought not to provide an accurate account of the encounter, but to assert his own physiognomic abilities.

While scholars like Elm and Shaw have commented on Gregory's self-presentation as a prophetic physiognomist, however, the significance of this passage to the Nazianzen's construction of ideal philosophical appearance merits further exploration. Gregory's combination of insults against the emperor's appearance, speaking, and reasoning at Athens presented each characteristic as complementary to the others. The implication was that Julian's unsteady gaze and swaying shoulders were as much a condemnation of the future emperor's lack of philosophical *habitus* as were his broken speech and unreasoned questions and answers, which were delivered outside of the "expected" order of learning (*paideusis*). Indeed, Gregory's choice to critique Julian's breath (*hubrin pneōn kai periphronēsin*, *koptomenos pneumati*) drew on classical ideas of how the voice regulated the air (*pneuma*) that moved between the body and the

---

[101] For example, Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate* (1978), 12-13; McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus* (2001), 59 n. 115; Rosen, *Julian* (2006), 18-19.
[102] Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 460.
[103] Teresa Shaw, "Wolves in Sheep's Clothing: the Appearance of True and False Piety," *Studia Patristica* 29 (1997), 127-32.

soul, as discussed in the previous chapter. Julian, Gregory emphasized, lacked both the external and internal features of a proper philosopher.

A closer examination of physiognomic literature from the second through fourth centuries, moreover, shows how Gregory marked Julian's body as a sign of his failure to achieve "true" philosophy. While Gregory did not cite any physiognomic work extensively, his descriptions of body parts in this passage of the *Second Oration Against Julian* show that he was at least familiar enough with the practice to use it against the emperor. Physiognomic treatises, whether Polemo's from the second century, or the third- to fourth-century treatises that drew on Polemo (Adamantius' in Greek and an anonymous author's in Latin), treated imbalance of *pneuma*, along with unsteady eyes, heads, and bodies, as markers of "bad" character, revealing traits like wickedness, effeminacy, lack of learning, or a combination of all three.[104] Thus the emperor's speech, which was stopping short and interrupted by breath, could not possibly reveal him as a proper masculine philosopher. As Adamantius noted, "those who speak with difficulty are for the most part bad and mindless (*kakoi kai anoētoi*)."[105] For Gregory, such a condemnation could apply to Julian's voice: it revealed the emperor as both wicked and poorly-educated, two accusations which clearly went together in the Nazianzen's mind. Speech interrupted by the breath only added to these accusations. Polemo warned that "if you see that [one's] breath is heavy, without exertion or asthma, judge for him strong anger, lack of friendship, wickedness of thought, and prattling speech."[106] By claiming that Julian's voice and breath were improperly

---

[104] A translation of Polemo's *Physiognomy*, which only survives in Arabic translation, can be found in Robert Hoyland, "The Leiden Polemon," in Swain (ed.), *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul* (2007), 329-463. Adamantius' Greek *Physiognomy* and the anonymous Latin *Physiognomy* are also in the same volume (ed./trans. Ian Repath, 487-547 and 549-635, respectively).

[105] Adam. B42. οἱ χαλεπῶς φθεγγόμενοι κακοὶ καὶ ἀνόητοι ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολύ.

[106] Pol. B41.

regulated, Gregory sought to dislocate the emperor from the model of philosophical self-moderation (*sōphrosunē*) that Julian had wished to present for himself.

Movement in the eyes was a particularly damning sign for physiognomists. According to Polemo, an eye that circled around signified that its owner had committed a foul act.[107] More generally, a fast-moving eye indicated evil, wicked conjecture, and lack of truth.[108] Adamantius claimed that quivering (*pallomenoi*) eyes, depending on their size, proved that someone was either mischievous and deceitful or mindless and insane—Gregory would certainly have thought either pair of adjectives fitting to Julian.[109] The author of the anonymous Latin *Physiognomy*, moreover, declared that "when eyes sometimes roll, sometimes run back, and sometimes stop, crimes…have not yet been perpetrated by [their owners], but they are being turned over in mind and thought."[110] By attributing such eyes to Julian, Gregory drew on physiognomic ideas common in antiquity that linked quick motion of the eyes to wickedness in thought.

While the eyes were the physiognomist's most important marker of character, other parts of the body were also interpreted as signals of a person's "true" nature. Physiognomic treatises emphasized the need to take into account the sum total of all a person's physical features in order to come to a reasonable judgment of character. Gregory understood this rule well enough to attribute a whole series of negative bodily attributes to Julian. In particular, Gregory's description of the emperor's movement served to counter Julian's own self-fashioning as a man of self-control: if Julian's body was constantly shaking and swaying, then how could he possibly have claimed to have a moderate soul? Thus, the emperor's unsteady neck, shoulders, and feet

---

[107] Pol. A5.
[108] Pol. A7.
[109] Adam. A14. Ὀφθαλμοὶ μικροὶ παλλόμενοι κακομηχάνους καὶ δολίους, μεγάλοι δὲ ἀνοήτους καὶ μάργους ἐλέγχουσιν.
[110] Anon. Lat. 21. cum autem modo involvuntur modo recurrunt oculi modo interquiescunt, ab his nondum perpetrata sunt huiusmodi facinora, verum in animo et in cogitatione versantur.

combined with his moving eyes to reveal his wickedness. Even the emperor's shaggy hair could be read negatively: Adamantius described a "rough neck like a mane" as a sign of one "ignorant with insolence" (*amathous sun hubrei*).[111] The motion, in addition to the shape, of the neck further provided Gregory with insults to launch against Julian's unfit body. As Adamantius claimed, "the man who moves lightly in the shoulders and at the same time stoops gently is very great-minded and manly, for a lion also walks like this."[112] Gregory's picture of Julian, with his unsteady neck, constantly swaying shoulders, and stumbling feet certainly did not show such a leonine person. Thus, the caricature of Julian in Gregory's rhetoric labeled the emperor as not only wicked, but also as unmanly and unlearned, which further separated Julian from Gregory's ideal of proper (Christian) philosophy, as well as from Julian's own self-presentation as a philosopher.

With his physiognomic attack on Julian, Gregory presented himself as a philosopher who could spot the cracks in the former emperor's façade. Nearly two decades after Julian's death, Gregory would face another rival philosopher—this time, a Christian who supported the same pro-Nicene orthodoxy that the Nazianzen promoted. This rival, the Christian Cynic Maximus, complicated Gregory's self-presentation as a physiognomist-priest. Gregory's conflict with Maximus, much like Basil's with Eustathius and Julian's with Cynics, underlined the power of philosophical appearance in competitions between fourth-century elites within, as well as across, religious boundaries. In 380, Maximus originally appeared in Constantinople as Gregory's ally against anti-Nicene communities, and the Nazianzen presented him with a laudatory oration (*Oration* 25). After he attempted to take Gregory's position as bishop of Constantinople,

---

[111] Adam. B21. τραχὺς αὐχὴν ὥσπερ λοφιὰ ἀμαθοῦς σὺν ὕβρει.

[112] Adam. B40. ὁ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ὤμοις ὑποκινούμενος καὶ ἅμα πράως κεκυφὼς μεγαλονοίας καὶ ἀνδρίας εὖ ἥκει· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ λέων βαίνει.

however, Maximus was transformed from ally to rival in the Nazianzen's rhetoric, in a similar fashion as Eustathius was transformed in Basil's rhetoric. This transformation involved a re-evaluation of Maximus' external appearance from philosopher's *habitus* to impostor's façade. While Gregory's sketch of Julian presented himself as a skilled physiognomist, his rhetorical transformation of Maximus made this self-presentation more difficult. By denouncing Maximus, however, Gregory asserted that he was still a man who could spot genuine philosophers by their appearance.

When Gregory originally praised Maximus, he emphasized the Cynic's appearance as a marker of his virtue, and claimed that as a Christian, Maximus wore philosophical dress better than any non-Christian Cynic. As Arthur Urbano has noted of this oration, "Gregory argues through Maximus' appearance that he represents the purification, or Christianization, of philosophy itself."[113] He called Maximus a "dog [i.e., Cynic] barking against dogs," and praised his "conquest" of non-Christian philosophers, achieved by adopting their appearance (*schēmatos*).[114] This philosophical appearance, Gregory continued, combined with Maximus' philosophical virtue to prove that "piety does not reside in superficial details nor does philosophy lay in a downcast appearance (*tōi katēphei*), but rather in steadfastness of soul and purity of mind and in genuine inclination towards virtue, whatever appearance (*schēmatos*) we have and whoever we accompany."[115] Here, Gregory marked Maximus as a "genuine" philosopher, distinct from the frauds he lambasted in *His Oration on the Priesthood* and the *Second Oration*

---

[113] Urbano, "Dressing a Christian" (2013), 227.

[114] *Or.* 25.6. Κυνικῆς δὲ, τὸ μὲν ἄθεον διαπτύσας, τὸ δὲ ἀπέριττον ἐπαινέσας, τοῦτό ἐστιν ὃ νῦν ὁρᾶτε, κύων κατὰ τῶν ὄντως κυνῶν, καὶ φιλόσοφος κατὰ τῶν ἀσόφων, καὶ Χριστιανὸς ὑπὲρ πάντων, καὶ νικῶν τὴν μὲν ἐκείνων αὐθάδειαν τῇ τοῦ σχήματος ὁμοιότητι, τῶν δὲ παρ' ἡμῖν ἔστιν ὧν τὴν ἀπειροκαλίαν τῇ καινότητι τοῦ ἐνδύματος.

[115] *Or.* 25.6. δεικνὺς, ὅτι μὴ ἐν μικροῖς τὸ εὐσεβὲς, μηδὲ ἐν τῷ κατηφεῖ τὸ φιλόσοφον, ἀλλ' ἐν ψυχῆς στερρότητι καὶ διανοίας καθαρότητι, καὶ γνησίᾳ τῇ πρὸς τὸ καλὸν νεύσει, ὅπως ἂν τοῦ σχήματος ἔχωμεν, καὶ οἱστισιν ἂν ὁμιλῶμεν.

Against Julian. Gregory argued that Maximus, unlike ill-educated priests and non-Christian philosophers, possessed the character traits necessary to legitimize his wearing of Cynic garb.

This legitimization, however, turned out to be premature. After Maximus' attempted seizure of the seat of Constantinople, Gregory's descriptions turned vituperative. In an oration defending himself against the cabal (*Oration* 26), Gregory retracted his original praise of Maximus, calling the Cynic and his followers "dogs who force their way into the pastorate and in their absurdity contribute nothing to the office other than a tonsure of the hair which they used to care for (*ēskēsan*) wickedly."[116] While earlier he had lauded Maximus' philosophical appearance as a marker of his virtue, now Gregory insisted that the only legitimate claim Maximus had to the episcopate was his tonsure, and that the only asceticism that could be attributed to him was the care he had previously given to his hair. At the end of this oration, he labeled Maximus as plump and pampered and told him to "sprout some gray hair and a wan complexion so that you might at least be believed to be sagacious and philosophical."[117] The man who had previously embodied the co-opting of philosophical virtue into Christian life was now a fraud who cared more for his body—particularly his hair—than for true philosophy. In *Oration* 26, Maximus was an impostor, but he was not even a convincing impostor. His care for his hair clearly marked him as a luxurious effeminate, parallel to the ways in which Julian mocked Constantine, Constantius, and the Antiochenes.

---

[116] *Or.* 26.3. Δέδοικα δὲ ἤδη καὶ κύνας, ποιμένας εἶναι βιαζομένους, καὶ τὸ παράδοξον, οὐδὲν εἰς ποιμαντικὴν εἰσενεγκόντας, ἢ τὸ κεῖραι κόμας, ἃς κακῶς ἤσκησαν.

[117] *Or.* 26.14. Γῆρας δὲ οὐκ ὀνειδίσαις ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ νοσῶδες; οὐχ ὅλον τοῦτο τῆς ὕλης καὶ τῆς φύσεως, ἵνα εἰδῇς τι τῶν ἐμῶν ἀποῤῥήτων· ἔστιν ὃ καὶ ὁ λογισμὸς ἐδαπάνησεν, ἵνα μικρόν τι καυχήσωμαι. Οὐδὲ σὺ σφριγῶν μοι καὶ σαρκοτροφῶν, ἡδὺ θέαμα. Εἴθε τι καὶ πολιᾶς ἐπήνθει σοι καὶ ὠχρότητος, ἵνα πιστευθῇς γοῦν εἶναι συνετὸς καὶ φιλόσοφος.

Later in the 380s, Gregory would write even stronger words against Maximus in his autobiographical poem *On His Own Life*, as he sought more extensively to delegitimize this Cynic's claim to "proper" physical appearance. Gregory turned his description of Maximus' dress, again to paraphrase Arthur Urbano, from "a sign of philosophical appearance" to "a devious corruption of nature."[118] By branding Maximus as a "corruption of nature," Gregory separated this Cynic from the *habitus* of philosophy, which was, according to common elite notions, supposed to naturally manifest itself in the appearance and character of those with the proper training. Gregory labeled Maximus as "an effeminate (*thēludrias*), an Egyptian freak (*phantasma*), a raging evil, a dog, a cynic, a street-lounger, an Ares, a voiceless calamity," and "a colossal monster," and focused especially on the Cynic's "excessive" concern for hair and makeup.[119] He attributed to Maximus a "philosopher's coil of golden hair" and "the drugs [i.e., cosmetics] of women."[120] Through such language, he sought to paint Maximus as an androgynous impostor whose "feminine" care for his body unmasked the flimsy façade of his philosophical appearance: the Cynic shared, in Gregory's rhetoric, "his hair with women, and his staff with men."[121] Gregory further attacked Maximus' status as a philosopher by describing how he boasted about his appearance, "always shading his shoulders with lovely curls and sending his thoughts to his swinging hair, carrying all his learning (*paideusin*) on his body."[122] Gregory assaulted Maximus by dissociating the Cynic's appearance from "proper" learning (*paideusis*), just as he had described Julian's speech as outside the natural order of learning. With his

---

[118] Urbano, "Dressing a Christian" (2013), 228.

[119] *DSV* 750-4. Ἦν τίς ποθ' ἡμῖν ἐν πόλει θηλυδρίας, /Αἰγύπτιον φάντασμα, λυσσῶδες κακόν, / κύων, κυνίσκος, ἀμφόδων ὑπηρέτης, / ἄρις, ἄφωνον πῆμα, κητῶδες τέρας.

[120] *DSV* 757-60. πλεῖστον γυναικῶν ἔργον, εἶτ' οὖν ἀρρένων, / χρυσοῦν, ἐλίσσειν τὴν φιλόσοφον σισόην. / τὰ τῶν γυναικῶν ἐν προσώποις φάρμακα / σοφοὶ φερόντων.

[121] *DSV* 768. κόμην γυναιξίν, ἀνδράσιν βακτηρίαν.

[122] *DSV* 769-72. ἐξ ὧν ἐκόμπαζ' ὥς τι τῇ πόλει δοκῶν, / ὤμους σκιάζων βοστρύχοις ἀεὶ φίλοις, / πέμπων λογισμοὺς σφενδονωμέναις κόμαις, / πᾶσαν φέρων παίδευσιν ἐν τῷ σώματι.

androgynous body and excessive luxury, the Maximus presented here by Gregory was clearly not a paragon of elite *paideia*. When the Nazianzen wrote that Maximus carried all his learning on his body, he implied that the Cynic lacked the "genuine" learning of the soul.

This assault on Maximus raises an important question about Gregory's self-presentation. Why did the Nazianzen, who in 355 was evidently a competent enough physiognomist to predict Julian's calamitous reign, fail to see through the Cynic's façade in the first place—particularly if this façade did not seem very convincing? In the words of John McGuckin, "the more he denounced Maximus as a dirty fraud, the more he threw a cold light onto his own naiveté, for being taken in to start with. Was such a simplicity suitable in someone who aspired to be the leader of the Nicenes in the capital city?"[123] Certainly, Gregory's initial praise of Maximus became problematic when the Cynic attempted to usurp the bishop's seat—the Nazianzen insisted in *Oration* 25 that Maximus possessed "true" virtue underneath his philosophical appearance, and in *Oration* 26 argued that Maximus did not even *look* like a philosopher. In his autobiography, Gregory attributed this turn-around to his simplicity, much as Basil had done in recalling his past association with Eustathius. While he painted Maximus as a "sophist and creator of evils," Gregory claimed that he was "unaccustomed to such things," since he was trained rather to speak wisely and to follow the Scriptures.[124] Through this defense, Gregory sought to distinguish his "genuine" education from Maximus' "false" veneer of learning. While throughout his works he presented himself as a philosopher who possessed the "correct" knowledge necessary to lead God's people—clear, simple speech and adherence to Scriptures—he presented Maximus as a sophist who only knew how to deceive.

---

[123] McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus* (2001), 315.

[124] *DSV* 784-90. σοφώτερον δέ, καὶ γὰρ οὐ διὰ ξένων, / αὐτῶν δ' ἀφ' ἡμῶν συμπλέκει τὸ δρᾶμ' ὅλον, / ὡς ἂν σοφιστὴς τῶν κακῶν καὶ συνθέτης, / τῶν ταῦτ' ἀήθων καὶ πλοκῆς πάντῃ ξένων, / ἄλλην δὲ τιμᾶν δεινότητ' εἰθισμένων· / εἰπεῖν σοφόν τι καὶ λέγοντα θαυμάσαι / βίβλων τε θείων ἐκλέγειν τὴν καρδίαν.

Yet this appeal to simplicity reveals how Gregory adapted the rhetoric of philosophical appearance to suit his needs. Like Basil, he had to rewrite his previous association with a man he considered to be an enemy. Much like Basil had done with Eustathius, Gregory claimed to have been "taken in" by a man whose external appearance was supposed to reveal his adherence to a long-standing model of a philosopher. Maximus, like Eustathius, could claim status as a philosopher by means of his long hair, clothing, and staff. Gregory, however, sought to separate Maximus from this status completely. While Basil had at least acknowledged that Eustathius' appearance revealed humility (even if this appearance was a façade), Gregory's rhetoric in *Oration* 26 and *On His Own Life* branded Maximus as an androgynous freak who did not even *look* like a philosopher. In this sense, Gregory did not so much rewrite his association with Maximus as he created a *new* Maximus—one that was so freakishly attached to his physical appearance that he could not possibly be mistaken for a philosopher. By transforming him from a "dog barking against dogs" to an "Egyptian freak," Gregory sought to delegitimize Maximus' appearance just as he had sought to delegitimize Julian's in the 360s. By glossing over his previous praise of Maximus and painting him in this light, Gregory crafted a narrative in which he never was deceived by this Cynic, because the deception was never convincing. Whether or not Gregory was successful is less clear—after all, Maximus' challenge eventually led him to resign his bishopric, and he levied his most virulent attacks on this Cynic from retirement. The attempt to brand Maximus as an anti-philosophical freak, however, shows how Gregory continued to present himself as a physiognomist-priest even after his unceremonious departure from the imperial capital.

Gregory's attacks against Julian and Maximus present a fascinating and complex picture of how the Nazianzen sought to claim philosophical appearance and priestly authority for

himself. The fiasco with Maximus proved that friends and enemies did not look as different as Gregory would have wished, and the bodily features that signified true philosophers were open to interpretation. Yet as a skilled author, Gregory deployed long-standing ancient assumptions about the link between bodily features and character in order to present himself as a genuine philosopher who could identify frauds like Julian and Maximus. Thus Julian, who styled himself as an abstemious philosopher, appeared in Gregory's polemic as a shifty character whose unsteady body revealed both his failure to achieve genuine philosophy—and the self-moderation that accompanied it—and his failure to "conceal" this lack. Maximus, meanwhile, changed in a few months from a Christian whose virtue allowed him to carry Cynic accoutrements better than any non-Christian philosopher, to a luxurious effeminate whose learning appeared only on his body. While it is impossible to know for certain, in 355 a young Gregory studying at Athens might even have viewed Julian as favorably as he had viewed Maximus in early 380. After all, Julian would have been (at least publicly) a Christian, and was certainly as devoted to the ideals of *paideia* as Gregory. Nazianzen's true skill, however, was not at *identifying* his enemies as impostors before they betrayed themselves, but at *deploying* the rhetoric of imposture against them in order to delegitimize their claims as educated religious leaders. In this way, Gregory presented himself as a physiognomist-priest by branding the bodies of his enemies with markers of "false" philosophy.

Conclusion

In Late Antiquity, the body's appearance stood at the center of battles over religious authority both within and across the boundaries of Christianity and Hellenism. As Julian, Basil, and Gregory all believed that philosophy involved molding the body as well as the mind, it was

natural for them to adopt and advocate for physical features that, in theory, revealed themselves as legitimate philosophers. While each of them claimed to debase the body in favor of the soul, their continued focus on both positive and negative adornment reveals how much care was involved in fashioning their bodies to appear unfashioned. Through cosmetic strategies that emphasized ascetic praxis, they sought to claim the status of philosophers who distinguished themselves by rejecting "normal" luxuries. These strategies, evident both in stylistic features such as shaggy hair and unkempt clothing and in bodily features such as gait and facial expression, formed part of these men's self-presentation as philosophers whose proper background, education, and habits suited them for positions of authority. For Julian, Basil, and Gregory, lack of concern for physical appearance was a natural effect of the asceticism they practiced. They presented themselves as men who could legitimately dress as philosophers because, they claimed, their habits matched their habit.

Yet since this philosophical appearance was up for grabs between multiple groups of competing intellectuals, each of these men also sought to exclude others from their cosmetic strategies. Julian, Basil, and Gregory all asserted their legitimacy as philosophers by distinguishing their own "genuine" appearance from the "imposture" of rivals. By ridiculing rivals—Cynic philosophers, Christian ascetics, and Christian priests—as frauds, Julian, Basil, and Gregory created differences in *habitus* that were not necessarily visible on the surface. There is no reason to believe that any of these authors presented an appearance that was any more "natural" or any less a "façade" than that of their enemies. Even when Gregory mocked Maximus as a dandy, it is likely that Maximus' self-presentation as a Cynic would have convinced many spectators—particularly since Gregory himself seems to have accepted it when he first met Maximus. Yet by branding their rivals' appearance as contrived, Julian, Basil, and

Gregory asserted that they were perceptive enough to determine who properly embodied a philosophical *habitus*, and who was only doing it for show. The distinction may have been a rhetorical one, but it was powerful rhetoric, by which these men applied longstanding notions of appearance and character to the philosophical and theological battles of their day. Their distinctions between their own "genuine" philosophical appearance and the "fraudulent" appearance of others mapped on to a distinction between "right" and "wrong" religion, seen in Julian's attack on Cynics and Christian monks, Basil's on Eustathius, and Gregory's on Maximus. These men, embroiled in bitter conflicts over the boundaries of Christianity and Hellenism, linked philosophical appearance with their versions of religious authority.

CHAPTER THREE
Female Bodies: Philosophy and Authority in Presentations of Ascetic Christian Women

The first two chapters explored strategies of philosophical self-presentation in the writings of Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the emperor Julian. I demonstrated how each of these men promoted themselves as philosophers by describing their ascetic praxis as something inscribed onto their bodies and into their souls—a *habitus* that was imprinted on the "wax tablet" of their souls, and which manifested itself naturally in their display of physical features such as shaggy hair and simple clothing. They all emphasized that because of their religious orthodoxy—whether this orthodoxy was Christian or Hellenic—they were able to sport such an appearance legitimately, as opposed to their rivals, whom they labeled as heretics and impostors. In this way, they applied the cultural capital of a philosophical *habitus* to their own battles over the boundaries of "proper" religion in the second half of the fourth century.

This chapter will examine the extent to which two of these men attributed philosophical *habitus* to women as a part of their battles. While the world of *paideia* was chiefly masculine, there are numerous late antique texts—both Christian and Hellenic—that praise women as philosophers. Indeed, some of the most prominent such women came from the families of the Cappadocians. Gregory of Nazianzus composed a funeral oration for his sister Gorgonia sometime between 369 and 374, and sang his mother Nonna's praises in the funeral oration he

delivered for his father sometime after 374.[1] Gregory of Nyssa, meanwhile, wrote two famous texts in the early 380s—the *Life of Macrina* and the philosophical dialogue *On the Soul and Resurrection*—painting his and Basil's sister Macrina as an ideal philosopher, ascetic, and teacher.[2] In these texts, Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina appear as models of philosophy, asceticism, elite decorum, and Christian orthodoxy, much in the same way that Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Julian presented themselves.

Unfortunately, as we do not have any surviving texts that can be reliably attributed to any of these women, it is impossible to tell how they presented themselves. Rather, what our texts

---

[1] For analysis of the style of Gregory's presentations of his family members in these orations and the circumstances of the orations' deliveries, see Tomas Hägg, "Playing with Expectations: Gregory's Funeral Orations on his Brother, Sister, and Father," in Børtnes and Hägg (eds.), *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (2006), 133-51. For Gregory's construction of Gorgonia as a martyr, see Virginia Burrus, "Life after Death: The Martyrdom of Gorgonia and the Birth of Female Hagiography," in Børtnes and Hägg (eds.), *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (2006), 153-70. Burrus rightly disputes John McGuckin's thesis that Gregory's oration reveals his coolness toward —or even envy of—his sister: McGuckin, *Saint Gregory of Nazianzus* (2001), 28-30. For the depiction of Gorgonia and Nonna within the broader effort of the Cappadocian Fathers to link themselves and their families with Christian saints, see Vasiliki Limberis, *Architects of Piety: the Cappadocian Fathers and the Cult of the Martyrs* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 122-32, 144-7. For an analysis focusing on the philosophical virtues praised in Gregory's oration to Gorgonia, see Maria Elena Conde Guerri, "El elogio fúnebre de Gorgonia, modelo de filosofía cristiana," *Helmantica: Revista de filología clásica y hebrea* 45 (1994), 381-92. While Guerri draws attention to the virtues of philosophy present in Gregory's oration, she does not link these virtues to the Nazianzen's broader efforts to praise his female relatives by characterizing them as female philosophers.

[2] Macrina has received substantial attention in modern scholarship. For an analysis of her *Life* focusing on her and Gregory's aristocratic family and the development of Christian monastic communities among elite families in Late Antiquity, see Arnaldo Momigliano, "The Life of St. Macrina by Gregory of Nyssa," *Contributo all storia degli studi classici* 8 (1987), 333-47. For a study of Macrina that raises ambiguities over "masculine" and "feminine" roles in Gregory's *Life*, see Ludlow, *Gregory of Nyssa* (2007), 202-19. For analysis of Macrina as a Christian woman of *paideia*, see Pierre Maraval, *Vie de ainte Macrine,* SC 178 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1971), 90-103; Philip Rousseau, "'Learned Women' and the Development of a Christian Culture in Late Antiquity," *Symbolae Osloenses* 70 (1995), 116-47, 124-7; Anna M. Silvas, *Macrina the Younger, Philosopher of God*, Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts 22 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), x-xi, 163-7, 247-8; Ellen Muehlberger, "Salvage: Macrina and the Christian Project of Cultural Reclamation," *Church History* 81:2 (2012), 273-97; Urbano, *The Philosophical Life* (2013), 245-72. For Macrina's role as a heroic martyr, see Georgia Frank, "Macrina's Scar: Homeric Allusion and Heroic Identity in Gregory of Nyssa's *Life of Macrina*," *JECS* 8:4 (2000), 511-30; Virginia Burrus, "Macrina's Tattoo," in Dale B. Martin and Patricia Cox Miller (eds.), *The Cultural Turn in Late Ancient Studies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 103-16; Limberis, *Architects of Piety* (2011), 150-5. For Gregory's writing of the *Life of Macrina* as an act of ascetic piety and a liturgical performance of prayer, see Derek Krueger, *Writing and Holiness* (2004), 110-32; *idem*, "Writing and the Liturgy of Memory in Gregory of Nyssa's *Life of Macrina*," *JECS* 8:4 (2000), 483-510; Silvas, *Macrina the Younger* (2008), 104-8. For studies of Macrina and her mother Emmelia that emphasize these women's influence promoting asceticism within their family and leading the community at Annisa, see Elm, *Virgins of God* (1994), 78-105; Kate Cooper, *Band of Angels: the Forgotten World of Early Christian Women* (New York: the Overlook Press, 2013), 163-90; Silvas, *Asketikon* (2005), 69-83; *eadem*, *Macrina the Younger* (2008), 32-49.

tend to show is how elite men viewed women.[3] Since these women appear to us through the voices of their male relatives, their literary representations tell us as much (if not more) about Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa as about the women themselves. By presenting their female relatives as philosophers, Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa attributed virtue to themselves by praising the virtue of the women near them. In elite Roman political discourse, a woman's self-moderation (*sōphrosunē*) reflected the self-moderation of the men of her household, and men often praised their wives, daughters, mothers, and sisters as a way of broadcasting their own virtue.[4] I argue that the Gregorys' praise of their female relatives can be read in this context. Indeed, both the Nazianzen and the Nyssen were eager to mention their familial connections to these women.[5] By writing about Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina, the Gregorys were, in fact, writing about themselves.

All this is not to say that these women did not actually possess philosophical virtue, nor that they were simply pawns in the efforts of their male relatives. As Kate Wilkinson argues, a woman's self-moderation need not imply her lack of agency. In her study of the women of the Anicii, a late antique family of Latin Christian aristocrats, Wilkinson argues that "modesty, despite its conventionality, was a creative and performative mode of being for late Roman Christian ascetic women, an opportunity for women's agency."[6] As Wilkinson demonstrates,

---

[3] Elizabeth A. Clark, "The Lady Vanishes: Dilemmas of a Feminist Historian after the 'Linguistic Turn'," *Church History* 67:1 (1998), 1-31; *eadem*, "Ideology, History, and the Construction of 'Woman' in Late Ancient Christianity," *JECS* 2:2 (1994), 155-84. For a more positive assessment of women's presence in early Christian literature, see David Brakke, "The Lady Appears: the Materializations of 'Woman' in Early Monastic Literature," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33:3 (2003), 387-402. For more on how male authors circumscribed religious authority—Judaic and "pagan," as well as Christian—of women in the ancient Mediterranean, see Ross Shepard Kraemer, *Unreliable Witnesses: Religion, Gender, and History in the Greco-Roman Mediterranean* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), esp. 243-74.

[4] Cooper, *The Virgin and the Bride* (1996), 11-9.

[5] Nazianzen: *Or.* 8.1, *Or.* 18.8; Nyssen: *VM* 1.22-3.

[6] Kate Wilkinson, *Women and Modesty in Late Antiquity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 1-2. For more on Roman elite women's education revolving around ideals of modesty and obedience, see E.A. Hemelrijk, *Matrona Docta: Educated Women in the Roman Élite from Cornelia to Julia Domna* (New York: Routledge, 1999).

maintaining the image of a modest aristocratic woman required a level of control of dress, speech, and deportment akin to that required to maintain the image of an educated elite man.[7] While Wilkinson focuses her study on a group of women in the Latin West a few decades after the period of my study, her observations fit well into the world of the Cappadocian Christians, as the literary representations of Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina all exhibit the ideals of modesty that elite Romans in both East and West valued. This modesty, moreover, overlapped with that required of Christian ascetic men. While the Gregorys were quite certain to emphasize their sisters' and mothers' femininity, this does not mean that the praise of their female relatives was only meant to show women how to act. In the texts written by Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa, Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina all displayed a philosophical *habitus* that was distinct from, yet overlapped with, the *habitus* presented for elite men. The self-moderation and humility that these women embodied were meant to inspire men and women alike to an ideal Christian philosophy, manifested in ascetic praxis.

The Gregorys were particularly interested in broadcasting such an ideal in light of the intra-Christian conflicts in which they were immersed in fourth-century Cappadocia. As discussed in the previous chapter, Basil's former mentor Eustathius had been condemned for an ascetic praxis that allegedly blurred accepted boundaries between men and women, and in the early 370s he split with Basil over a theological dispute. The escalation of Basil's conflict with Eustathius occurred at the same time in which Gregory of Nazianzus composed his orations praising his sister and mother, and Gregory of Nyssa wrote his biography of Macrina about a half decade later. It is significant that at around the same time that their close ally and friend had cut

[7] Wilkinson, *Women and Modesty* (2015), 4, 14-8, 139-61.

ties with an ascetic who had been accused of condemning marriage and allowing women to dress like men, the Gregorys presented images of their sisters and mothers as Christian ascetics who respected the traditional roles of aristocratic women. By doing so, they wished to communicate not only that the virtue of their female relatives reflected well upon themselves, but also that this virtue aligned more with their own version of Christian orthodoxy than with that of rivals like Eustathius.

In order to present Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina as ascetics who, in contrast to Eustathius' reputation, respected traditional gender boundaries, Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa crafted images of these women that displayed the ideals of philosophy discussed in the previous two chapters—sensory/vocal control and humble appearance—while reminding their audiences that these ideals manifested themselves differently on a female body than on a male one. Thus, these women were all praised for controlling the channels of their eyes, ears, and tongue, yet as elite Romans commonly believed that women's bodies were more susceptible to external influences, the rhetoric around these women's sensory control implied that it was particularly necessary to protect women from external attacks. Similarly, while all three of these women were lauded for their rejection of luxury and adoption of humble appearance, the language with which the Gregorys described their appearance reminded listeners/readers of their physical beauty. Vocal control, moreover, was particularly complicated for the Gregorys' presentations of Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina. While each of these women received a degree of praise for their virtuous speech, their male relatives sought to emphasize that their vocal authority did not interfere with that of male Christian authorities like priests. Hence Gregory of Nazianzus lauded his sister and mother for their pious silence and respect for

ecclesiastical authority. When they did speak, it was only to recite holy words as part of their ascetic subjugation. Gregory of Nyssa, moreover, constructed his sister as a philosophical teacher, but the lessons she taught were separated in location, audience, and substance from those of a Christian priest. Additionally, at the end of the narrative in the *Life of Macrina*, male ecclesiastical figures co-opted Macrina's philosophical authority after her death. Thus, according to their male biographers, these women, unlike those of Eustathius' following, supported—*not* subverted—ecclesiastical authority. Both Gregorys deployed overlapping, yet distinct, narrative strategies in order to paint their sisters and mothers as ideal ascetics whose philosophical *habitus* still allowed them to appear as proper aristocratic women and orthodox Christians.

Self-Moderation and the Female Body in Antiquity

The Gregorys' constructions of Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina as ascetic philosophers corresponded to longstanding ancient views about the "natural" differences between male and female bodies and souls. As Aline Rousselle has demonstrated, ancient doctors constructed theories of female anatomy from second-hand accounts and extrapolation from their knowledge about the male body, rather than from empirical observation. These theories reflected ancient Greek and Roman social assumptions about the role of women as bearers of children, and contributed to a "legally sanctioned domination by fathers and husbands, indeed by men in general, over women's bodies."[8] Because knowledge of anatomy was shaped by social assumptions about male superiority, ancient authors tended to emphasize the weakness of the female body. While medical and philosophical theorists disagreed over whether the female body

[8] Rousselle, *Porneia*, 2nd ed. (1993), 24-32. The direct quote is on page 32.

was physiologically different from the male, or whether it was simply an imperfect version of the male ideal, the emphasis was always on the inferiority of the woman's body.[9] These assumptions about women's "natural" physical weakness worked reciprocally with Roman social expectations that women were subordinate to the wills of their male relatives.

Since ancients tended to believe in a close connection between the body and soul, the theory that women's bodies were weaker than men's often corresponded to a belief that women's souls were also inferior. Philosophers differed over whether it was possible for women to achieve the same philosophical virtue as men could achieve. Aristotle argued that a woman's cooler body heat affected her ability to control her reason (and through reason, her capacity for virtue), while Platonists and Stoics argued that men and women shared a common human natural capacity for virtue. Even the more optimistic Platonists and Stoics, however, emphasized that this virtue was more difficult for women to achieve because of their physical and intellectual inferiority.[10] In the *Republic*, indeed, while Plato advocated for men and women to receive the same type of education in his ideal state, he stated that there was nothing "practiced by people in which the male sex is not far superior (*diapherontōs echei*) than the female."[11] Thus, in Plato's view, women should be educated like men, but their "natural" inferiority would make this education much more difficult. This view continued in the fourth-century Cappadocia, where Gregory of Nyssa praised Macrina for surpassing her "natural" femininity in her achievement of

---

[9] Gillian Clark, *Women in Late Antiquity: Pagan and Christian Life-styles* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 70-3.
[10] Clark, *Women in Late Antiquity* (1993), 121. For well-informed speculation of how different schools of Hellenistic philosophy might have received a female student, see Martha C. Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*, New Series 2 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 44-5, 53-6, 117-20, 294-6, 320-4.
[11] *Resp*. 455c. οἶσθά τι οὖν ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μελετώμενον, ἐν ᾧ οὐ πάντα ταῦτα τὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν γένος διαφερόντως ἔχει ἢ τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν; See also *Resp.* 455d-e. For scholarly analyses of Plato's views on women, see Julia Annas, "Plato's 'Republic' and Feminism," *Philosophy* 51:197 (1976), 307-21; Susan Moller Okin, "Philosopher Queens and Private Wives: Plato on Women and the Family," *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 6:4 (1977), 345-69.

philosophical virtue.[12] Such notions reflect elite Greek assumptions about women's inferiority in both physical and intellectual endeavors.

These assumptions lay behind elite rhetoric about controlling and protecting women. Authors who accepted the belief that women were physically and mentally weaker than men believed that women were less able to control the effects of external sensory stimuli on the health of their souls, and to control the effects of their bodies on others' senses. Certainly, concern over the senses was a major part of all elite education, male and female alike. For women, however, the danger of external stimuli entering the soul through the eyes and ears took on particularly sexual significance. For an elite woman, to be seen by a male spectator was to be penetrated—a particular danger for a Roman matron who was expected to devote herself exclusively to her husband. According to Varro, the Latin verb *videre* ("to see") was etymologically related to the noun *vis* ("force" or "violence").[13] As David Fredrick emphasizes, this etymology, while inaccurate, reveals how Varro linked sight and sexuality, as this Roman author "associates visual command of the natural world with the power of the male gaze to violate the female body—not surprisingly, since *vis* sometimes means 'sexual violence,' 'rape'."[14] This notion of gaze as penetration shaped men's ideals of proper viewing for an upper-class woman. Roman elites argued that certain spectacles—in particular, naked bodies—were unfitting objects of an aristocratic woman's gaze.[15] Plutarch even offered an anecdote that under Romulus, the Romans

---

[12] *VM* 1.14-17.
[13] *Ling.* 6.80.
[14] David Fredrick, "Introduction: Invisible Rome," in *idem* (ed.), *The Roman Gaze*, 1-30, 1-2. Also relevant is Fredrick's article in the same volume on the complex spectrum of social and gender roles between "penetrated" and "penetrator" in different places (theater, forum, *domus*) in Roman society: Fredrick, "Mapping Penetrability in Late Republican and Early Imperial Rome," in *idem* (ed.), *The Roman Gaze* (2002), 236-64.
[15] Carlin Barton, "Being in the Eyes: Shame and Sight in Ancient Rome," in Fredrick (ed.), *The Roman Gaze* (2002), 216-35.

passed legislation that compelled men to give women the right of way walking and prohibited them from saying anything indecent (*aischron*) or being naked in a woman's presence.[16] While apocryphal, this anecdote illustrates concern among elite men over what visual and aural material entered into the eyes and ears of women, and the belief that women were particularly susceptible to corruption from external stimuli.

Christian concerns over protecting women from sensory attacks had scriptural roots as well, and applied to the literary representation of female ascetics such as Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina. As Dale Martin has shown, Paul's command in 1 Corinthians 11.2-16 for women to wear veils was rooted in ancient beliefs that the female body was more porous, and thus more susceptible to visual and aural penetration than the male body.[17] As Martin argues, "the assumption that women were more endangered by surrounding forces…was not simply a metaphor for feminine weakness or dependence on masculine protection; rather, it was a physiological fact, anchored in the very nature of female flesh."[18] While veils certainly intended to protect men from being corrupted by viewing women, they equally served to protect women—with their "porous" bodies—from the sensory assaults of men.

Connected to these concerns over the sensory corruption of women and those who viewed them, rhetoric surrounding dress was a particularly prominent arena in which elite men emphasized the visual dangers posed by members of the opposite sex. As Kristi Upson-Saia has

---

[16] *VR* 20.3.
[17] Dale Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (1995), 229-49. Tertullian's *De virginibus velandis* is explicit about the connection between veiling and protection from penetration, and is discussed below. For a study of both artistic and literary evidence of veils and their significance in pre-Christian Greek antiquity, see Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones, *Aphrodite's Tortoise: the Veiled Woman of Ancient Greece* (Swansea: the Classical Press of Wales, 2003). It is also worthwhile to remember that "feminine" medical traits such as porousness could be attributed to male ascetics' bodies as well, as was the case in Theodoret's fifth-century presentation of Symeon the Stylite: Ellen Muehlberger, "Simeon and Other Women in Theodoret's *Religious History*: Gender in the Representation of Late Ancient Christian Asceticism," *JECS* 23:4 (2015), 583-606.
[18] Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (1995), 242.

argued, "elite Roman men constructed a sartorial system—that focused attention on luxury goods and that paired the attire of women and foreigners—in a way that undergirded their supremacy over both groups."[19] As aristocratic women in the late Republic and early Principate exercised more control over property and wealth than in previous centuries, and as Rome's wealth grew with its expansion throughout the Mediterranean, elite men increasingly presented women's dress—in particular, luxurious articles of clothing and makeup—as a sign of their weak natures.[20] Early Christian authors, Upson-Saia argues, deftly adapted this discourse of dress and feminine weakness to praise Christian women for their virtuous humble appearance, which surpassed that of luxurious "pagans":

> While the dress and grooming of all Christians was carefully scrutinized, we find that the looks of Christian women, and particularly female ascetics, mattered most. These women were made the chief spectacles of Christian ideals. Christian leaders fervently urged Christian women to cast aside ostentatious and expensive garments, accessories, hairdressings, and cosmetics in order to prove—through a humble and modest appearance—that even the lowliest members of the Christian community possessed extraordinary virtue.[21]

The call for Christian women to carry a "humble and modest appearance" echoes the rhetoric of both Christian and Hellenic authors in Late Antiquity who called for male philosophers to reveal their wisdom and virtue by rejecting luxury. Rhetoric surrounding Christian women's dress thus overlapped with the cosmetic strategies discussed in the previous chapter.

For women, however, these exhortations to reject luxury carried particularly sexual connotations that emphasized the penetrability of the female body. While authors presented the

---

[19] Kristi Upson-Saia, *Early Christian Dress* (2011), 9. For Christian women's dress, see also Clark, *Women in Late Antiquity* (1993), 105-18.
[20] Upson-Saia, *Early Christian Dress* (2011), 15-32.
[21] Upson-Saia, *Early Christian Dress* (2011), 34. Upson-Saia quotes extensively from Christian sources, Greek and Latin, from Paul to Jerome, and focuses primarily upon material from Tertullian and Clement (Upson-Saia, *Early Christian Dress* [2011], 33-58).

sight of women as a danger to the men viewing them, who risked being tempted by their appearance, there was equal danger to the women who were viewed. Thus Tertullian claimed that an unveiled virgin was tickled (*titillatur*) by the fingers of pointing spectators, pierced (*percutitur*) by their eyes, and grew warm (*concalescit*) from imagining embraces and kisses, until her forehead became hardened, her sense of shame (*pudor*) dispensed with, and "the desire to be pleasing is learned."[22] Clement of Alexandria, meanwhile, warned that "the eyes are corrupted (*diaphtheirontai*) before the rest of the body."[23] While this admonition certainly applied to all Christians, Clement added that women who donned luxurious clothing and makeup "prostitute themselves simply by their appearances."[24] Such warnings highlight early Christian authors' concern over the visibility and penetrability of women. While Christians commonly advocated humble appearance for men and women in order to signal philosophical virtue, for women these calls carried additional sexual significance.

As was the case with men, so too with women did the ideal appearance of an educated elite lie somewhere between excessive luxury and excessive boorishness. In Late Antiquity, female ascetics faced similar accusations of crudeness and imposture as Cynics received from Julian. As with the rhetoric surrounding luxury in women's dress, moreover, such accusations of boorishness centered around women's sexuality. Jerome ridiculed allegedly "false" virgins who bore the appearance of an ascetic in order to attract male attention:

> Your very clothing, though dark and rough, is a sign of your silent thoughts, since it has no crease, since it trails on the ground so that you may seem taller, since your tunic is

---

[22] *Virg. vel.* 14.10. *Quantum velis bona mente conetur, necesse est publicatione sui periclitetur, dum percutitur oculis incertis et multis, dum digitis demonstrantium titillatur, dum nimium amatur, dum inter amplexus et oscula assidua concalescit. Sic frons duratur, sic pudor feritur, sic solvitur, sic discitur aliter iam placere desiderare.*

[23] *Paed.* 3.11.70. Πρὸ γὰρ τοῦ παντὸς σώματος διαφθείρονται οἱ ὀφθαλμοί.

[24] *Paed.* Αἱ ταῦτα ἐπιτηδεύουσαι γυναῖκες ἰδίαις ὄψεσι προαγωγεύουσιν αὐτάς.

> torn on purpose, so that what is inside may be seen. Your clothes hide what is ugly and show what is attractive. When you walk the creaking of your shiny black shoes calls young men to you. A band presses your breasts together, and a tight belt constricts your chest more narrowly. Your hair trails down over your forehead or ears and sometimes your small cloak falls so as to bare your white shoulders. Then, as if you had not wished to be seen, you quickly cover that which you wished to uncover. And when you hide your face in public, as if out of modesty, with a prostitute's skill you are only showing that which is most able to please.[25]

As Kate Wilkinson has remarked, this passage—along with several others in which Jerome ridiculed "false" virgins—highlights the performative nature of women's modesty in Late Antiquity.[26] In the minds of educated male Christians like Jerome and the Cappadocians, the ideal ascetic woman—just like her male counterpart—was expected to stand in the middle of a spectrum between extravagant luxury and ragged squalor. As with Julian's anti-Cynic orations, moreover, Jerome's "false" virgins appeared as lovers of luxury underneath their filthy appearance. While trying to look like they did not care about their bodies, these alleged impostors purposely sought to care for their looks in a way that heightened their sexuality.

At the same time that elite men wrote about women's need to control their senses and their clothing, they also wrote about women's need to control their voices. As discussed in Chapter One, vocal control was considered an essential element of a young elite male's education, and the tone and substance of a man's voice was a marker of his achievement of masculinity. While women were likewise expected to control their voices, female vocal control often meant silence. In the first century CE, Valerius Maximus recounted the tale of Gaia

---

[25] *Ep.* 117.7. *uestis ipsa uilis et pulla animi tacentis indicium est, si rugam non habeat, si per terram, ut altior uidearis, trahatur, si de industria dissuta sit tunica, ut aliquid intus appareat operiatque, quod foedum est, et aperiat quod formosum. caliga quoque ambulantis nigella ac nitens stridore iuuenes ad se uocat. papillae fasciolis conprimuntur et crispanti cingulo angustius pectus artatur. capilli uel in frontem uel in aures defluunt. palliolum interdum cadit, ut candidos nudet umeros, et, quasi uideri noluerit, celat festina, quod uolens retexerat. et quando in publico quasi per uerecundiam operit faciem, lupanarum arte id solum ostendit, quod ostensum magis placere potest.*

[26] Wilkinson, *Women and Modesty* (2015), 125-31. For more on early Christian discourse surrounding "false" virgins, see also Teresa Shaw, "*Askesis* and the Appearance of Holiness," *JECS* 6:3 (1998): 485-99.

Afrania, a first-century BCE woman who spoke for herself in court cases, "not because she lacked advocates, but because she abounded in shamelessness."[27] In his *Conjugal Precepts*, Plutarch claimed that a self-moderated woman (*tēs sōphronos*) "should as modestly guard against exposing her voice to outsiders as she would guard against stripping off her clothes, for when she speaks (*lalousēs*) her emotions (*pathos*), character (*ēthos*), and disposition (*diathesis*) can be read."[28] In Late Antiquity, Jerome's praise of the virgin Asella showed a similar valuation of female vocal control: "her speech was silent and her silence spoke."[29] Such silence, as Kate Wilkinson argues, formed another part of late antique aristocratic women's performance of modesty.[30] This performance, I add, valued the same traits of self-control expected of men (sensory/vocal control, modest dress), but did so in a way that emphasized women as weaker beings in greater need of control.

These concerns about controlling women's bodies were present in fourth-century Asia Minor, even before the heyday of Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa. Basil of Ancyra, a Homoiousian bishop who had formerly been a doctor, wrote a treatise *On Virginity* that listed women's "natural" physiological and spiritual weakness as the basis for virgins' need to guard every part of their bodies from pollution.[31] Interestingly, for Basil of Ancyra, the goal of virginity was for Christian ascetic women to achieve a masculine *habitus*:

> Therefore the virgin, guarded (*phulattomenēn*) so as not to be ensnared in any way by the nets of pleasure, must be manly in appearance (*arrenōpon to omma*), make her voice firm (*sterran poiein tēn phōnēn*), and in her gait and all the movement of her body altogether (*badismati kai sunolōs panti kinēmati tōi tou sōmatos*) control the bait of

---

[27] *FDM* 8.3.2. *C. Afrania uero Licinii Bucconis senatoris uxor prompta ad lites contrahendas pro se semper apud praetorem uerba fecit, non quod aduocatis deficiebatur, sed quod inpudentia abundabat.*
[28] *Pr. Coniug.* 142d. καὶ τὴν φωνὴν ὡς ἀπογύμνωσιν αἰδεῖσθαι καὶ φυλάττεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐκτός
[29] *Ep.* 24.5. *sermo silens et silentium loquens.*
[30] Wilkinson, *Women and Modesty* (2015), 86-116.
[31] Elm, *Virgins of God* (1994), 113-24.

> pleasure…she should manfully correct herself with modest movements (*heautēn sōphrosi kinēmasin andreiōs orthousan*) towards the earnest image of virtue.[32]

At the same time as Basil of Ancyra was influential in Asia Minor, moreover, Eustathius was being rebuked for allowing women and men to dress alike in his ascetic community, as discussed in the previous chapter. The influence of men such as Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius in fourth-century Asia Minor highlights what was at stake for the Gregorys as they constructed ideal models of female asceticism, as both these Christians were authorities with non-Nicene theology who gained cultural capital as philosophers.

Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa shared with Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius a belief that women were capable of receiving praise as ascetics. They, however, sought to emphasize both ascetic renunciation *and* womanly modesty when they lauded their female relatives. While they presented Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina as scripturally-educated women who applied their knowledge of the sacred texts to leading pious lives as Christian ascetics—whether domestic ascetics like Gorgonia and Nonna or a leader of a female ascetic community like Macrina—they also stressed these women's virtue by painting them as proper Roman aristocrats. Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa both granted their female relatives status as Christians whose wisdom and self-moderation embodied the values of philosophy they praised in men. At the same time, however, they constructed images of these women that signaled their femaleness, and marked their philosophical *habitus* as noticeably different from that of a male Christian ascetic. Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina all received praise in ways that characterized

---

[32] Bas. *DV* 18. διὰ τοῦτο δεῖ τὴν παρθένον, τῷ μηδενὶ τρόπῳ τοῖς τῆς ἡδονῆς δικτύοις ἐμπλακῆναι φυλαττομένην, ἀῤῥένωπὸν τὸ ὄμμα, καὶ στερῥὰν ποιεῖν τὴν φωνὴν, τῷ δὲ βαδίσματι καὶ συνόλως παντὶ κινήματι τῷ τοῦ σώματος, συνέχειν τῆς ἡδονῆς τὰ δελέατα· οὐχ ἁλῶσαν, φημὶ, ἔτι μᾶλλον ταῖς ἐπινοίαις πρὸς ἡδονὴν ἑαυτὴν, καὶ παγίδα ἑτέροις τε ὁμοῦ, καὶ τῇ ἑαυτῆς ψυχῇ τὸ οἰκεῖον σῶμα ἀρτύουσαν, πρὸς τὸ σύντονον δὲ τῆς ἀρετῆς εἶδος ἑαυτὴν σώφροσι κινήμασιν ἀνδρείως ὀρθοῦσαν.

them as ideal exemplars of asceticism for both men and women to follow, yet also marked them as proper elite women. By constructing these women as models of philosophical self-moderation who did not challenge traditional elite gender boundaries, the Gregorys sought to classify not only themselves, but also their families, as models of what they considered orthodox philosophy.

Sensory Education and Female Corruptibility

Both Gregorys presented their female relatives as models of self-moderation by emphasizing their control over what words and images entered their souls via the eyes and ears, and what words exited through their mouths. Just as Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the emperor Julian discussed their ascetic praxis in terms of controlling sensory/vocal organs, so too were Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina praised for similar control. For these women, however, the rhetoric of control was much more closely intertwined with ancient assumptions about female weakness and sexual corruption. When the Nazianzen and the Nyssen declared that their sisters and mothers protected their eyes and ears from receiving "improper" words and images, they emphasized that these female ascetics were in greater danger of external penetration, and thus greater need of protection, than were their male counterparts. The presentations of Gorgonia's, Nonna's, and Macrina's control of their eyes, ears, and tongues emphasized these women's ability to achieve philosophical self-moderation while also drawing on longstanding perceptions of women's "natural" weaknesses.

In ancient thought, control of the eyes, ears, and tongue was an essential component of a philosopher's self-moderation. In his funeral oration to Gorgonia, Gregory of Nazianzus actively

promoted his sister as a model of such self-moderation in opposition to "extremist" ascetics like those of Eustathius' following:

> In self-moderation (*sōphrousunēi*) she so greatly excelled, and so far surpassed, those of her own day—to say nothing of those of old who have great reputation for self-moderation (*sōphrosunēi*)—that, in regard to the two divisions of life for everyone, that is, the married and the unmarried state, the latter being higher and more divine, though more difficult and dangerous, while the former is more lowly and safer, she was able to avoid the disadvantages of each, and to select and combine all that is best in both—namely, the height of the one and the security of the other, thus becoming modest without pride (*sōphrōn atuphos*), blending the good of the unmarried state with marriage, and proving that neither of them absolutely binds us to, or separates us from, God or the world, so that the one from its own nature must be utterly avoided, and the other altogether praised.[33]

Gregory's rhetoric throughout this oration presented Gorgonia as a model of philosophical self-moderation (*sōphrosunē*).[34] What is particularly significant here is that, according to Gregory, his sister embodied this model as both a Christian ascetic *and* as a married woman. Such a portrayal would have been particularly significant in late antique Cappadocia, where Eustathius had gained a considerable following while declaring that marriage must be altogether avoided. Contrary to ascetics like Eustathius, however, Gregory depicted his sister as proof that one could, in fact, achieve philosophical self-moderation while still being married. Nonna, likewise, would have fulfilled this ideal in Gregory's rhetoric, as he praised his mother for being both a pious Christian and dutiful wife.[35] In his funeral oration to Gorgonia, the declaration that she was "modest

---

[33] *Or.* 8.8. Σωφροσύνῃ μέν γε τοσοῦτον διήνεγκε, καὶ τοσοῦτον ὑπερῆρε τὰς κατ᾽ αὐτὴν ἁπάσας, ἵνα μὴ λέγω τὰς παλαιὰς, ὧν ὁ πολὺς ἐπὶ σωφροσύνῃ λόγος, ὥστε εἰς δύο ταῦτα διῃρημένου πᾶσι τοῦ βίου, γάμου λέγω καὶ ἀγαμίας, καὶ τῆς μὲν οὔσης ὑψηλοτέρας τε καὶ θειοτέρας, ἐπιπονωτέρας δὲ καὶ σφαλερωτέρας, τοῦ δὲ ταπεινοτέρου τε καὶ ἀσφαλεστέρου, ἀμφοτέρων φυγοῦσα τὸ ἀηδὲς, ὅσον κάλλιστόν ἐστιν ἐν ἀμφοτέροις ἐκλέξασθαι, καὶ εἰς ἓν ἀγαγεῖν, τῆς μὲν τὸ ὕψος, τοῦ δὲ τὴν ἀσφάλειαν, καὶ γενέσθαι σώφρων ἄτυφος, τῷ γάμῳ τὸ τῆς ἀγαμίας καλὸν κεράσασα, καὶ δείξασα, ὅτι μήθ᾽ ἕτερον τούτων ἢ Θεῷ πάντως, ἢ κόσμῳ συνδεῖ, καὶ διίστησι πάλιν ὥστε εἶναι τὸ μὲν παντὶ φευκτὸν κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν φύσιν, τὸ δὲ τελέως ἐπαινετόν.
[34] Guerri, "El elogio fúnebre de Gorgonia" (1994), 385-6.
[35] *Or.* 18.7-8.

without pride" particularly implied that rivals who denounced marriage altogether were modest *with* pride—and thus not truly modest. Gregory's praise of his female relatives—especially that of his sister—as models of self-moderation thus advocated a middle ground between attachment to marriage and excessive renunciation. In this way, he distinguished these women from ascetics like Eustathius who renounced marriage altogether.

Gregory discussed the self-moderation of his sister and mother in terms of the sensory control that he had advocated for priests in his *Oration on the Priesthood*. By highlighting their mastery of their eyes, ears, and tongues, he argued that these women possessed the same Christian philosophy that he possessed, because they controlled the passage of words into and out of their souls. Gorgonia, Gregory insisted, achieved virtue by mastering the visual, aural, and vocal channels of her body: "Who so controlled (*ephronisen*) her eyes?…Who so barred the portals of her ears (*akoēi thuras*)? And who opened them more to divine words, or, rather, set her mind (*noun*) as guide over her tongue (*hēgemona glōssēi*) in narrating the judgments of God?"[36] Nonna, meanwhile, received similar praise for preventing corrupting words from entering her soul: "She would not let her ears or her tongue, which had received and spoken holy things, be utterly spoiled (*katamolunthēnai*) by Greek [i.e., "pagan"] tales or theatrical songs."[37] These passages parallel the descriptions of education as sensory/vocal control found in the early works of Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Julian. At the same time, however, there is a noticeable additional emphasis on women's supposed weakness. According to Gregory, Gorgonia "closed the portals of her ears," and Nonna prevented herself from being "spoiled" by external "pagan"

---

[36] *Or.* 8.9. Τίς μὲν οὕτως ὀφθαλμὸν ἐσωφρόνισεν;…Τίς μᾶλλον ἀκοῆ θύρας ἐπέθηκεν; τίς δὲ τοῖς θείοις λόγοις ἠνέῳξε, μᾶλλον δὲ, τίς νοῦν ἐπέστησεν ἡγεμόνα γλώσσῃ λαλεῖν τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ δικαιώματα;

[37] *Or.* 18.10. μηδὲ διηγήμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς, ἢ ᾄσμασι θεατρικοῖς καταμολυνθῆναι τὴν ἀκοὴν, ἢ τὴν γλῶσσαν, τὴν τὰ θεῖα δεχομένην ἢ φθεγγομένην.

words. Moreover, in Gregory's rhetoric, this protection from corruption came through their exclusive devotion to the words of the Scriptures. While he praised his sister for "closing the portals" of her ears, he also declared that she "opened them to divine words." Likewise, Nonna did not allow "pagan" words to corrupt her because her ears and tongue had already received holy words. In this way, Gregory classified Gorgonia and Nonna as philosophers on the same terms as he would have judged men—control of the eyes, ears, and tongue—while placing extra emphasis on these women's ability to protect themselves from external corruption.

Gregory of Nyssa's presentation of Macrina offers an even stronger emphasis on female corruptibility and exclusive devotion to the Scriptures. In his *Life of Macrina*, Gregory treated his sister's education as a means of protecting her from the corrupting influence of non-Christian *paideia*. While he praised his young sister as quick-learning (*eumathēs*), he emphasized that her lessons operated under the supervision of her parents: "whatever lesson her parents' judgment offered, in that lesson the nature of the young girl shone forth."[38] According to Gregory, her mother Emmelia was particularly concerned to guard Macrina during her early education by carefully controlling what she read:

> It was a matter of serious interest to her mother to educate (*paideusai*) the child, but not in that external and general learning (*tēn exōthen tautēn kai enkuklion paideusin*), by which, for the most part, during the first years students are taught through the poets. For she thought that it was shameful and entirely improper to teach a soft and easily-molded nature (*hapalēn kai euplaston phusin*) either the passions of tragedy—those passions of women which give poets inspiration and subject matter—or the obscene comedies, or the

[38] *VM* 3.3-6. Ὑπερβᾶσα δὲ τὴν τῶν νηπίων ἡλικίαν εὐμαθὴς ἦν τῶν παιδικῶν μαθημάτων, καὶ πρὸς ὅπερ ἂν ἡ τῶν γονέων κρίσις ἦγε μάθημα, κατ' ἐκεῖνο ἡ φύσις τῆς νέας διέλαμπεν.

> causes of the evils around Troy, utterly spoiling (*katamolunomenēn*) her with these more irreverent tales about women.[39]

The prohibitions which, according to Gregory, Emmelia placed on Macrina's education highlight the common ancient belief that words molded young students, like wax molded tablets. Such a concept was, on the surface, not particularly different from the warnings given by Basil, drawn from previous moralizing Greek philosophers such as Plutarch and Plato, on why it was necessary to teach young boys from an early age.[40] Ancient notions of the "soft wax" of a young soul applied to boys, as well as girls. The indecencies of theatrical performances like tragedies and comedies, moreover, were quite commonly attacked by Christian and non-Christian elites alike for their potential to corrupt impressionable viewers and readers.[41] Here, Gregory recounted that a young Macrina avoided certain classical Greek texts because her nature was "soft and easily molded" (*hapalē kai euplastos*). In this way, Macrina's education did not appear significantly different from Basil's ideal classical education.

Yet Macrina's gender gives this passage an extra significance that is not present in works such as Basil's *Address to Young Men*. Gregory labeled Macrina's nature as "soft and easily molded" both because she was young *and* because she was female. While Basil's *Address* recommended selective reading of non-Christian sources, Gregory's account shows Macrina avoiding these sources altogether. Greek moralists may have recommended young boys steer clear of tragedy and comedy, but avoiding stories about Troy would have been unthinkable, since

---

[39] *VM* 3.6-15. Ἦν δὲ τῇ μητρὶ σπουδὴ παιδεῦσαι μὲν τὴν παῖδα, μὴ μέντοι τὴν ἔξωθεν ταύτην καὶ ἐγκύκλιον παίδευσιν, ἣν ὡς τὰ πολλὰ διὰ τῶν ποιημάτων αἱ πρῶται τῶν παιδευομένων ἡλικίαι διδάσκονται. Αἰσχρὸν γὰρ ᾤετο καὶ παντάπασιν ἀπρεπὲς ἢ τὰ τραγικὰ πάθη, ὅσα ἐκ γυναικῶν τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ὑποθέσεις τοῖς ποιηταῖς ἔδωκεν, ἢ τὰς κωμικὰς ἀσχημοσύνας ἢ τῶν κατὰ τὸ Ἴλιον κακῶν τὰς αἰτίας ἀπαλὴν καὶ εὔπλαστον φύσιν διδάσκεσθαι, καταμολυνομένην τρόπον τινὰ τοῖς ἀσεμνοτέροις περὶ τῶν γυναικῶν διηγήμασιν.

[40] See discussion in Chapter 1.

[41] Webb, *Demons and Dancers* (2008), 168-96. The perceived detrimental effect of theatre on audiences was closely linked with the characterization of performers as effeminate: Webb, *Demons and Dancers* (2008), 139-67.

Homer was the foundational author for Greek-speaking students in the Roman Empire.[42] Gregory, however, insisted that education through Homer, just as much as through tragedies and comedies, would render Macrina "spoiled" (*katamolumenē*), just as Gregory of Nazianzus stressed that his mother was not spoiled (*katamolumenē*) by "pagan" words. While similar moralizing rhetoric may appear in treatises about educating boys, Gregory of Nyssa insisted that the effects of immoral reading would be more much more detrimental for girls like Macrina, who —like Nonna, but unlike young elite boys—would be "spoiled" by exposure to such works.

Gregory presented young Macrina's education as entirely scriptural, in place of the "spoiling" effects of classical texts. Once again, this part of Macrina's education presented a model for male and female Christian students, while placing extra emphasis on female corruptibility. Gregory wrote of his sister that "whatever passages of divinely inspired Scripture that seemed more graspable by the very young were the child's lessons, and above all, the Wisdom of Solomon, and after this, whatever led [her] to a moral way of life (*ton ēthikon bion*)."[43] On the one hand, the idea that a child's education should serve as moral formation was by no means exclusive to women, as Basil's *Address to Young Men* recommended selective reading of Greek literature in order to promote virtue among young men.[44] On the other hand, Macrina's selective reading of the Scriptures sent an additional message: not only must young girls avoid reading the morally degenerate words of Greek poetry, they must also exercise caution when reading the divinely-inspired Scriptures. Even though Gregory described young Macrina as quick-learning (*eumathēs*), she did not read *all* the Scriptures, only the parts that

---

[42] Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind* (2001), 194-7.
[43] *VM* 3.15-9. Ἀλλ' ὅσα τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς εὐληπτότερα ταῖς πρώταις ἡλικίαις δοκεῖ, ταῦτα ἦν τῇ παιδὶ τὰ μαθήματα καὶ μάλιστα ἡ τοῦ Σολομῶντος Σοφία καὶ ταύτης πλέον ὅσα πρὸς τὸν ἠθικὸν ἔφερε βίον.
[44] *Ad adul.* 4-5. See discussion in Chapter 1.

were more graspable (*eulēptoteros*) to very young children and that led to a moral way of life (*ēthikon bion*). Jerome's advice to the Roman virgin Paula the Younger, given two decades later than Gregory's *Life of Macrina*, offered a similar message: while Jerome wished this young virgin to read all books of the Scriptures, he insisted that she read them in a specific order. After first memorizing the Psalms, Jerome instructed Paula to learn "rules of life" by reading Solomon's Proverbs.[45] It is not difficult to see a similar motivation in Gregory of Nyssa's presentation of Macrina's education beginning with moral readings like the Wisdom of Solomon. Gregory of Nazianzus, indeed, praised Gorgonia for embodying—and even surpassing—the matronly virtues of Solomon's ideal woman (Proverbs 31:10-31).[46] The Nyssen's account of Macrina's scriptural education offered a similar emphasis, showing not simply that his sister was educated exclusively in the Scriptures, but also that her scriptural lessons would have taught her to be a proper elite matron.

The Psalms formed a key element of Macrina's selective scriptural education. According to Gregory, Macrina learned the Psalms at a very early age, internalizing them as an integral part of her daily life:

> But also there was none of the Psalms which she did not know, since she recited each part of the psalmody at the proper times of the day: when she rose from her bed, performed or rested from her duties, sat down to eat or rose up from the table, when she went to bed or got up to pray, at all time she had psalmody with her like a good traveling companion who never fails.[47]

---

[45] *Ep.* 107.12. discat primum psalterium, his se canticis auocet et in prouerbiis salomonis erudiatur ad uitam.
[46] *Or.* 8.9.
[47] *VM* 3.19-26. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ψαλμῳδουμένης γραφῆς οὐδ' ὁτιοῦν ἠγνόει καιροῖς ἰδίοις ἕκαστον μέρος τῆς ψαλμῳδίας διεξιοῦσα τῆς τε κοίτης διανισταμένη καὶ τῶν σπουδαίων ἁπτομένη τε καὶ ἀναπαυομένη καὶ προσιεμένη τροφὴν καὶ ἀναχωροῦσα τραπέζης καὶ ἐπὶ κοίτην ἰοῦσα καὶ εἰς προσευχὰς διανισταμένη, πανταχοῦ τὴν ψαλμῳδίαν εἶχεν οἷόν τινα σύνοδον ἀγαθὴν μηδενὸς ἀπολιμπανομένην χρόνου.

The Psalms, Gregory insisted, were one of the earliest pieces of writing "imprinted" onto the "fresh wax" of young Macrina's mind, thus molding her into a dutiful performer of ascetic piety. In this instance of the *Life*, Macrina performed a schedule of psalmody reminiscent of monastic communities, well before she officially committed herself to ascetic life. She recited Psalms at "proper" times throughout the day, from rising out of bed in the morning to waking for nightly vigils. She carried psalmody (*psalmōdia*) with her as her companion, thus making the Psalms an essential part of her *habitus* from a very early age. Gregory's presentation of Macrina's psalmody, combined with her selective reading of the Scriptures, reinforced his presentation of a woman whose soul had been protected from external corruptions because it had been "imprinted" with divine.

Gorgonia's control of her senses, Nonna's and Macrina's avoidance of "corrupting" non-Christian readings, and the prioritization of ethical reading—Solomon in particular—in Macrina's scriptural education all functioned to idealize a particular image of an elite Christian female philosopher. It is important to recognize that this image was distinctly different from that of a male philosopher. While the Gregorys presented an ideal female philosopher who possessed values of self-moderation that would have been desirable for both women and men, they were keen to remind their audiences that the subjects of their praise were women, whose weaker bodies—and, to a degree, weaker souls—rendered them more susceptible to corruption, and thus in more need of protection, than men. As aristocratic women in highly educated families, Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina were able to receive literary education, yet their male relatives chose to emphasize their education as exclusively scriptural. This education—in private, *not* in public, through the Scriptures, *not* through classical literature—did not prepare them to pursue

Christian virtue as ecclesiastical leaders, as did Basil's and the Gregorys'. In this sense, their education did not challenge elite gender boundaries. According to their male biographers, these women, unlike "other" ascetics like the Eustathians, were loyal to their families: the Nazianzen emphasized his sister and mother as virtuous married women, and the Nyssen wrote of a young Macrina who obeyed her mother's wishes. Thus, the images of female self-moderation that these Cappadocians constructed did not destroy, but reinforce, traditional expectations of aristocratic women. By devoting themselves to the Scriptures—particularly, the wisdom of Solomon—and completely avoiding the dangers of "pagan" myths, Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina (as the Gregorys presented them) displayed a level of self-moderation that asserted their status as well-behaved elites.

Material and Rhetorical Cosmetics in the Presentation of a Female Ascetic Philosopher

As discussed in the previous chapter, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Julian presented legitimate philosophical *habitus* as something that was both imprinted deep within their souls and visibly evident upon their bodies. In speaking and writing about their sisters and mothers, Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa also praised external appearance alongside internal character. The physical appearance of Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina was an essential element of how their male biographers enshrined these women as exemplary female Christian philosophers. As with sensory control, the values of physical appearance that the Gregorys constructed for their female relatives paralleled male ideals. In general, educated authors advised both philosophers and women to avoid hairstyles and clothing that were deemed luxurious, and to

display virtues of simplicity, humility, and self-control.[48] While the purpose of such an appearance could differ—the philosopher's simplicity signaled devotion to immaterial wisdom, while the woman's simplicity signaled control of her own and others' sexual desire—Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa each presented their female relatives' humble appearance as a sign of both control over sexuality and devotion to wisdom.

Yet by describing their female relatives with humble appearance, the Gregorys risked associating these women with groups like Eustathius' following, who allegedly blurred gender boundaries by allowing both men and women to dress like philosophers. In order to avoid such association, these Cappadocians stressed Gorgonia's, Nonna's, and Macrina's status as women by coloring their rhetoric with the feminine language of cosmetics. In other words, even when these women appeared without material cosmetics, the texts about them dazzled listeners/readers with rhetorical cosmetics that emphasized their physical beauty. In this way, the cosmetic strategies that the Gregorys applied to their female relatives' made visible these women's invisibility.[49] While present in the cosmetic strategies discussed in the previous chapter, the language of cosmetics appears much more heavily throughout Gregory of Nazianzus' encomia to Gorgonia and Nonna and Gregory of Nyssa's *Life of Macrina*. By drawing on the language of cosmetics to praise their female relatives' cultivation of philosophical appearance, they thus reminded their audience that these women were different from men, at the same time that they praised them for eschewing "feminine" features like makeup, fancy hair, and fine clothing. The

---

[48] Upson-Saia, *Early Christian Dress* (2011), 15-32. Similarly, Lucian's *Demonax* ridiculed the second-sophistic rhetor Favorinus, a eunuch, for falling short of "philosophy" because of his love of luxury and failure to embody rigorous asceticism (Gleason, *Making Men* [1995], 133-7).

[49] For the importance of making women's invisibility visible in ancient Roman political discourse, see Cooper, *The Virgin and the Bride* (1996), 13.

Gregorys presented Gorgoina's, Nonna's, and Macrina's physical appearance in the middle of a spectrum between luxurious "pagans" on the one end, and gender-bending ascetics on the other.

When praising Gorgonia's sensory control, Gregory of Nazianzus wrote that she not only controlled her *own* eyes, but also kept herself from being seen by other (male) eyes: "Who was more worthy of being seen," he wrote of his sister, "yet who was seen less, and made herself more inaccessible to the eyes of men?"[50] This praise of Gorgonia's invisibility fits well within elite Christian literature on the sexual dangers of women who were publicly visible, as discussed above with the examples of Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria. Inaccessible to the eyes of men, Gorgonia (as Gregory constructed her) would not risk either corrupting other men who saw her, or being violated by the gazes of such voyeuristic men. By emphasizing his sister's inaccessibility to the eyes of such men, Gregory declared that his sister, though beautiful, was uncorrupted by male visual penetration.

Yet while Gregory lauded his sister's invisibility, his funeral oration invited his readers/listeners to observe her body as a marker of her purity and incorruptibility. He presented a detailed description of Gorgonia's simple appearance that functioned as a sort of counter-*ekphrasis*:

> No gold, fashioned by art into surpassing beauty, ever adorned (*ekosmēse*) her, or fair tresses fully or partly exposed, or spiral curls, or the dishonorable devices (*sophismata*) of those who disgracefully turn the noble head into a showpiece. Hers were no costly, flowing, diaphanous robes, hers no brilliant and beautiful gems, flashing color round about and causing the figure to glow with light. Hers were no devices and magic tricks of the painter, or that cheap beauty of the earthly creator who, as a rival creator, hides the image of God with deceitful pigments and disgraces it with adornment and exhibits to wanton eyes the divine form as a meretricious idol (*eidōlon pornikon*), that this counterfeit beauty may steal away that natural image which is to be preserved for God

[50] *Or.* 8.9. Τίς μὲν ἦν φαίνεσθαι μᾶλλον ἀξία; Τίς δὲ ἧττον ἐφάνη, καὶ ἀπρόσιτον ἐτήρησεν ἑαυτὴν ἀνδρῶν ὄψεσιν;

> and the world to come. But while she was familiar with the many and various external ornaments (*kosmous tous exōthen*) of women, she recognized none as more precious than her own character and the splendor which lies within (*tēs endon apokeimenēs lamprotētos*). The only blush that pleased her was the blush of modesty (*aidous*), and the only pallor, that which comes from self-control (*enkrateias*). But pigments and makeup, and living pictures, and flowing beauty of form (*eumorphian*) she left to the women of the stage and the public squares, and to all for whom it is a disgrace and a reproach to feel ashamed.[51]

This long description of Gorgonia's *lack* of adornment turned conventional *ekphrasis* on its head, as Gregory both dazzled with language about golden jewelry, flowing locks, and bright-colored robes, and distanced his subject from these features of beautification.[52] Such features, he claimed, were devices (*sophismata*), in opposition to the "genuine" truth of Christian philosophy. In Gregory's words, Gorgonia adopted an ideal physical appearance by rejecting "standard" categories of women's appearance as "devices." As Julian's Marcus Aurelius looked ideal because he was "unkempt and unadorned" standing before the gods, so Gregory's Gorgonia revealed her virtue by rejecting adornment.[53] Gorgonia, moreover, cared more about her "internal" self than "external" trifles. This contrast between external cosmetics and Gorgonia's internal character represented a distinction not only between the soul and the body, but also between Christian and "pagan": the Cappadocians, after all, commonly designated non-Christian

---

[51] *Or.* 8.10. Οὐ χρυσὸς ἐκείνην ἐκόσμησε τέχνῃ πονηθεὶς εἰς κάλλους περιουσίαν, οὐ ξανθαὶ πλοκαμίδες διαφαινόμεναί τε καὶ ὑποφαινόμεναι, καὶ βοστρύχων ἕλικες, καὶ σοφίσματα σκηνοποιούντων τὴν τιμίαν κεφαλὴν ἀτιμότατα, οὐκ ἐσθῆτος περιῤῥεούσης καὶ διαφανοῦς πολυτέλεια, οὐ λίθων αὐγαὶ καὶ χάριτες χρωννῦσαι τὸν πλησίον ἀέρα, καὶ τὰς μορφὰς περιλάμπουσαι· οὐ ζωγράφων τέχναι καὶ γοητεύματα, καὶ τὸ εὔωνον κάλλος, καὶ ὁ κάτωθεν πλάστης ἀντιδημιουργῶν, καὶ κατακρύπτων τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πλάσμα ἐπιβούλοις χρώμασι, καὶ διὰ τῆς τιμῆς αἰσχύνων, καὶ προτιθεὶς τὴν θείαν μορφὴν εἴδωλον πορνικὸν λίχνοις ὄμμασιν, ἵνα κλέψῃ τὸ νόθον κάλλος τὴν φυσικὴν εἰκόνα τηρουμένην Θεῷ καὶ τῷ μέλλοντι. Ἀλλὰ πολλοὺς μὲν ᾔδει καὶ παντοίους γυναικῶν κόσμους τοὺς ἔξωθεν, τιμιώτερον δὲ οὐδένα τοῦ ἑαυτῆς τρόπου, καὶ τῆς ἔνδον ἀποκειμένης λαμπρότητος. Ἓν μὲν ἔρευθος ἐκείνῃ φίλον, τὸ τῆς αἰδοῦς· μία δὲ λευκότης, ἡ παρὰ τῆς ἐγκρατείας. Τὰς δὲ γραφὰς καὶ ὑπογραφὰς, καὶ τοὺς ζῶντας πίνακας, καὶ τὴν ῥέουσαν εὐμορφίαν, ταῖς ἐπὶ θεάτρων παρῆκε καὶ τῶν τριόδων, καὶ ὅσαις αἰσχύνη καὶ ὄνειδος τὸ αἰσχύνεσθαι.

[52] See also Burrus, who cleverly described this passage as a "rhetorical strip-tease": "Martyrdom of Gorgonia" (2006), 160.

[53] *Caes.* 317c-d. See discussion in Chapter 2.

texts as "external" (*exōthen*).[54] Further, the comparison of cosmetics to idolatry was a common theme in the works of elite Christian men like Gregory who wished to distinguish between human-made features of "pagans" and the "natural" beauty of the soul.[55] Gregory thus depicted his sister's lack of adornment as a function of her adherence to the truth of Christian philosophy and her rejection of the "external" sophisms of "pagans."

Yet Gregory's praise of his sister's avoidance of "external" cosmetics reminded his audience of her status as a woman. The extensive counter-*ekphrasis* of everything that Gorgonia was *not* wearing implied that it was not common for aristocratic women like her to avoid such adornment. For Gregory, then, Gorgonia's lack of adornment was noteworthy not simply because she was a philosopher, but also because she was a woman. While he praised his sister for rejecting the adornments of cosmetics, he still deployed the language of makeup to praise her. Evidently, cosmetics set the boundaries with which to praise women even when they did not wear cosmetics. Gorgonia's "blush of modesty" and "pallor of self-control" meant that she did not *lack* makeup, but rather that she possessed the *right kind of makeup*—that which would reveal not her wealth, but her asceticism.

In this way, Gregory rhetorically dressed his sister with the physical appearance he saw fitting for a female Christian philosopher. He fashioned his own speech as a verbal adornment of Gorgonia that mirrored the style of her physical body, "spurning all sweetness and elegance (*kompson*) in style" in his praise of "one unadorned (*akallōpistos*)," who considered "lack of

[54] See, for example, *Ad. Adul.* 4.2, 10.3.
[55] Upson-Saia, *Early Christian Dress* (2011), 43-4.

adornment as beauty (*touto kallos…to akosmon*)."[56] Gregory continued to deploy cosmetic terminology in his "refusal" to decorate his sister with fancy rhetoric:

> Let another, regarding the laws of panegyric, praise the country and the family of the departed. He will certainly not lack many excellent topics, if he wishes to adorn her with external ornaments (*kosmein…tois exōthen*), as one adorns a beautiful form with gold and precious stones and embellishments of art and hand. While these things betray ugliness by the very fact of their application, they cannot render more attractive the beauty which surpasses them.[57]

In this passage, Gregory offered another counter-*ekphrasis*, as he described his oration as a process of "not" crafting a work of art with beautiful embellishments. This counter-*ekphrasis* highlighted both Gorgonia's beauty and her rejection of it. Gregory insisted that he *could* adorn his funeral oration to his sister with fancy praise, but such praise would not surpass her own beauty. He thus connected his words directly to his praise of his sister's unadorned body: just as Gorgonia spurned the "external" ornaments of other women, so Gregory spurned "external" style in his speech. When he praised his sister's lack of adornment (*akosmon*) as her beauty, he incorporated her into the same cosmetic strategy deployed by educated elite authors such as himself, Basil, and Julian.

As the author of the oration, however, he set the terms on which to laud his sister, and he chose the terms of cosmetics. By coloring his speech with language of makeup and adornment, he reasserted Gorgonia's femaleness, even as he placed her above the "artificial" features that "pagan" women desired. Just as Gorgonia did not require physical cosmetics in order to reveal

---

[56] *Or.* 8.3. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἱκανῶς ὑπὲρ τούτων ἀπολελογήμεθα, καὶ ἀναγκαῖον ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ἀπεδείξαμεν ὄντα τὸν λόγον, φέρε, προσβῶμεν ἤδη τοῖς ἐγκωμίοις, τὸ μὲν περὶ τὴν λέξιν γλαφυρὸν καὶ κομψὸν διαπτύσαντες (ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἀκαλλώπιστος ἡ ἐπαινουμένη, καὶ τοῦτο κάλλος αὐτῇ τὸ ἄκοσμον).

[57] *Or.* 8.3. Ἄλλος μὲν οὖν πατρίδα τῆς ἀπελθούσης ἐπαινείτω καὶ γένος, νόμους ἐγκωμίων αἰδούμενος· πάντως δὲ οὐκ ἀπορήσει πολλῶν καὶ καλῶν λόγων, εἰ βούλοιτο ταύτην κοσμεῖν καὶ τοῖς ἔξωθεν, ὥσπερ μορφὴν τιμίαν τε καὶ καλὴν χρυσῷ, καὶ λίθοις, καὶ τοῖς ἐκ τέχνης καὶ χειρὸς ὡραΐσμασιν· ἃ τὴν μὲν αἰσχρὰν ἐλέγχει τῇπαραθέσει, τῇ καλῇ δὲ οὐ προσθήκη κάλλους ἐστὶν ἡττώμενα.

her beauty, so Gregory did not need verbal cosmetics in order to praise her beauty, yet in each case, the language of cosmetics set the boundaries of the discourse. The "blush of modesty" and "pallor of self-control" that he described in his description of his sister's unadorned body thus paralleled the configuration of his own speech. Gregory praised the virtues of a woman who did not require any additional cosmetic adornment to be beautiful, while reminding the audience that praise of women commonly focused on physical beauty.

Gregory extolled his mother Nonna's appearance in a similar vein. In his funeral oration to his father, he declared that while other women pride themselves on "beauty, natural as well as artificial," Nonna "only ever knew one beauty, that of the soul, and, as best as she could, the preservation and purification of her divine image (*theian eikona*), leaving paint and artificial adornments (*technētous kosmous*) to women on the stage."[58] Once again, Gregory emphasized a female relative's rejection of "other women's" artificial cosmetics in favor of "genuine" beauty. Nonna's natural "divine image," indeed, contrasted directly with the "meretricious idol" Gregory lambasted in his description of Gorgonia's appearance. Gregory thus implied that his mother's simple appearance contrasted with the human-made cosmetics of "pagans." At the same time, however, he once again reinforced the idea that cosmetics were particularly feminine. Nonna's rejection of worldly adornments reinforced the common ancient connection of such adornments to women: Gregory insisted that while *this* woman cared about true beauty, *women* as a whole cared about beauty that was false and/or superficial. He thus lauded his mother, as he lauded his sister, by separating her from more "feminine" features of cosmetic beauty.

---

[58] *Or.* 18.8. Ἐκείνη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ, τῶν ἄλλων γυναικῶν κάλλει φιλοτιμουμένων καὶ ὑψουμένων, ὅσον τε φυσικὸν καὶ ὅσον ἐπίπλαστον, ἓν ἐπισταμένη κάλλος, τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς, καὶ τὸ τὴν θείαν εἰκόνα ἢ συντηρεῖν, ἢ ἀνακαθαίρειν εἰς δύναμιν· τοὺς δὲ γραπτοὺς καὶ τεχνητοὺς κόσμους, ταῖς ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἀποῤῥίψασα.

Macrina received a similar evaluation of her physical appearance from Gregory of Nyssa. Just as the Nazianzen had described Gorgonia as worthy of being seen yet concealed from the eyes of other men, the Nyssen stressed that Macrina was a beautiful young woman concealed from public view. In the *Life*, when Macrina reaches a nubile age, her beauty—and inaccessibility—receives special emphasis:

> It is indeed worth marveling how the beauty (*kallos*) of the young girl, although covered (*kekrummenon*), did not escape notice, nor did there seem to be a single wonder across her entire country that could compare with her beauty and comeliness (*eumorphias*), so that not even the hands of painters could come close to her beautiful youth (*tēs hōras*), and every crafting art (*mēchamenēn technēn*) that ventures upon the greatest things, such as depicting images of the planets themselves through imitation, was not able to imitate precisely (*di'akribeias mimēsasthai*) the fortune of her figure (*morphēs*).[59]

Macrina appeared, in her brother's words, both well-known for her physical beauty and covered (*kekrummenē*) from others' gazes. Gregory of Nyssa clearly chose to underline Macrina's physical beauty more so than Gregory of Nazianzus did for either Gorgonia or Nonna. While the latter two women were praised for their scorn of external adornments and their cultivation of internal beauty, Macrina's external beauty came in to focus early in her *Life*, before she adopted ascetic life at Annisa: while beauty (*kallos*) could refer either to the body or the soul, comeliness (*eumorphia*) very clearly emphasized physical beauty, as did Gregory's reference to the fortune of Macrina's youth (*hōra*) and form (*morphē*). Her beautiful form, moreover, both mirrored and exceeded the skill of even the best artisans—the Nyssen, like the Nazianzen, deployed ekphrastic language linking womanly beauty to works of art. While Gregory of Nazianzus also contrasted

---

[59] *VM* 4.4-13. Ἔνθα δὴ καὶ θαυμάζειν ἄξιον, ὅπως οὐδὲ κεκρυμμένον τῆς νέας τὸ κάλλος ἐλάνθανεν οὐδέ τι κατὰ τὴν πατρίδα πᾶσαν ἐκείνην τοιοῦτον θαῦμα ἐδόκει οἷον ἐν συγκρίσει τοῦ κάλλους ἐκείνου καὶ τῆς εὐμορφίας εἶναι, ὡς μηδὲ ζωγράφων χεῖρας ἐφικέσθαι δυνηθῆναι τῆς ὥρας· ἀλλὰ τὴν πάντα μηχανωμένην τέχνην καὶ τοῖς μεγίστοις ἐπιτολμῶσαν, ὡς καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν στοιχείων τὰς εἰκόνας διὰ τῆς μιμήσεως ἀνατυποῦσθαι, τὴν τῆς μορφῆς ἐκείνης εὐκληρίαν μὴ ἰσχῦσαι δι' ἀκριβείας μιμήσασθαι.

Gorgonia's and Nonna's internal beauty with the external beautification attempted by artisans, he did so in order to highlight his sister's and mother's rejection of external beauty altogether. Gregory of Nyssa, however, contrasted Macrina's appearance with the works of artisans in order to *emphasize* the beauty of his sister's external body.

Gregory of Nyssa thus sketched a description of his sister as an ideal young aristocratic woman: concealed from public view, yet exceedingly beautiful, perfect for a prominent suitor. According to Gregory, though Macrina desired a life dedicated to God, she acquiesced to her parents' wishes and accepted betrothal to a young man "well-known for self-moderation (*sōphrosunēi*), having just returned from school."[60] She thus appeared not only as an ideal young woman in appearance, but also behavior, obedient to the wishes of her father and betrothed to a man who embodied the elite values of *paideia*. Yet after narrating her fiancé's early death and her subsequent adoption of ascetic life, Gregory did not further discuss his sister's physical appearance until after her death. According to Gregory, a certain deaconess named Lampadion told him of the funeral arrangements his sister made before she died:

> 'The adornment (*kosmos*) of concern to the holy one was her pure life (*katharos bios*); this is for her both the ornament (*enkallōpisma*) of her life and the shroud (*entaphion*) of her death. As to all those things which are for the ornamentation of the body (*pros kallōpismon sōmatos*), she neither had anything to do with them during her lifetime nor did she put any away for the present occasion, so that not even if we wanted to, would there be anything more than what we have to dress her in.'[61]

Evidently shocked that his wealthy sister had nothing with which to decorate herself for her funeral, Gregory then asked Lampadion whether there was anything stored away with which to

---

[60] *VM* 4.16-7. γνώριμον ἐπὶ σωφροσύνῃ, ἄρτι τῶν παιδευτηρίων ἐπανήκοντα.

[61] *VM* 29.6-12. «Τῇ ἁγίᾳ κόσμος ὁ καθαρὸς βίος διεσπουδάσθη· τοῦτο καὶ τῆς ζωῆς ἐγκαλλώπισμα καὶ τοῦ θανάτου ἐντάφιον ἐκείνῃ ἐστί· τὰ δ' ὅσα πρὸς καλλωπισμὸν σώματος βλέπει, οὔτε ἐν τῷ τῆς ζωῆς χρόνῳ προσήκατο οὔτε εἰς τὴν παροῦσαν χρῆσιν ἐταμιεύσατο, ὥστε οὐδὲ βουλομένοις ἡμῖν ἔσται τι πλέον τῆς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο παρασκευῆς παρούσης.»

adorn (*epikosmēsai*) her funeral bier.[62] In response, the deaconess told Gregory to "look at her cloak (*himation*), look at the veil (*kaluptra*) of her head, the worn sandals (*tetrimmena… hupodēmata*) of her feet. This is her wealth, this her fortune."[63] Later Vetiana, an aristocratic follower of Macrina at Annisa, mentioned an iron necklace as another element of Macrina's simple adornment (*kosmos*).[64] Through the words of Lampadion and Vetiana, Gregory called on his audience to view the previously invisible appearance of his sister. This appearance, with the cloak and worn sandals, mirrored the look cultivated by male ascetics at Annisa and reflected the philosophical capital of "simple" dress that Basil and Gregory, along with other late ancient elites, advocated. Macrina's veil, however, signified the gender of her philosophical appearance, distinguishing her from Eustathian women who were accused of cross-dressing. Just as she was well-guarded (*kekrummenē*) as a beautiful young girl, so in death she bore a veil (*kaluptra*) in order to guard her face from others' gazes. Further, the very fact that Gregory did not choose to insert this praise of Macrina's appearance until after her death reinforced the message that during her lifetime, his sister was not accessible to the eyes of others. Even in his narration, it is only after her death that Macrina's ascetic appearance becomes visible to the audience.

After recounting the tale of Macrina's scar—a mark which she obtained by excising her own tumor in order to prevent male doctors from viewing her bare breast—Gregory continued to praise his sister's post-mortem philosophical appearance.[65] While Gregory recounted that

---

[62] *VM* 29.12-13. «Καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τοῖς ἀποκειμένοις εὑρεῖν, ἔφην ἐγώ, τῶν ἐπικοσμῆσαί τι δυναμένων τὴν ἐκφοράν;»

[63] *VM* 29.14-17. «Ποίοις, εἶπεν, ἀποκειμένοις; ἐν χερσὶν ἔχεις πᾶν τὸ ἀπόθετον· ἰδοὺ τὸ ἱμάτιον, ἰδοὺ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἡ καλύπτρα, τὰ τετριμμένα τῶν ποδῶν ὑποδήματα· οὗτος ὁ πλοῦτος, αὕτη ἡ περιουσία.»

[64] *VM* 30.7-8. «᾽Ιδού, φησί, πρὸς ἐμὲ βλέψασα, οἷος περιδέραιος κόσμος τῆς ἁγίας ἐξήρτηται.»

[65] *VM* 31. For analysis of the episode in the *Life* recounting Macrina's scar, see Virginia Burrus, "Macrina's Tattoo," in Dale B. Martin and Patricia Cox Miller (eds.), *The Cultural Turn in Late Ancient Studies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 103-16.

Macrina's body had finally been adorned (*perikosmēthē*) with some linen at his insistence, Lampadion objected that "it was not right for Macrina to be seen by the eyes of the virgins dressed as a bride."[66] Instead, she offered a grey protective cloak (*tōn phaiōn pephulagmenon himation*) that once belonged to Gregory's and Macrina's mother Emmelia, "so that Macrina's sacred beauty (*hieron…kallos*) should not be made to shine in clothing used for external fashion (*epeiskatōi…kosmōi*)."[67] The simple cloak, however, only increased Macrina's beauty: "she shone even in the grey (*elampe kai en tōi phaiōi*)," a feat Gregory attributed to the power of God, who added to Macrina's physical beauty so that she shone in real life just as she had previously shone in the vision Gregory received right before his sister's death.[68] In Late Antiquity, the bodies of both male and female saints were commonly described as shining to signify their holiness.[69] What is significant for my argument here is how in this passage, Gregory deployed the imagery of the shining body in order to emphasize his sister's philosophical appearance. Macrina shines in the humble cloak (*himation*) that would have been a familiar marker of an ancient philosopher. At the same time, however, Gregory's description of his sister's shining body emphasizes her physical beauty. According to this account, Lampadion objected to adorning Macrina "like a bride," yet even in a humble philosopher's cloak, her body shone. This overlap between bridal adornment and philosophical garb highlights the balance that Gregory

---

[66] *VM* 32.1-4. Ἐπεὶ δὲ πέρας εἶχεν ἡμῖν ἡ σπουδὴ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐνόντων περιεκοσμήθη τὸ σῶμα, πάλιν φησὶν ἡ διάκονος μὴ πρέπειν νυμφικῶς ἐσταλμένην αὐτὴν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς τῶν παρθένων ὁρᾶσθαι.

[67] *VM* 32. 4-7. «Ἀλλ' ἔστι μοι, φησί, τῆς μητρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας τῶν φαιῶν πεφυλαγμένον ἱμάτιον, ὃ ἄνωθεν ἐπιβληθῆναι καλῶς ἔχειν φημί, ὡς ἂν μὴ τῷ ἐπεισάκτῳ διὰ τῆς ἐσθῆτος κόσμῳ τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦτο κάλλος λαμπρύνοιτο.»

[68] *VM* 32. 8-12. ἡ δὲ ἔλαμπε καὶ ἐν τῷ φαιῷ, τῆς θείας, οἶμαι, δυνάμεως καὶ ταύτην προσθείσης τὴν χάριν τῷ σώματι, ὥστε κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ἐνυπνίου ὄψιν ἀκριβῶς αὐγάς τινας ἐκ τοῦ κάλλους ἐκλάμπειν δοκεῖν. The vision is recounted in *VM* 15.12-22.

[69] For more on the visual language surrounding descriptions of the bodies, relics, and tombs of saints in Late Antiquity, see Miller, *The Corporeal Imagination* (2009), 62-101.

sought to create in his description of Macrina's appearance: while she wore a grey cloak that might have identified her as a "cross-dressing" Eustathian ascetic, her shining body indicated that in death, she was both philosopher and bride.

The rhetoric surrounding Gorgonia's, Nonna's, and Macrina's physical appearance functioned as another part of the Gregorys' efforts to present these women as ideal elite female Christian philosophers. Just as they received praise from their male biographers for their sensory control and exclusively scriptural education, so too these women were praised for their humble—yet properly feminine—appearance. While Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa praised their female relatives as women who, rejecting physical makeup in favor of "internal" beauty, paralleled the humble appearance of male philosophers, they also classified this appearance as female by describing their beauty—*physical*, as well as spiritual—in terms of makeup. In order to identify Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina as women, Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa colored their rhetoric with the language of makeup, fancy clothing, and brilliant beauty, even as they lauded their sisters and mothers for rejecting such features. They may have encouraged all Christians, male and female alike, to cultivate an appearance that was unkempt and unadorned in order to reveal themselves as disciples of "true" philosophy, but their descriptions of their female relatives' appearance implied that "proper" female ascetics should still be discussed in terms of physical beauty.

Speech, Subjugation, and the Crafting of the Ideal Female Voice

Both Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa created models of female education that emphasized the necessity to control and protect women's bodies. They advertised their

female relatives' ability to protect their souls by avoiding corrupting words/images and disdaining "feminine" cosmetics (while still coloring their portrayals of these women with cosmetic language). Presentations of these women speaking served the Gregorys as another means to define and delimit their ideal female Christian philosopher. Just as traditional male classroom education involved training young boys to control their voices in order to speak as "proper" elite men, so Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa argued that Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina spoke as "proper" elite women. In order to present them in this way, the Gregorys associated these women's speech with their willing subjugation to male priests. While elite men like Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa were comfortable praising women as counselors and teachers of Christian philosophy—the Nyssen in particular gave this image to Macrina—they also wanted to make sure that their roles as teachers did not overlap with the public teaching (preaching) of Christian priests, and thus did not challenge elite notions of women's limited public authority. In the words of Gillian Clark, "private discussions with a distinguished Christian woman were not preaching."[70] When the Gregorys praised their female relatives for their knowledge of the Scriptures and ability to impart this knowledge to others, they did so in ways that stressed these women as informal teachers within households and ascetic communities, not as authoritative public speakers. By presenting their female relatives as dutiful subjects to priestly authority, the Gregorys furthered their presentation of these women as proper orthodox female ascetics.

While in the previous two sections—on female sensory control and female dress—Gregory of Nazianzus' and Gregory of Nyssa's narrative strategies were similar enough to merit

---

[70] Clark, *Women in Late Antiquity* (1993), 128.

examining them together, their descriptions of their female relatives' speaking differ enough that I will discuss them in separate sub-sections. On the one hand, Gregory of Nazianzus insisted that even though Gorgonia and Nonna served as counselors to those around them, their observance of silence—especially in churches—was more praiseworthy. For the Nazianzen, the most important speaking his sister and mother performed was the recitation of Scriptures as part of their ascetic praxis—thus, their speech was primarily a tool for their self-subjugation. Gregory of Nyssa, on the other hand, clearly presented Macrina as a teacher of philosophy, instructing her family members—himself included—and female ascetics at Annisa. Yet even while painting Macrina as a teacher, the Nyssen limited her authority in his role—she taught exclusively within the confines of Annisa, and taught no male students aside from her immediate family members. Additionally, her teaching emphasized her self-subjugation, as she instructed others to endure difficulty and to subject themselves to God. Even while Macrina was a teacher, her lessons implied that her primary value was as a woman who willingly subjected herself. Further, at the end of the *Life of Macrina*, Gregory asserts himself as a male bishop who co-opted Macrina's role as a teacher, thus bringing her authority into the bounds of his own ecclesiastical authority.

Gorgonia and Nonna, Silent and Subjugated

Gregory of Nazianzus circumscribed his sister's and mother's speech within what he considered fitting boundaries for a woman's voice. Nearly in the same breath, he lauded Gorgonia as both a wise counselor and obediently silent woman. Because of her intellect (*dianoia*), he declared, his sister was considered an adviser by those around her, both those

within and outside of her family.[71] Yet at the same time as he acknowledged her ability to speak words of advice, he devoted greater energy to praising her for *not* speaking:

> What was more well-aimed than her words? What was more intelligent than her silence? But since I mentioned silence, I will proceed to her most suitable characteristic, and the one most proper to women (*gunaixi prepōdestaton*), and most useful for the present time. Who knew better the things of God, both from the divine oracles and her own understanding? Yet who spoke less, remaining within the womanly bounds (*tois gunaikeiois horois*) of piety?[72]

Gorgonia's status as an intelligent woman evidently created some tension for Gregory. While he certainly had no problem granting his sister status as an wise counselor, it seems he was concerned not to overstate her achievement of this role. Quite literally, he placed boundaries (*horoi*) on Gorgonia's role as philosophical counselor, marking her as both exceptionally intelligent and dutifully obedient. While Gregory presented Gorgonia as a wise philosopher who offered others counsel, his emphasis on her silence sought to circumscribe her within what he considered the "natural" boundaries of women's speech.

Gregory was particularly concerned to assert his sister's dutiful silence in the presence of priests. As discussed in the previous two chapters, Gregory considered priests to be the educated (male) leaders of Christian philosophy.[73] He did not wish to put his sister, however intelligent, into such an authoritative position. After lauding her silence, Gregory continued to paint Gorgonia as an obedient female subject of Christian leadership:

> And, that which is obliged for a woman who knows how to be truly pious (*tēi…alēthōs eusebein egnōkuiai*), and which is the only object of beautiful desire: who so adorned (*katekosmēsen*) shrines with offerings, both others and this one, which will hardly be adorned

---

[71] *Or.* 8.11.

[72] *Or.* 8.11. Τί δὲ τῶν λόγων ἐκείνων εὐστοχώτερον; τί δὲ τῆς σιωπῆς συνετώτερον; Ἀλλ' ἐπειδή γε σιωπῆς ἐμνήσθην, προσθήσω τὸ οἰκειότατον ἐκείνης, καὶ γυναιξὶ πρεπωδέστατον, καὶ τῷ παρόντι καιρῷ χρησιμώτατον. Τίς μὲν ἔγνω τὰ περὶ Θεοῦ μᾶλλον ἔκ τε τῶν θείων λογίων καὶ τῆς οἰκείας συνέσεως; Τίς δὲ ἧττον ἐφθέγξατο ἐν τοῖς γυναικείοις ὅροις τῆς εὐσεβείας μείνασα;

[73] See also Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012), 153-81.

> now that she is gone? Or rather, who so presented herself as a living shrine to God (*naon heauton tōi Theōi zōnta*, cf. 1 Cor. 6:19)? Who so honored priests, both others and this one [Gregory the Elder] who was her fellow fighter and teacher of piety, whose beautiful seeds are a pair of children consecrated to God?[74]

Coming immediately in the oration after his discussion of Gorgonia's wise counsel and dutiful silence, this description of her activities in churches and reverence to priests further presented Gorgonia as a proper female subject of masculine authority. While she could use her knowledge of Christian philosophy to offer informal advice to family and friends, she could not—in Gregory's view—challenge priests, the most authoritative Christian philosophers. Gregory thus made sure to remind his audience that in addition to her observance of the "womanly bounds" of silence, his sister bestowed gifts upon church buildings and honored the priests who preached inside. According to Gregory, even Gorgonia's very body was a temple, thus linking her bodily control to her veneration of church buildings. Moreover, Gregory praised his sister's honor to her father, who served as both her priest and her teacher, thus emphasizing her obedience to male authorities. In Gregory's funeral oration, Gorgonia's status as intellectual philosopher is countered by her role as an obedient daughter and laywoman.

Gregory also praised his mother's submission to male authorities. He stressed that Nonna's "voice was never heard in the sacred assemblies or places, outside of what was necessary and liturgical."[75] While women participated in Christian liturgies, the ceremonies were controlled by male priests, so women's speaking would have been confined within the sorts of

---

[74] *Or.* 8.11. Ὁ δ' οὖν ὠφείλετο τῇ γε ἀληθῶς εὐσεβεῖν ἐγνωκυίᾳ, καὶ οὗ καλὴ μόνον ἡ ἀπληστία, τίς μὲν ἀναθήμασιν οὕτω ναοὺς κατεκόσμησεν, ἄλλους τε καὶ τὸν οὐκ οἶδ' εἰ μετ' ἐκείνην κοσμηθησόμενον; Μᾶλλον δὲ, τίς οὕτω ναὸν ἑαυτὸν τῷ Θεῷ ζῶντα παρέστησεν; Τίς δὲ τοσοῦτον ἐδόξασεν ἱερέας, ἄλλους τε καὶ τὸν ἐκείνῃ τῆς εὐσεβείας συναγωνιστὴν καὶ διδάσκαλον, οὗ τὰ καλὰ σπέρματα καὶ ἡ καθιερωμένη τῶν τέκνων τῷ Θεῷ συζυγία;
[75] *Or.* 18.9. Οἷον τὸ μήποτε φωνὴν αὐτῆς ἐν ἱεροῖς ἀκουσθῆναι συλλόγοις, ἢ τόποις, ἔξω τῶν ἀναγκαίων καὶ μυστικῶν.

"womanly boundaries" that Gorgonia—according to her brother—so dutifully observed.[76] Gregory also declared that his mother "rejoiced at the hands and faces of priests."[77] He thus linked Nonna's obedience at sacred assemblies to her devotion to ecclesiastical leadership, just as he had done for his sister Gorgonia. For his mother, moreover, Gregory declared that her observance of restricted speech during services marked her bodily and spiritual purity:

> And if it was a great thing for the altar never to have had an iron tool lifted upon it (Deut. 27:5), and that no chisel should be seen or heard—with greater reason, since everything dedicated to God ought to be natural and free from artifice (*phusikon kai atechnon*)—then surely was it not also a great thing that she honored the holy places by her silence (*to siōpēi timasthai ta hagia*), never turned her back on the venerable table, never spat upon the holy pavement, and never gave her right hand or put her lips to the hands or lips of a *Hellēn*, not even a woman most well-adorned (*kosmiōtatēs*) and fitting in other respects?[78]

In Gregory's oration, Nonna's observance of holy silence came at the fore of a list of actions signaling her reverence of sacred spaces. Her silence, along with her facing of the sacred table, restraint from spitting, and refusal to touch or kiss Hellenic women, was a performed action that revealed her adherence both to Christian models of piety and to traditional elite categories of womanly conduct. In this way, Gregory presented his mother as a model of self-moderation in a way that placed her into the same "boundaries" of womanly silence into which he had set Gorgonia.

---

[76] For the evidence of women in late antique liturgy, see Derek Krueger, *Liturgical Subjects: Christian Ritual, Biblical Narrative, and the Formation of the Self in Byzantium*, Divinations (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 15; Robert E. Taft, "Women at Church in Byzantium: Where, When—and Why?" *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 52 (1998), 27-87.

[77] *Or.* 18.9. Τίς δὲ ἱερέων οὕτως ᾐδέσθη χεῖρα καὶ πρόσωπον;

[78] *Or.* 18.10. Καὶ εἰ μέγα τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ ποτὲ τὸ μὴ πέλεκυν ἐπ' αὐτὸ ἀναβῆναι, μηδὲ ὀφθῆναι, ἢ ἀκουσθῆναι λαξευτήριον (λόγῳ μείζονι, ὡς δέον φυσικὸν καὶ ἄτεχνον εἶναι πᾶν τῷ Θεῷ καθιερούμενον), πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ παρ' ἐκείνης μέγα, τὸ σιωπῇ τιμᾶσθαι τὰ ἅγια, τὸ μήποτε νῶτα δοθῆναι τῇ σεβασμίῳ τραπέζῃ, μηδὲ καταπτυσθῆναι θεῖον ἔδαφος, τὸ μήποτε δεξιὰν ἐμβληθῆναι ἢ χείλη μιγῆναι χερσὶν Ἑλληνικαῖς ἢ χείλεσι μηδὲ τῆς τἄλλα κοσμιωτάτης γυναικὸς καὶ οἰκειοτάτης;

When Gregory did praise his sister and mother for speaking, it was within the context of their self-subjugation as ascetics. He lauded Gorgonia's fasting, hard bedding, and nightly vigils —the latter being the "greatest struggle of philosophic men (*malista philosophōn andrōn to agōnisma*)."[79] Along with these ascetic habits, Gregory included intellectual features in which his sister equalled—even surpassed—male Christian philosophers:

> Indeed, in this respect [nightly prayer] she was seen more manly (*andrikōtera*) than not only women, but also the most high-minded men, in her intelligent chanting (*tonon emphrona*) of the Psalms, in her reading, explanation, and timely recollection of the divine oracles, in her bending of knees which had grown callous, and, as it were, attached to the ground, in her tears to cleanse her stains with contrite heart and the spirit of humility (*pneumati tapeinōseōs*), in prayer lifting her up, and in her mind fixed on contemplation and rapture. In all these things, or in any one of them, can any man or woman boast to have surpassed her?[80]

Gregory classified Gorgonia's asceticism—above all her recitation of the Psalms—as a means by which she became more "manly" (*andrikōtera*) than even men. As Derek Krueger has shown, recitation of Psalms offered complex ground for the performance of gender roles. As men and women, monastic and lay alike, participated in daily liturgies, "the speaker of the Psalms was both male and female, or either male or female, depending on performance contexts…The voice of abjection crossed gendered boundaries."[81] Such a "voice of abjection," I argue, was integral to Gregory's praise of Gorgonia. His description of Gorgonia's reading, understanding,

---

[79] *Or.* 8.13. ἢ τοῦτο μὲν οὐ μόνον γυναικῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνδρῶν ὤφθη τῶν γενναιοτάτων ἀνδρικώτερα, ψαλμῳδίας δὲ τόνον ἔμφρονα, ἢ θείων λογίων ἔντευξιν, ἢ ἀνάπτυξιν, ἢ μνήμην εὔκαιρον, ἢ κλίσιν γονάτων κατεσκληκότων, ἢ ὥσπερ τῷ ἐδάφει συμπεφυκότων, ἢ δάκρυον ῥύπου καθάρσιον ἐν καρδίᾳ συντετριμμένῃ καὶ πνεύματι ταπεινώσεως, ἢ εὐχὴν ἄνω τιθεῖσαν, καὶ νοῦν ἁπλανῆ καὶ μετάρσιον· ταῦτα πάντα, ἢ τούτων τί ἐστιν ὅστις ἀνδρῶν ἢ γυναικῶν ἐκείνην ὑπερβεβηκέναι καυχήσαιτο;

[80] *Or.* 8.13. ἢ τοῦτο μὲν οὐ μόνον γυναικῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνδρῶν ὤφθη τῶν γενναιοτάτων ἀνδρικώτερα, ψαλμῳδίας δὲ τόνον ἔμφρονα, ἢ θείων λογίων ἔντευξιν, ἢ ἀνάπτυξιν, ἢ μνήμην εὔκαιρον, ἢ κλίσιν γονάτων κατεσκληκότων, ἢ ὥσπερ τῷ ἐδάφει συμπεφυκότων, ἢ δάκρυον ῥύπου καθάρσιον ἐν καρδίᾳ συντετριμμένῃ καὶ πνεύματι ταπεινώσεως, ἢ εὐχὴν ἄνω τιθεῖσαν, καὶ νοῦν ἁπλανῆ καὶ μετάρσιον· ταῦτα πάντα, ἢ τούτων τί ἐστιν ὅστις ἀνδρῶν ἢ γυναικῶν ἐκείνην ὑπερβεβηκέναι καυχήσαιτο;

[81] Krueger, *Liturgical Subjects* (2014), 19.

memorizing, and reciting of holy words, in which she exceeded even the intellectual capabilities of men, was intimately linked with her ascetic subjugation, particularly evident through reference to Gorgonia's humility (*tapeinōsis*). It was through wearing her body out in ascetic praxis that she managed to rival men in the performance of scriptural recitation.[82] Gregory thus implied that women *could* equal—and even surpass—men in their achievement of Christian philosophy, yet emphasized that their excellence in this philosophy came through self-subjugation.

Nonna, according to Gregory, likewise applied her voice to subdue her body. As he did for his sister, Gregory praised his mother's ascetic praxis as a philosophical performance that could have been recognized by both women and men: "who showed such honor for every form of philosophy? Who subdued her flesh more by fasting and vigils, or stood like a pillar for both the nightly and daily psalmodies?"[83] Like Gorgonia, Nonna displayed her virtuous voice in the midst of ascetic practices such as fasting, vigils, and recitations. The position and condition of Nonna's body was essential to Gregory's praise of his mother's recitation of holy words. While he described his sister's knees implanted into the ground like tree roots, he fashioned his mother as a pillar, standing erect and solid in the midst of her scriptural recitations. By standing through daily and nightly psalmodies, Gregory's Nonna offered another image of how an ideal female philosopher's voice functioned in the subjugation of her body. As he had done with Gorgonia, so too with Nonna did Gregory emphasize the voice as a tool of subjugation. According to Gregory, when the women of his family *did* speak—and, he insisted, they did not do so in ways that would interfere with male authorities—their voices functioned as part of their ascetic subjugation.

---

[82] For the centrality of Gorgonia's self-subjugation in Gregory's praise, see Burrus, "Life after Death" (2006), 156.
[83] *Or.* 18.9. Τίς…πᾶν εἶδος φιλοσοφίας ἐτίμησεν; Τίς δὲ μᾶλλον νηστείαις καὶ ἀγρυπνίαις τὰς σάρκας ὑπέσπασεν, ἢ ψαλμῳδίαις ἑαυτὴν ἐστήλωσε παννύχοις τε καὶ ἡμερησίαις;

Macrina, Ascetic Teacher

While Gregory of Nazianzus painted Gorgonia and Nonna as philosophical councilors, benefactors of temples, and dutifully silent worshipers, Gregory of Nyssa was much more explicit about his sister Macrina's role as a teacher. As Arthur Urbano has observed, in both the *Life of Macrina* and the Platonic dialogue *On the Soul and Resurrection* Gregory presented his sister as a female teacher of Christian philosophy.[84] Throughout the *Life,* Gregory referred to his sister as a teacher (*didaskalos*), whether she instructed members of her immediate family—including her mother, her younger brother Peter, and even Gregory himself—or a community of female ascetics at Annisa.[85] Significantly, though, when Macrina taught people outside her family, Gregory only mentioned *women* who called her a *didaskalos*. Gregory of Nyssa thus lauded his sister as a capable teacher of Christian philosophy while circumscribing her actions in this role. Whereas the Nazianzen presented Gorgonia advising people both within and outside of her household—insofar as she, observing pious silence, ever spoke—the Nyssen restricted Macrina's influence over men to her brothers. In Gregory's rhetoric, outside of her immediate family, only women looked to Macrina as a teacher.

The contexts in which Macrina appears in the *Life* as a teacher likewise show significantly different roles between Gregory of Nyssa's ideal male and female Christian philosophers. As I will discuss in Chapter Five, Gregory presented his brother Basil as a teacher who applied his excellence in philosophy to fighting "heretics" and "pagans." He presented his sister Macrina, however, as a Christian teacher who avoided non-Christian literature altogether,

---

[84] Urbano, *The Philosophical Life* (2013), 259-64.
[85] Macrina as *didaskalos* of family members: *VM* 12.13 (Peter); *VM* 19.6 (Gregory). Macrina as *didaskalos* of female ascetics: *VM* 26.9.

and applied her knowledge to endure hardships and instruct others to do so. After the tragic death of her brother Naukratios in a fishing accident at Annisa, Macrina placed "reason in opposition to passion (*tōi pathei ton logismon*)" and "taught (*paidotribēsasa*) her mother Emmelia's soul to be manly (*pros andreian*)."[86] She instructed her youngest brother Peter after he was "orphaned" at a young age by the death of his father, Basil the Elder.[87] Macrina's greatest role in the *Life* as a teacher of endurance, however, occurred during her deathbed illness, to which Gregory devotes nearly half of his text. Throughout Gregory's narration of this illness, she appears as a second Socrates, bravely discussing the philosophy of God and the soul in the midst of immense bodily pain.[88] Just as she had taught her mother to endure the pain of losing Naukratios, so she taught Gregory to endure the pain of Basil's death (he had died a year before Macrina's illness) by discussing philosophy.[89] When Gregory complained to her about his exiles under the Homoian emperor Valens, she gave a long speech rebuking him for not recognizing the gifts of God bestowed upon him, a bishop recognized throughout the Empire.[90] Significantly, in this narrative, Macrina instructs Gregory to endure hardships, even those hardships pressed on him by "heretics" like Valens. In Gregory's rhetoric, the lessons Macrina imparted to him fulfill the role that she had assumed when teaching her mother and Peter—a philosophical teacher who guided

---

[86] *VM* 10.1-6. Ἐν τούτῳ διεφάνη τῆς μεγάλης Μακρίνης ἡ ἀρετή, ὅπως τῷ πάθει τὸν λογισμὸν ἀντιστήσασα ἑαυτήν τε ἄπτωτον διεφύλαξε καὶ τῆς μητρικῆς ἀσθενείας ἔρεισμα γενομένη πάλιν ἐκ τοῦ βυθοῦ τῆς λύπης αὐτὴν ἀνιμήσατο, τῷ καθ' ἑαυτὴν στερρῷ τε καὶ ἀνενδότῳ καὶ τὴν τῆς μητρὸς ψυχὴν πρὸς ἀνδρείαν παιδοτριβήσασα. See also *VM* 10.17-21: ὅμως ὑψηλοτέρα γενομένη τῆς φύσεως συνεπῆρε τοῖς ἰδίοις λογισμοῖς τὴν μητέρα καὶ ὑπεράνω τοῦ πάθους ἔστησε, τῷ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ὑποδείγματι πρὸς ὑπομονήν τε καὶ ἀνδρείαν παιδαγωγήσασα.
[87] *VM* 12.4-6. Οὗτος γὰρ ἦν ὁ τελευταῖος τῶν γονέων βλαστός, ὃς ὁμοῦ τε υἱὸς καὶ ὀρφανὸς ὠνομάσθη· ἅμα γὰρ τῷ παρελθεῖν τοῦτον εἰς φῶς καταλείπει ὁ πατὴρ τὸν βίον.
[88] For specific discussion exploring Gregory's styling of Macrina as Socrates, and the links between Macrina's illness and her wisdom, see especially Muehlberger, "Salvage" (2012), 273-97.
[89] *VM* 17.26-7.
[90] *VM* 21.1-20.

her family members to endure suffering. She spoke authoritatively as a teacher, but her voice commanded subjugation.

The way that Gregory presented Macrina's composure on her deathbed further stressed her endurance of suffering. When he first encountered a sick Macrina lying on a plank covered with a sackcloth, she forced herself up to greet her brother and bow to him—thus showing proper honor to priests, as Gorgonia and Nonna had shown.[91] She then voiced her thanks to God for allowing her to see Gregory one last time.[92] After she spoke, Gregory wrote, "in order that she not bring any despondency into my soul, she tried to stifle her groans and forced herself somehow to hide her gasping for breath," and sought to lighten Gregory's mood by "initiating pleasing conversations" with her brother.[93] In this episode of the *Life*, Macrina not only teaches, but also performs, the "manly" endurance that she had instructed her mother to follow after the death of Naukratios. Her painful efforts to greet her episcopal brother and to suppress her ailments in his presence show Gregory's effort to present her as a model of philosophical endurance and female subjugation.

Gregory's inclusion of Macrina's final prayer in the *Life* sought to show that she demonstrated this endurance through the control of her voice up to the very end of her life. While Gregory of Nazianzus presented Gorgonia's and Nonna's performance of prayer—especially psalmody—as an element of the subjugation of their female bodies, Gregory of Nyssa fused recitation and subjugation to an even greater extent in his account of Macrina's deathbed

---

[91] *VM* 17.1-8.
[92] *VM* 17.9-12.
[93] *VM* 17.12-17. Καὶ ὡς ἂν μηδεμίαν ἐπαγάγοι τῇ ἐμῇ ψυχῇ δυσθυμίαν, τὸν στεναγμὸν κατεπράϋνε καὶ τὴν συνοχὴν τοῦ ἄσθματος κρύπτειν πως ἐβιάζετο, διὰ πάντων τε πρὸς τὸ φαιδρότερον μεθηρμόζετο, τῶν καταθυμίων λόγων αὐτή τε κατάρχουσα καὶ ἡμῖν τὰς ἀφορμὰς δι' ὧν ἠρώτα παρασκευάζουσα.

prayer.[94] After recounting the conversations he had with his sister and emphasizing the delight he took in her words, the Nyssen brought his narrative back to Macrina's bodily pain, reminding the audience that his sister displayed virtue in the face of extreme difficulty. In the *Life*, as Macrina nears her final moments, she is no longer able to speak to those nearby, yet manages to continue speaking to God, "upon whom she held her eyes intently."[95] According to Gregory, moreover, Macrina positioned her entire body to speak her final words to God. Not only were her eyes intent, she also turned her bed eastward and reached out her hands as she "spoke quietly in a low voice, so that we could barely hear what she said."[96] This prayer, Gregory asserted, "reached God and was heard by him."[97] The next chapter of the *Life* offers the words of the prayer, and Gregory's decision to place it in direct speech once again gave Macrina vocal authority on her deathbed.[98] In her prayer, the consistent presence of direct second-person addresses to God evoked the language of the Psalms, in particular Psalm 74:12-23 (LXX: 73:12-23).[99] As she spoke, she "traced the seal (*sphragida*) [of the cross] on her eyes, mouth, and heart," thus inscribing her words upon her body.[100] When her tongue could no longer produce words—even in the low voice with which she enunciated her prayer—she continued praying by parting her

---

[94] For discussions of Macrina's deathbed prayer, see Maraval, *Vie de saint Macrine* (1971), 75-7; Krueger, *Writing and Holiness* (2004) 120-31; Ludlow, *Gregory of Nyssa* (2007), 218-9; Limberis, *Architects of Piety* (2011), 152-3.

[95] *VM* 23.2-7. Τῇ δὲ οὐκ ἐνεδίδου ἡ προθυμία, ἀλλ' ὅσον τῇ ἐξόδῳ προσήγγιζεν, ὡς πλέον θεωροῦσα τοῦ νυμφίου τὸ κάλλος ἐν σφοδροτέρᾳ τῇ ἐπείξει πρὸς τὸν ποθούμενον ἵετο, τοιαῦτα φθεγγομένη οὐκέτι πρὸς ἡμᾶς τοὺς παρόντας, ἀλλὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον εἰς ὃν ἀτενὲς ἀφεώρα τοῖς ὄμμασι.

[96] *VM* 23.7-11. Πρὸς γὰρ ἀνατολὴν ἐτέτραπτο αὐτῇ τὸ χαμεύνιον, καὶ ἀποστᾶσα τοῦ πρὸς ἡμᾶς διαλέ− γεσθαι δι' εὐχῆς ὡμίλει τὸ λοιπὸν τῷ θεῷ χερσί τε ἱκετεύουσα καὶ ὑποφθεγγομένη λεπτῇ τῇ φωνῇ, ὥστε ἡμᾶς ἐπαΐειν μετρίως τῶν λεγομένων.

[97] *VM* 23.11-13. τοιαύτη δὲ ἦν ἡ εὐχή, ὡς μηδὲ ἀμφιβάλλειν, ὅτι καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐγίνετο καὶ παρ' ἐκείνου ἠκούετο.

[98] For a brief overview of the classical, biblical, and liturgical elements of this prayer, see Maraval, *Vie de sainte Macrine* (1970), 75-7.

[99] Krueger, *Writing and Holiness* (2004), 130.

[100] *VM* 25.1-2. Καὶ ταῦτα ἅμα λέγουσα ἐπετίθει τὴν σφραγῖδα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τῷ στόματι καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ.

lips and moving her hands.[101] Then, as evening came, she offered the requisite prayer of thanksgiving with the same bodily movements.[102] At the end of this prayer, "her hand was brought up to her face for the seal," to indicate that she was finished, and "breathing a strong, deep, breath, she ended her life."[103] According to Gregory, Macrina's entire body—eyes, voice, and posture—were focused upon God up to her very last moments. Her final prayer thus presented her subjugating her body and soul to God even within the midst of immense suffering.

By emphasizing both her inability to speak in a clear voice to those around her and her persistence speaking with her entire body positioned toward God, Gregory concluded his presentation of his sister as an ideal female Christian philosopher. Even when Macrina could not converse with people, her voice—which God still heard—persisted as an example of her ability to endure physical difficulty. Her entire bodily arrangement added strength to the authority of her voice, as her hands were stretched out to God while she lay upon a bed facing Paradise. When her voice finally failed her, and those around her could no longer hear her speaking, even faintly, her body indicated that she persisted in speaking to God, as her lips, eyes, and hands continued to signal her prayer. Moreover, her final words—the evening thanksgiving—highlight her speech as a marker of her devotion to the daily liturgy of ascetic life at Annisa. To her very last breath, Macrina endured bodily suffering, yet used her ailing body—including, but by no means limited to, her voice—to devote herself to God. For Gregory, a philosopher could achieve no greater

---

[101] *VM* 25.2-6. Καὶ κατ' ὀλίγον ἥ τε γλῶσσα τῷ πυρετῷ καταφρυγεῖσα οὐκέτι διήρθρου τὸν λόγον καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ὑπενεδίδου, καὶ ἐν μονῇ τῇ τῶν χειλέων διαστολῇ καὶ τῇ τῶν χειρῶν κινήσει τὸ ἐν προσευχῇ εἶναι αὐτὴν ἐγινώσκομεν.

[102] *VM* 25.10-12. τῆς δὲ φωνῆς ἐπιλειπούσης διὰ τῆς καρδίας καὶ διὰ τῆς τῶν χειρῶν κινήσεως ἐπλήρου τὴν πρόθεσιν καὶ τὰ χείλη πρὸς τὴν ἔνδοθεν ὁρμὴν συνεκινεῖτο.

[103] *VM* 25.12-15. ὡς δὲ ἐπλήρωσε τὴν εὐχαριστίαν καὶ ἡ χεὶρ ἐπαχθεῖσα διὰ τῆς σφραγῖδος τῷ προσώπῳ τὸ πέρας τῆς εὐχῆς διεσήμανε, μέγα τι καὶ βύθιον ἀναπνεύσασα τῇ προσευχῇ τὴν ζωὴν συγκατέληξεν.

feat. His attribution of this devoted prayer to Macrina highlights the purpose to which he believed that a woman's philosophy should be directed: the endurance of suffering and the persistent use of the voice to supplicate God.

Gregory of Nyssa, then, qualified Macrina's authority as a speaker in a substantially different manner than Gregory of Nazianzus qualified Gorgonia's and Nonna's authority in this realm, even though both these Cappadocians sought to emphasize their female relatives' vocal subjugation. The Nazianzen paired Gorgonia's role as philosophical counselor with praise of her silence and devotion to priests, and emphasized Nonna's self-control in a similar manner. To be sure, the Nyssen mentioned Macrina's obedience to bishops in her willingness to greet her brother with a bow, yet he was less concerned to paint his sister as a silent woman. Indeed, his Macrina speaks extensively, even on her deathbed, even when she is no longer audible. Macrina's very persistence in speaking, however, reflects the way in which Gregory qualified her role as an authoritative teacher. Just as she had taught her mother and younger brothers to endure suffering, so she exhibited the ability to endure her own suffering on her deathbed. The image of Macrina instructing others to endure suffering by her own words and example highlights how Gregory fused philosophical authority and ascetic subjugation in his presentation of his sister as teacher.

Gregory Co-Opts Macrina's Authority

While Gregory presented Macrina as a teacher who instructed her family and her female followers to endure suffering, the chapters in the *Life* immediately following her death transfer this role to Gregory. In these chapters, Gregory first joins the female ascetics at Annisa in

mourning Macrina's death, then instructs these women to turn their mourning into prayer to God. In this way, he co-opted the philosophical authority he had granted to Macrina for himself, thus making her asceticism into part of his own (male) episcopal authority. During Macrina's illness, her female followers had "stifled the impulse to cry out" because of respect for Macrina, their teacher (*didaskalos*).[104] According to Gregory's account, the female ascetics viewed Macrina as their teacher, and constrained their grief out of respect for her. In this respect, Gregory indicated that Macrina guided not only her family members, but also her female followers, in the endurance of suffering. After her death, however, "their suffering (*pathos*) could no longer be contained in silence," and "all at once, a bitter, uncontrollable wailing erupted."[105] No longer checked by Macrina's endurance, the voices of the female ascetics at Annisa "cried out and wailed in dirges."[106] Just as Gregory had written the direct speech of Macrina's final prayer, here he recorded the words of the women's lamentations, thus reinforcing the performative element of the female voice in the *Life of Macrina*.[107] The women cried to Macrina that "with you even the night was illumined like day for us by your pure life, but now even day will be changed to utter darkness."[108] By including this direct prayer, Gregory drew a contrast between Macrina's character on her deathbed and that of her followers after she died: his sister had directly addressed God in second person during her final prayer, yet now her disciples directly declared

---

[104] *VM* 26.3-9. Τέως μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ διεκαρτέρουν ἐκεῖναι, τῇ ψυχῇ τὴν ὀδύνην ἐγκατακλείουσαι, καὶ τὴν τῆς οἰμωγῆς ὁρμὴν τῷ πρὸς αὐτὴν φόβῳ κατέπνιγον, ὥσπερ δεδοικυῖαι καὶ σιωπῶντος ἤδη τοῦ προσώπου τὴν ἐπιτίμησιν, μή που παρὰ τὸ διατεταγμένον αὐταῖς φωνῆς τινος παρ' αὐτῶν ἐκραγείσης λυπηθείη πρὸς τὸ γινόμενον ἡ διδάσκαλος.

[105] *VM* 26.9-12. Καὶ οἱονεὶ πυρός τινος ἔνδοθεν αὐτῶν τὰς ψυχὰς διασμύχοντος, ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι κατακρατεῖσθαι δι' ἡσυχίας τὸ πάθος ἠδύνατο, ἀθρόως πικρός τις καὶ ἄσχετος ἀναρρήγνυται ἦχος.

[106] *VM* 26.22. ταῦτα ἐβόων καὶ ταῦτα ἐν τοῖς θρήνοις ἀπωλοφύροντο.

[107] For the literary elements of the virgins' prayer, see Maraval, *Vie de sainte Macrine* (1971), 80-2.

[108] *VM* 26.27-29. Ἐπὶ σοῦ ἡμῖν καὶ ἡ νὺξ ἀντὶ ἡμέρας ἦν καθαρᾷ ζωῇ φωτιζομένη· νῦν δὲ καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα πρὸς ζόφον μεταστραφήσεται.

their grief to their teacher in the second person. In the *Life*, then, Macrina performed "manly" endurance to the very end of her life, yet her followers exhibited more "womanly" mourning after her death.

At first, Gregory narrated, he himself joined in the "womanly" mourning. The female ascetics' wailing voices, he wrote, sank him into an even deeper despondency than his sister's death had already created for him: "for two reasons my soul was paralyzed, both because of what I saw visibly (*to phainomenon eblepon*) and because of hearing (*tēn akoēn*) the mournful wailings of the maidens resounding all around (*periēchoumēn*)."[109] The sights and sounds surrounding Macrina's death thus operated—initially, at least—in contrast to the sensory control that elites like Gregory touted as a model of self-moderation. The women's wailing was so great, Gregory continued, that "my reason no longer maintained its proper balance, but, as if submerged by some swollen river in flood, I was swept away by sorrow and, disregarding the tasks at hand, gave myself over completely to lamentation."[110] The wailing, which the *Life* attributed to Macrina's female followers, had a tangible effect on Gregory, who, though trained by Macrina herself to endure hardship, was given over to sorrow when he heard the noises of her mourning disciples. Gregory thus argued that the sorrowful lamentations of Macrina's followers —the kind of lamentation that Macrina herself had discouraged after the death of her brother Naukratios—affected not only those wailing, but also those hearing the wailing.

After narrating his initial despondency, however, Gregory presented himself regaining his senses and taking command over the voices of Macrina's disciples. Gregory (as he narrated) co-

---

[109] *VM* 26.1-3. Ἐμοὶ δὲ διχόθεν ἐγίνετο πάρετος ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ οἷς τὸ φαινόμενον ἔβλεπον καὶ οἷς τὴν ἀκοὴν διὰ τῆς γοερᾶς τῶν παρθένων οἰμωγῆς περιηχούμην.

[110] *VM* 26.12-15. ὥστε μοι μηκέτι μένειν ἐν τῷ καθεστηκότι τὸν λογισμόν, ἀλλὰ καθάπερ χειμάρρου τινὸς ἐπικλύσαντος ὑποβρύχιον παρενεχθῆναι τῷ πάθει καὶ τῶν ἐν χερσὶν ἀμελήσαντα ὅλον τῶν θρήνων εἶναι.

opted Macrina's role as the female ascetics' teacher, instructing these women to endure hardship just as Macrina had taught him to do. Significantly, it was the physical sight of Macrina's body that led Gregory back to his senses:

> But when I somehow gathered my soul back from some abyss, as it were, gazing intently (*atenisas*) at [Macrina's] holy head and, as though rebuked for the disorder of those wailing in mourning, I shouted with a great voice (*megalēi tēi phonēi*) to the maidens: "Look at her (*pros tautēn blepsate*)," I said, "and remember her precepts, by which you were taught by her (*par'autēs epaideuthēte*) order and gracefulness (*tetagmenon kai euschēmon*) in everything. One proper occasion for our tears her divine soul prescribed when she bade us weep only at the time of prayer. This is what we can also do now by changing wails of lamentation into a united psalmody (*tēs tōn thrēnōn oimōgēs eis sumpathē psalmōidian metatetheisēs*)." I said this in a louder voice (*meizoni tēi phōnēi*), so as to drown out the noise of the dirges.[111]

Gregory's account of his leadership over the female ascetics after Macrina's death emphasizes the dominance of his own voice over those of the women at Annisa. Twice Gregory emphasizes the strength of his voice, first declaring that he spoke in a great (*megalē*) voice and then classifying his instructions as even greater (*meizon*) than the lamentations of the women. Gregory thus asserts himself in the *Life* as an authority over these women, taking his sister's place as the teacher who instructed them to endure suffering. The tone in which he delivered this message was as important as its content: Gregory's great voice was the instrument with which he asserted his authority. Additionally, the strength of his voice was linked to his sight, as his intent gaze at Macrina's body originally prompted him to speak out to the maidens, and he commanded the maidens to look upon Macrina to recall her instructions and weep only in times of prayer. By

---

[111] *VM* 27.1-12. Ἐπεὶ δέ πως καθάπερ ἐκ βυθοῦ τινος τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἀνελεξάμην πρὸς τὴν ἁγίαν ἐκείνην κεφαλὴν ἀτενίσας, ὥσπερ ἐπιτιμηθεὶς ἐπὶ τῇ ἀταξίᾳ τῶν ἐπιθορυβούντων διὰ τοῦ θρήνου· «Πρὸς ταύτην βλέψατε, εἶπον μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ πρὸς τὰς παρθένους βοήσας, καὶ τῶν παραγγελμάτων αὐτῆς ἀναμνήσθητε, δι' ὧν τὸ ἐν παντὶ τεταγμένον καὶ εὔσχημον παρ' αὐτῆς ἐπαιδεύθητε. Ἕνα καιρὸν δακρύων ὑμῖν ἡ θεία ψυχὴ αὕτη ἐνομοθέτησεν ἐν τῷ τῆς προσευχῆς καιρῷ τοῦτο πράττειν παρεγγυήσασα· ὃ καὶ νῦν ποιεῖν ἔξεστι, τῆς τῶν θρήνων οἰμωγῆς εἰς συμπαθῆ ψαλμῳδίαν μετατεθείσης.» Ταῦτ' ἔλεγον μείζονι τῇ φωνῇ, ὡς ἂν τὸν ἦχον τῶν θρήνων ὑπερηχήσαιμι.

transforming the women's wailing to psalmody, Gregory presented himself in the same role into which he had placed his sister during earlier in the *Life*. As he had written about Macrina enduring suffering in order to pray to God—even when her physical voice failed—now he commanded Macrina's disciples to follow her example.

After the women dressed Macrina's body with the meager adornments she possessed—fashioning her as a humble philosopher, as discussed above—Gregory again asserted his authority by organizing a funeral procession. In the midst of the "maidens' psalmody, mixed with lamentations," people from the area surrounding Annisa learned of Macrina's death, and "flooded together to see the misfortune (*pathos*)."[112] While this crowd spent the night "singing hymns around her body, just as is done during the celebration of martyrs," at dawn even more men and women came, and "interrupted the psalmody with their loud cries of grief (*epethorubei tais oimōgais tēn psalmōidian*)."[113] Gregory, however, did not allow such disorder to last:

> But although my soul was distressed by the sad event, nonetheless I continued to reflect how it was possible, with the means I had at my disposal, that nothing fitting for such a funeral be omitted, and so I separated the flood of people according to sex, mixing the crowd of women with the choir of maidens, and the group of men with the ranks of the monks, procuring from the two groups one rhythmical, harmonious psalmody (*mian ex hekaterōn euruthmon te kai enarmonion…psalmōidian*), just as in an ordered chorus (*chorostasiai*), blended beautifully because of the common concord of all.[114]

---

[112] *VM* 33.1-5. Ὡς δὲ ἡμεῖς ἐν τούτοις ἦμεν καὶ αἱ ψαλμῳδίαι τῶν παρθένων τοῖς θρήνοις καταμιχθεῖσαι περιήχουν τὸν τόπον, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἐν κύκλῳ πανταχόθεν ἀθρόως τῆς φήμης διαχεθείσης πάντες οἱ περιοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τὸ πάθος συνέρρεον.

[113] *VM* 33.6-10. Τῆς οὖν παννυχίδος περὶ αὐτὴν ἐν ὑμνῳδίαις καθάπερ ἐπὶ μαρτύρων πανηγύρεως τελεσθείσης, ἐπειδὴ ὄρθρος ἐγένετο, τὸ μὲν πλῆθος τῶν ἐκ πάσης τῆς περιοικίδος συρρυέντων ἀνδρῶν ἅμα καὶ γυναικῶν ἐπεθορύβει ταῖς οἰμωγαῖς τὴν ψαλμῳδίαν. For this episode as particularly significant in Gregory's styling of Macrina as a martyr, see Limberis, *Architects of Piety* (2011), 153; Krueger, *Writing and Holiness* (2004), 125-6; Muehlberger, "Salvage" (2012), 277-85.

[114] *VM* 33.10-19. ἐγὼ δὲ καίτοι γε κακῶς τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὸ τῆς συμφορᾶς διακείμενος ὅμως ἐκ τῶν ἐνόντων ἐπενόουν, ὡς ἦν δυνατόν, μηδὲν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ τοιαύτῃ κηδείᾳ πρεπόντων παραλειφθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διαστήσας κατὰ γένος τὸν συρρυέντα λαὸν καὶ τὸ ἐν γυναιξὶ πλῆθος τῷ τῶν παρθένων συγκαταμίξας χορῷ, τὸν δὲ τῶν ἀνδρῶν δῆμον τῷ τῶν μοναζόντων τάγματι, μίαν ἐξ ἑκατέρων εὔρυθμόν τε καὶ ἐναρμόνιον καθάπερ ἐν χοροστασίᾳ τὴν ψαλμῳδίαν γίνεσθαι παρεσκεύασα διὰ τῆς κοινῆς πάντων συνῳδίας εὐκόσμως συγκεκραμένην.

As he had done after the female ascetics' initial sorrow, here too in the *Life* Gregory conquers his own grief and brings order to a crowd of mourners by turning their voices from lamentation to psalmody. Here, however, Gregory's authority is even greater, as he organizes women *and* men, lay as well as ascetic, into gender-segregated groups in order to perform psalmody. While Macrina had instructed her family and her female followers to endure suffering, here Gregory instructed more people in such endurance by organizing both ascetics and laypeople into distinct communities of worshipers.

After the ordered psalmody, Gregory—with the help of the regional bishop Araxios and his clergy—led the crowd in a funeral procession from Annisa to the church of the Holy Martyrs where his parents were buried.[115] Narrating this funeral procession offered Gregory an opportunity to present his own self-control in opposition to the wailing lamentations of Macrina's followers. The clergy, ascetics, and other attendants proceeded in a "liturgical (*mustikē*) procession," carrying Macrina's body accompanied by "harmoniously chanted psalmody (*homophōnōs psalmōidias…melōidoumenēs*)."[116] As it progressed toward the tomb, this procession was thronged by crowds of mourners, so much so that it took the entire day to reach this destination, which was only seven or eight *stadia* away (about a quarter mile).[117] When they reached the tomb, Gregory wrote, "we put the bier down and immediately turned to prayer, but the prayer was an invitation for people to start their lamentations."[118] As Macrina was being buried, one of her disciples shouted out wildly (*ataktōs*) that they would never be able to look at

---

[115] *VM* 33.21-24.

[116] *VM* 34.12-14. καὶ ἦν τις μυστικὴ πομπὴ τὸ γινόμενον, ὁμοφώνως τῆς ψαλμῳδίας ἀπ' ἄκρων ἐπὶ ἐσχάτους καθάπερ ἐν τῇ τῶν τριῶν παίδων ὑμνῳδίᾳ μελῳδουμένης.

[117] *VM* 34.15-20.

[118] *VM* 34.20-23. Ἐπειδὴ οὖν ἐντὸς τῶν θυρῶν τοῦ οἴκου κατέστημεν, ἀποθέμενοι τὴν κλίνην τὰ πρῶτα εἰς προσευχὴν ἐτρεπόμεθα· ἡ δὲ εὐχὴ θρήνων γίνεται ἀφορμὴ τῷ λαῷ.

her "godlike face" again.[119] After this comment, "chaotic confusion (*sunchusis ataktos*) drowned out the previous well-ordered and sacred psalmody (*tēn eutakton ekeinēn kai hieroprepē psalmōidian*)," and the crowd joined the women's wailing with their own weeping.[120] Gregory's narrative opposed the "womanly" disorder of Macrina's followers to the "manly" control that she —and now Gregory himself—taught. After calling for silence, the choir leader (*kērukos*) led the people to prayer by "shouting out (*emboōntos*) the customary calls (*tas sunetheis…phōnas*) to the church," which finally settled the crowd.[121] The disorderly wailing of the crowd, prompted by the women's wailing for the loss of Macrina, was thus controlled by a male leader within the space of the church. As Gregory had shouted above the lamentations of the crowd when he had first arranged the psalmody, now the choir leader—whom Gregory had initially summoned—used his voice to bring order to the chaos of mourners.

This vocal battle between ordered psalmody and chaotic lamentation connects more broadly to Gregory's efforts to assert episcopal control over Macrina's ascetic following. In life, Gregory's Macrina displayed elite self-moderation from an early age by devoting herself to the Scriptures, being protected from others' gazes, and by teaching others to endure suffering. Even on her deathbed, when her physical pain made it impossible to speak audibly, she continued to use her lips and hands to pray. In death, however, it was Gregory who enforced this model of devotion upon Macrina's disciples, as well as onto the community at large. As he had presented

---

[119] *VM* 34.23-28. Τῆς γὰρ ψαλμῳδίας κατασιγασθείσης ἐπειδὴ τὸ ἱερὸν ἐκεῖνο πρόσωπον αἱ παρθένοι προσέβλεψαν καὶ ἡ σορὸς ἤδη τῶν γονέων ἀπεκαλύπτετο, ἐν ᾗ καταθέσθαι δεδογμένον ἦν, μιᾶς τινος ἀτάκτως ἐκβοησάσης, ὅτι οὐκέτι μετὰ τὴν ὥραν ταύτην τὸ θεοειδὲς τοῦτο προσβλέψομεν πρόσωπον.

[120] *VM* 34.28-31. ὡς καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ παρθένοι τὸ ἴσον μετ᾽ αὐτῆς ἐξεβόησαν, σύγχυσις ἄτακτος τὴν εὔτακτον ἐκείνην καὶ ἱεροπρεπῆ ψαλμῳδίαν διέχεε, πάντων πρὸς τὴν τῶν παρθένων οἰμωγὴν ἐπικλασθέντων.

[121] *VM* 34.31-34. Μόλις δέ ποτε καὶ ἡμῶν τὴν σιωπὴν διανευόντων καὶ τοῦ κήρυκος εἰς εὐχὴν ὑφηγουμένου καὶ τὰς συνήθεις ἐμβοῶντος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ φωνάς, κατέστη πρὸς τὸ σχῆμα τῆς εὐχῆς ὁ λαός.

Macrina teaching her family members to endure suffering, so he narrated himself teaching his sister's disciples to endure the suffering of their teacher's death. While the *Life* presents Macrina as an authoritative teacher, the chapters narrating her death and funeral clearly grant authority to male church leaders. Gregory orders Macrina's followers to replace their wailing with lamentation and organizes a funeral procession that leads both ascetics and laypeople in psalmody to drown out their disordered lamentations. To be sure, it is not only women who participated in the "feminine" activity of mourning—both men and women alike lose control of themselves by wailing for the loss of Macrina. Gregory did, however, construct the ordering of lamentation as a masculine activity after Macrina's death. In the *Life*, it is a man (himself) who first commands the women to change mourning into psalmody, and who divides the crowd of mourners into gender-segregated groups of chanters. More men (Araxios' clergy) accompany him in leading the funeral, and another man (the choir leader) shouts over the wailing crowd in order to begin the prayers at Macrina's tomb. Gregory thus co-opted the authority he granted to Macrina by emphasizing the role of ecclesiastical leaders like himself in giving order to a loud and chaotic crowd of mourners.

Conclusion

Gregory of Nazianzus' presentations of Gorgonia and Nonna, along with Gregory of Nyssa's presentation of Macrina, formed a key part of these Cappadocians' strategies of self-presentation. For a well-bred elite Roman man, it was not enough to cultivate the ideals of *paideia* on one's own—one's family must also reveal the same values. Accordingly, both Gregorys presented their female relatives as ascetics who embodied philosophical ideals that they advocated for both men and women, such as sensory/vocal control, rejection of luxury, and

adoption of humble appearance. In their rhetoric, however, these ideals manifested themselves differently on a female body than they did on a male one. The Nazianzen and the Nyssen inherited a long tradition of elite discourse that viewed women's bodies and souls as fundamentally weaker than those of men, while at the same time participating in fourth-century debates over the proper behavior of an orthodox female Christian ascetic. When Gregory of Nazianzus, for instance, praised the sensory and vocal control exhibited by his sister Gorgonia, he placed extra emphasis on the fact that she was neither seen nor heard beyond what was fitting for an elite woman. Gregory of Nyssa, meanwhile, granted Macrina much greater authority as a philosophical teacher than the Nazianzen did for Gorgonia or Nonna. The Nyssen, however, also made sure to remind his audience that Macrina was a proper elite woman. In youth, she protected herself from external corruption by receiving an entirely scriptural education and by acquiescing to the wishes of her parents. As an ascetic leader, she restricted herself to her family and her female followers, and instructed others to subjugate themselves and to endure suffering. After her death, Gregory himself co-opted this role by guiding her followers into an organized community of psalmodists. Both Gregorys thus constructed images of their sisters and mothers in order to argue that the ideal female ascetic was both a Christian philosopher *and* a well-controlled elite.

These presentations were particularly significant given the ecclesiastical and theological issues current in Cappadocia during the 370s and 380s. Indeed, the Gregorys' presentations of their sisters and mothers as modest ascetics who distinguished themselves from men and obeyed male authorities can be read, in part at least, as a reaction to Eustathius' influence on asceticism in this region. Eustathius had been condemned for leading a community of ascetics in which marriage was entirely condemned, women and men both dressed like philosophers, and

ecclesiastical authorities were challenged. In contrast, Gregory's pictures of Gorgonia and Nonna revealed women who displayed ideal self-moderation—shown through sensory control and devotion to the Scriptures—*while* being married and having children. Macrina, though a virgin, displayed similar self-moderation by following her mother's scriptural curriculum. Moreover, while the Gregorys presented these women in humble appearance, their narrative choices distinguished them as women by emphasizing their physical beauty even as they praised them for rejecting it. Finally, these women appear as dutifully obedient to ecclesiastical authorities—after Macrina's death, Gregory even co-opts her authority into his own ecclesiastical power. Thus, Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa each constructed images of their female relatives that showed these women not only as exemplars of elite female self-moderation, but as models of female philosophers who mapped well onto their versions of Christian orthodoxy.

CHAPTER FOUR
Community Bodies: Teaching and Learning Philosophy at Annisa

The previous three chapters have focused on the Cappadocians' and Julian's presentations of individual ascetics—both themselves and their female relatives. By constructing an ideal philosophical *habitus*, imprinted onto the souls and manifest in the bodies of those who possessed it, these men took ancient notions of how education molded young elite boys—and, in different ways, girls—into upper-class authorities, and applied them to the religious and philosophical debates of their day. They argued that features such as sensory/vocal control and an unkempt appearance, when carried correctly (they and their relatives, of course, carried these correctly), demonstrated not simply elite status, but also religious orthodoxy, whether this orthodoxy was Christian or Hellenic. The Cappadocians and Julian presented themselves, as bearers of religious orthodoxy, as authorities fit to guide their followers to the Divine.

This chapter will explore how these men presented the communities they led, through a case study of Basil of Caesarea's and Gregory of Nyssa's presentation of their family retreat at Annisa. While Julian and Gregory of Nazianzus each considered themselves leaders of communities—for Julian, the community of Roman citizens, and for Gregory, the community of pro-Nicene Christians—the richness of the source material on the ascetic community at Annisa merits attention on its own. At Annisa, I argue, Basil constructed a curriculum of ascetic life that supplanted the intellectual training of classical *paideia*, while transferring elite ideals into his notions of communal asceticism. Gregory, meanwhile, wrote to promote Basil's curriculum as the ideal manifestation of Christian asceticism, which he presented as a discipline (*technē*) that

needed to be taught and learned. Basil and Gregory each presented Annisa as a philosophical community that exhibited elite self-moderation within a structured hierarchy of teachers and learners. While they did not expect everyone in this community to be an elite, they did expect the community as a whole to embody the same values of self-moderation and self-control that Roman elites so valued.

Basil had a close relationship with his family retreat at Annisa from adolescence. He had come here in the 350s after abandoning teaching at Caesarea, and in 358 had written *Ep.* 2 to Gregory of Nazianzus presenting the ideal of form philosophy—discussed in Chapters One and Two—that he pursued here. Throughout the course of his priesthood and episcopacy in the 360s and 370s, Basil emerged as a leader of an ascetic community at Annisa. The writings he collected about this community, known today as the *Asketikon*, reveal how he transferred the philosophical *habitus* he presented for himself to a wider community of ascetics. This text is a collection of questions and responses—divided into *Longer Responses* and *Shorter Responses*—about various elements of communal ascetic life.[1] *Ep.* 2 and the *Asketikon* highlight similar values of ascetic praxis—sensory/vocal control, scriptural learning, moderate dress—yet in the *Asketikon*, all of these values are worthy only to the extent that they benefit the wider community. According to Basil, it was by learning the Scriptures within a structured curriculum, knowing when to speak and when to stay silent, and by adhering dress to conventional gender expectations that the community at Annisa was imprinted with philosophical virtue. The *Asketikon's* constant emphasis on community highlights Basil's efforts to distinguish his asceticism from that of rival groups in fourth-century Cappadocia, most notably the ascetics of his former mentor Eustathius.

[1] For the composition of the *Asketikon*, see Silvas, *Asketikon* (2005), 1-13. For the establishment of hierarchy at Annisa (particularly gendered hierarchy), see Elm, *'Virgins of God'* (1994), 60-77.

By emphasizing that his ascetics at Annisa were molded into members of a structured, hierarchical community, Basil argued that a system controlled by elite ideals was necessary for "orthodox" asceticism (his ideal of philosophy), while "heretical" rivals were subversive and disorganized.

In addition to Basil's *Asketikon*, this chapter will also explore Gregory of Nyssa's *On Virginity* as a text that advocated Annisa as an ideal ground in which to learn asceticism. Gregory wrote this treatise, his first surviving written work, during a visit to Annisa in 369-70, shortly before his ordination as bishop in 372.[2] With this treatise, he followed his brother's footsteps, praising ascetic life as a training in ways that adapted the language of classical *paideia*. He presented "virginity"—with this term he described a life devoted to self-moderation (*sōphrosunē*) and self-control (*enkrateia*) centered around Christian scriptures—as a discipline that needed to be learned, in the same way that a student would learn any subject in school. Gregory conceived of Annisa as an ideal school in which to learn this discipline. Writing *On Virginity* in the early 370s, as conflict grew between Basil and Eustathius, Gregory's text reflects Basil's values of ideal communal asceticism, and rails against so-called extremists who, by not receiving proper instruction, failed to achieve the self-moderation and self-control that he and Basil sought to exhibit through their asceticism. The warnings Gregory issued about such "extremist" ascetics reflected the same elite concerns his brother displayed over allegedly subversive ascetic groups such as the Eustathians, and shows how Gregory, as well as Basil, transferred ideals of social class into fourth-century religious conflicts. It is thus useful to explore this work alongside Basil's *Asketikon*, as both texts sought to promote a similar style of

[2] Silvas, *Gregory of Nyssa* (2007), 19.

structured communal asceticism that exhibited philosophical values long cherished by Greek and Roman elites. Both Basil and Gregory thus sought to legitimize a form of structured ascetic education at Annisa by labeling the bodies of competing ascetics (most notably, Eustathians) as non-elite impostors. In so doing, they presented themselves as authorities who could mold not only themselves, but also their followers, into ideal performers of philosophy—a version of philosophy, however, which adhered to traditional boundaries of class and gender.

Ascetic Communities, Social Hierarchy, and Religious Orthodoxy in the Fourth Century

Basil's and Gregory's presentation of communal asceticism at Annisa was part of a broader fourth-century trend of educated Christian elites striving to control the rising ascetic movement. As they gained reputation across the eastern Mediterranean in the first half of the fourth century, ascetics challenged educated leaders' status as community leaders. The relationship between Antony and Athanasius offers the most notable fourth-century example of this conflict. David Brakke has shown that Athanasius wrote the *Life of Antony* to control this ascetic's prestige and present him as a loyal servant of his episcopacy.[3] Beyond Antony, however, multiple ascetic movements threatened upper-class Christian authority throughout the Mediterranean. For instance, wandering monks, often called Messalians, who believed the ascetic's sole duty was to pray continuously, and disdained all other activity (including manual labor) in favor of wandering from town to town begging for sustenance, provided another ascetic threat to higher social levels of Christians.[4] Such a vagrant life did not neatly order asceticism

[3] Brakke, *Athanasius and Asceticism* (1998), 201-265. For the broader tensions and overlaps between monks and bishops, the classic studies are Peter Brown, "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity," *JRS* 61 (1971), 80-101, and Philip Rousseau, *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church in the Age of Jerome and Cassian*, 2nd ed. (Notre Dame, ID: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010). For papyrological evidence of monks and clergy, see Ewa Wipszycka, *Moines et communautés monastiques en Égypte (IVe-VIIIe siècles)* (Warsaw: Warsaw University, 2009), 443-453.

[4] Daniel Caner, *Wandering, Begging Monks: Spiritual Authority and the Promotion of Monasticism in Late Antiquity*, TCH 33 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002).

into any hierarchy, and this lack of social order certainly did not appeal to elites like Basil and Gregory, who used their family's private property as grounds for ascetic retreat, and even had slaves with them for some of the time (though Macrina manumitted several upon her death).[5] Additionally, as both men and women adopted ascetic praxis, upper-class Christians sought to define and reinforce traditional elite gender boundaries among ascetics. While some groups (Eustathians, for instance) advocated cohabitation between the sexes, more traditionally-educated Christians like Basil sought to maintain boundaries between men and women even in ascetic retreat.[6] To Basil and his brother Gregory, who advocated moderation and order as fundamental elements of Christian ascetic life, those who rejected (at least nominally) social hierarchy and gender division were "false" ascetics.[7] As discussed in previous chapters, the asceticism these Cappadocian elites presented sought to reinforce social boundaries more than challenge them.

Among fourth-century elites, criticism of allegedly subversive monks even crossed the religious boundaries of Christianity and Hellenism. It is no coincidence that Julian mockingly called "false" Cynics like Herakleios "monks" in order to delegitimize their claim to the cultural capital of philosophy. Though educated fourth-century Christians commonly praised asceticism as the pinnacle of learned philosophy, Christian ascetics could (and often did) appear to non-Christians as enemies of proper *paideia*. Elite *Hellēnes* like the emperor Julian, Libanius, and Eunapius scorned what they saw as crowds of filthy brigands wandering through the streets and disrupting the social order of the cities, all the while living a life of luxury underneath their

---

[5] Elm, *Virgins of God* (1994), 84-86, 103.
[6] Elm, *Virgins of God* (1994), 77.
[7] As Susanna Elm argues, while anti-hierarchical ascetics like Encratites, Eustathians, Messalians, and others carried on movements based on the development of social order, the necessities of organizing and controlling communities led them to adopt their own hierarchies: *Virgins of God* (1994), 195.

ragged robes.[8] The complaints of these Hellenic intellectuals followed the same pattern of elite critiques of excessive boorishness discussed in the previous two chapters. Indeed, the spectrum of appearance discussed in Chapter Two applied more broadly to communities: according to the critiques of elites like Julian, wandering ascetic communities failed to achieve a middle ground between luxury and squalor not simply because of their style of dress, but also because of their apparent lack of organization, and thus could not possibly present themselves as genuine philosophers.

Both Christian and Hellenic elites in the fourth century East complained about disruptive and disorganized groups of ascetics. For Christians, moreover, concern over these "false" ascetics was intimately linked to intra-Christian theological conflicts. Athanasius' efforts to bring ascetics like Antony under his episcopal jurisdiction went hand-in-hand with his struggles against rival Christians like Arius and Melitius in Alexandria.[9] Though in the *Life of Antony* he enshrined the famous Egyptian ascetic as a champion of pro-Nicene orthodoxy, non-Nicene groups were just as active in the fourth-century desert. Athanasius was well aware that opponents, such as the "heretical" monk Hierakas, could pose significant threats to his authority by adopting and advocating ascetic praxis.[10] Elsewhere in the Mediterranean, other pro-Nicene authors sought to separate their theological opponents from ascetic virtue. As discussed in the previous chapter, in Rome during the 380s Jerome warned his virgin protegées about "fraudulent" virgins who concealed their lust underneath ascetic robes. Writing in 384 to Eustochium, he associated such impostors with Manichaean virgins.[11] In the writings of pro-Nicene champions like Athanasius

---

[8] See, for example, Juan Antonio Jiménez Sánchez, "La crítica intelectual pagana al monacato primitivo," *sacris erudiri* 49 (2010), 5-35.
[9] Brakke, *Athanasius and Asceticism* (1995), 4. For "heretical" factions in early Egyptian asceticism, see also James E. Goehring, *Ascetics, Society, and the Desert: Studies in Early Egyptian Monasticism* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999), esp. 200-218.
[10] Goehring, *Ascetics* (1999), 132-133.
[11] Jerome, *Ep.* 22.13.

and Jerome, "false" asceticism was a natural attribute of "heretics," and contrary to these authors' constructions of ideal Christian philosophy. Basil's and Gregory's rhetoric against so-called extremists like Eustathians and Messalians certainly fit into this pattern.

The Christian notion of the collective body factored into these fourth-century debates over proper asceticism and its relation to orthodoxy and orthopraxy. This notion dates back to Paul, who in his letters to first-century communities referred to the collective of Christian worshippers as the "body of Christ."[12] As Dale Martin has shown, Paul's notion of the collective "body of Christ" informed his writings about the dangers of corruption in his first letter to the Corinthians: Paul was particularly concerned about sin invading the Corinthian community in the same way he believed that disease invaded the human body.[13] In Late Antiquity, this notion of the communal body was particularly salient among monastic communities. As Caroline Schroeder has argued, the monastic rules of the fourth- and fifth-century Coptic monastic Shenoute "produce…ritualized subjects who, through enacting the ritual practices in the rules, form a unified, harmonious, disciplined, and pure social body that mirrors the disciplined and pure ascetic bodies of the monks themselves."[14] In Shenoute's rhetoric, individual monks' actions reflected the status of the community as a whole, and the structure of the communal body depended on the organization of individuals within it.

At Annisa, Basil (and to a lesser extent his brother Gregory) constructed an ascetic community using similar rhetoric about the communal body. In the *Asketikon*, Basil presented a form of philosophy in which praxis imprinted virtue not only into individuals' souls, but onto the entire community as a whole. According to Basil, asceticism was an ideal way of life that

---

[12] Rom 12.5; 1 Cor 12.12-27; Eph 3.6, 5.23.
[13] Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (1995), 139-249. See also discussion in the Introduction.
[14] Schroeder, *Monastic Bodies* (2007), 58. See also discussion in the Introduction.

required interaction within a community, and individualists were doomed to fail because they could not properly cultivate the moderate *habitus* of philosophy that he presented. The *Asketikon* conceived of individual actions as potential threats to the wellbeing of the entire community in the same way that 1 Corinthians presented sin as a disease. Basil, however, presented these individualist threats in ways that particularly highlighted rival ascetics, like Eustathians and Messalians, as the most prominent dangers to his community's safety. In *On Virginity*, meanwhile, Gregory offered a similar ideal of asceticism that advocated learning in community and denounced individualists as wild extremists. Both Basil and Gregory sought to establish Annisa as a place to learn the "right" kind of asceticism by achieving a middle ground between luxury and squalor. Conversely, they branded their rivals as immoderates, whose lack of proper organization and control caused them to fall from the median that these Cappadocians upheld. Where, precisely, this median lay was not as important as defining who was on it: in the words of Dale Martin, "the middle is wherever *we* are."[15] Basil and Gregory presented themselves as the keepers of this middle ground, and asserted their authority as philosophers and religious leaders by promoting their community of ascetics as superior to nearby alternatives.

Basil of Caesarea on Philosophy in Community

As I discussed in Chapter One, Basil conceived of ascetic praxis at Annisa as a means of "imprinting" his soul with the proper *habitus* of a Christian philosopher. In *Ep.* 2, he argued that by withdrawing from the city, he washed his soul's "wax tablet" of its previous "worldly" markings and prepared himself to receive the impressions of divine learning. This process, he claimed, occurred by controlling what words and images entered and exited his soul via his eyes,

[15] Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (1995), 36.

ears, and tongue. Over the next two decades of his life, as both presbyter and bishop of Caesarea, he would develop these ideas and apply them to establishing an organized community of Christian ascetics at Annisa, divided according to gender, age, and experience, and (as he saw it) distinguished from "heretical" communities like Eustathians and Messalians. In this community, Basil presented the philosophical *habitus* that he attributed to himself as a natural feature of the community of ascetics he directed. By promoting Annisa as a place where not only individuals, but also the community as a whole, was imprinted with a philosophical *habitus*, Basil asserted that his version of orthodox Christian asceticism—one that adapted elite ideals of self-moderation and order—was evident not only on his own body, but also on the bodies of his followers.

In Basil's rhetoric, such a community was necessary in order to cultivate proper asceticism. Not only did *Asketikon* advocate the metaphorical imprinting of habits onto the wax tablets of individuals—and through individuals, the community these individuals constituted—it also argued that "proper" ascetic habits were naturally formed within a community. While ideas of community formation were certainly present in *Ep.* 2, the message is much stronger in the *Asketikon*: Christian philosophy was best achieved within a structured community like that of Annisa, where educated elites like himself led others to the Divine. In the *Asketikon*, when replying to a question over whether anchorites should live in solitude, Basil warned that "I have learned by experience (*katamanthanō*) that life among several people with the same intent is far more useful."[16] By appealing to his own experience, Basil asserted himself as an authority on the many advantages communal ascetic life held over solitary hermitage: the mutual support of

[16] *Ask.* LR 7.1. Πρὸς πολλὰ χρησιμωτέραν καταμανθάνω τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῶν πλειόνων διαγωγήν.

members, the abandonment of personal interest and glory, the recognition and remonstration of vices, the ease of obeying God's commandments, and the fulfillment of life as the "body of Christ."[17] According to Basil—whose appeal to his own experience sought to reinforce his authority as an ascetic leader—the ascetic community at Annisa was an ideal location in which to shape individual bodies into the "body of Christ."

In addition to this praise of communal life, the *Asketikon* further asserted that solitary ascetic life was dangerous: "when one has closed off his untrained condition (*agumnaston… hexin*), he neither notices his own defects, nor to ascertain his progress in works."[18] Elsewhere, he expressly forbade community members to avoid manual labor, a common accusation against wandering Messalian ascetics.[19] Basil's concern about solitary and wandering ascetics certainly related to his broader efforts to align elite decorum and Christian orthodoxy in his presentation of the ascetic life at Annisa. He sought to present his community at Annisa as a properly-organized group of Christian worshippers who, contrary to "heretics" like the Eustathians and the Messalians, possessed the "proper" *habitus* of an elite philosopher. Accordingly, he not only asserted that such a *habitus* was best achieved within a community: he also insisted that solitary ascetics cultivated an "untrained condition" (*agumnastos hexis*). This language contrasted directly with the image of asceticism Basil sought to promote at Annisa. *Hexis* (from *echein*, to have), indeed, is the Greek equivalent to the Latin word *habitus*, and could refer to a person's medical condition, physical appearance, and/or "interior" dispositions. By associating solitary

---

[17] *Ask.* LR 7.1-2.

[18] *Ask.* LR 7.3. Κίνδυνος δὲ παρέπεται τῇ μοναστικῇ ζωῇ πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις. Πρῶτος μὲν καὶ μέγιστος ὁ τῆς αὐταρεσκείας…εἶτα ἀγύμναστον ἀεὶ τὴν ἕξιν κατακλείσας, οὔτε τὰ ὑστερήματα ἑαυτοῦ γνωρίζει, οὔτε τὴν ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις προκοπὴν ἐπιγινώσκει, τῷ πᾶσαν ὕλην τῆς ἐργασίας τῶν ἐντολῶν περιῃρηγέναι.

[19] SR 207. See also Caner, *Wandering, Begging Monks* (2002), 83-125.

asceticism with an "untrained condition," he asserted that those—like Eustathius and Messalians—who practiced outside of his idea of structured community did not carry the proper *habitus* of an orthodox Christian philosopher.

In order to assert that members of his ascetic community did in fact display such a *habitus*, Basil adapted the techniques of his own self-presentation—discussed in Chapters One and Two—to apply to a wider community at Annisa. The ideal ascetic, he argued, was not a solitary hermit, nor did he (or she) live as part of a disorganized band of wanderers. In Basil's rhetoric, life within a well-structured community was the best way to imprint the *habitus* of a philosopher onto the metaphorical wax tablet of the soul. In addition to advocating control of the eyes, ears, and tongue in the *Asketikon*—all prominent themes in *Ep.* 2—Basil also emphasized that speech, organized through social hierarchy and daily schedules of prayer, molded individuals into part of a wider community of students and teachers of Christian asceticism. The *Asketikon's* injunctions about clothing can also be read into this effort at community formation. In this text's comments on physical appearance, Basil sought to draw a visible line between the garb worn in his community and the allegedly subversive—and quite similar—clothing adopted by Eustathius' following. As Basil sought to distance himself from his former mentor's theology, he argued that the line between his ascetics and Eustathius' was not simply rhetorical, but the visible manifestation of the processes of imprinting and molding that he promoted at Annisa. In this way, Basil continued in the 370s to assert his authority as an ascetic leader by presenting his ideals of Christian philosophy at Annisa, in order to solidify an image of this retreat as a proper orthodox community that displayed the values of the educated elite to which he belonged.

Imprinting Communal Habits

The structure of Basil's *Asketikon* highlights his efforts to mold members of the Annisa community to a philosophical ideal. At the beginning of the *Longer Responses*, Basil wrote that he intended to "create in souls through chapters (*epi kephalaiōn*) a succinct reminder (*hupomnēsin*) always promoting divine yearning."[20] In ancient philosophy, such chapters (*kephalaia*) constituted a genre of writing that was thought to assist in intellectual and moral formation by providing a series of brief guidelines of a school's teachings.[21] Michel Foucault has categorized such writings as *hupomnēmata* ("reminders") which provided philosophers, particularly Stoics, with exercises that served not "simply as memory support" but "rather, a material and a framework for exercises to be carried out frequently: reading, rereading, meditating, conversing with oneself and with others"[22] In the fourth century, some Christians adopted these reminders as guides for ascetic praxis. Most famously, in Athanasius' *Life of Antony* this desert ascetic advised followers to "mark and write (*sēmeiōmetha kai graphōmen*) the actions and impulses of the soul as though we were to report them to each other," in order that "our writing stand in place of the eyes of our fellow ascetics."[23] Similarly, as Columba Stewart has observed, the late-fourth century ascetic Evagrius of Pontus—who, indeed, had served as Basil's reader in Caesarea in his early years—constructed numerous texts of *kephalaia*

---

[20] *Ask.* LR 2.4. Σκοπὸς γὰρ, ὡς προεῖπον, οὐχὶ πάντα εἰπεῖν· ἀδύνατον γάρ· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ κεφαλαίων σύντομον ὑπόμνησιν ἀνακινοῦσαν ἀεὶ τὸν θεῖον πόθον ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἐμποιῆσαι.

[21] For *kephalaia*, see E. von Ivánka, "*ΚΕΦΑΛΑΙΑ*. Eine Byzantinische Literaturform und ihre antiken Wurzeln," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 47 (1954), 285-91; Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life* (2004), 198-201; Foucault, "Self-Writing," in Rabinow (ed.), *Ethics, Subjectivity, and Truth* (1997), 207-222.

[22] Michel Foucault, "Self Writing," Rabinow (ed.), *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth* (1997), 210.

[23] *VA* 55.9. Ἕκαστος τὰς πράξεις καὶ τὰ κινήματα τῆς ψυχῆς, ὡς μέλλοντες ἀλλήλοις ἀπαγγέλλειν, σημειώμεθα καὶ γράφωμεν, 55.12. Ἔστω οὖν ἡμῖν τὸ γράμμα ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμῶν τῶν συνασκητῶν. For discussion, see also Foucault, "Self-Writing," in Rabinow (ed.), *Ethics, Subjectivity, and Truth* (1997), 208.

that were meant to guide ascetics through all stages of their praxis.[24] While many of the responses in the *Asketikon* are far from brief—particularly those of the *Longer Responses*—Basil did adopt the structure of ancient *kephalaia* in presenting his ideal of communal ascetic life. Basil's vocabulary introducing his *Longer Responses* (*hupomnēsis*, *kephalaia*) suggests that he intended this collection of questions and answers to serve the Annisa community in a similar way as earlier *kephalaia* would have served their own audiences—as a means of absorbing and reproducing the key teachings of the community. The very structure of this text thus functioned to guide individuals of the Annisa community to internalize his version of Christian ascetic life in the same way ancient students of philosophy would have internalized the doctrines of their schools.

The *kephalaia* of the *Asketikon* mirror Basil's *Ep.* 2 in presenting ascetic retreat as a means of imprinting habits into individuals' souls in the same way that wax imprinted a tablet. In the *Asketikon*, Basil advocated withdrawal (*anachōrēsis*) alongside the forgetting of former habits (*lēthēs tōn palaiōn ethōn*),[25] and encouraged his community to "carry the holy thought of God stamped in our souls (*entetupōmenēn tais psuchais*), like a seal that cannot be wiped away (*sphragida anexaleipton*), through constant and pure memory (*dia diēnekous kai katharas mnēmēs*)."[26] Through prayer (*proseuchē*) and meditation (*meletē*), Basil hoped for people at

---

[24] Columba Stewart, "Evagrius Ponticus on Monastic Pedagogy," in John Behr, Andrew Louth and Dimitri E. Conomos (eds.), *Abba: the Tradition of Orthodoxy in the West* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Press, 2003), 241-71.

[25] *Ask.* LR 5.2. Λυθῆναι οὖν δεῖ τῶν δεσμῶν τῆς προσπαθείας τοῦ βίου τόν γε ἀληθινῶς τῷ Θεῷ ἀκολουθήσειν μέλλοντα· τοῦτο δὲ διὰ παντελοῦς ἀναχωρήσεως καὶ λήθης τῶν παλαιῶν ἐθῶν κατορθοῦται.

[26] *Ask.* LR 5.2. Τοῦτο δὲ ποιήσαντας, πάσῃ φυλακῇ τηρεῖν προσήκει τὴν ἑαυτῶν καρδίαν, ὡς μήποτε τὴν περὶ Θεοῦ ἔννοιαν ἐκβαλεῖν, ἢ τὴν μνήμην τῶν θαυμασίων αὐτοῦ φαντασίαις τῶν ματαίων καταῤῥυπαίνειν· ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς διηνεκοῦς καὶ καθαρᾶς μνήμης ἐντετυπωμένην ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἡμῶν, ὥσπερ σφραγῖδα ἀνεξάλειπτον, τὴν ὁσίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔννοιαν περιφέρειν.

Annisa to rub away (*ektripsai*) the stains of sin from their souls.[27] The necessity to "wear away" (*ektripsai*) sin contrasted with Basil's view of divine thought as an indelible seal (*sphragis anexaleiptos*), as both of these phrases related to the notion of the mind as a "wax tablet" that could be imprinted and erased. Indeed, the adjective "indelible" (*anexaleiptos*) also connected to Gregory of Nazianzus' language in *On The Priesthood* regarding "improper" learning that needed to be wiped away.[28] Basil thus contrasted previous "worldly" knowledge, which needed to be rubbed away, with knowledge of God, which could not be erased. His community at Annisa, he argued, imprinted the latter.

Basil presented scriptural education as the ideal means of achieving such an "indelible imprint." For Basil, proper learning at Annisa centered around the Scriptures, and ideally began in childhood. Because their practice (*meletēn*) of letters needed to correspond to the goal (*skopōi*) of Christian life, children at Annisa needed to learn words from the Scriptures, and in place of traditional myths learn maxims (*gnomais*) from the book of Proverbs, receiving rewards for remembering names and events.[29] Teaching letters and grammar by maxims (*gnōmai*) taken from history and mythology was a common practice in the ancient world.[30] As he had done in *Ep.* 2, so here in the *Asketikon* Basil transferred values of the ancient classroom into forming his version of proper asceticism at Annisa, where he applied gnomic learning techniques to the texts of the Scriptures in order to promote youths to remember and imitate the behavior of past

---

[27] *Ask.* LR 6.1. τοὺς ἐξ ἁμαρτίας δὲ σπίλους ἐκτρῖψαι δυνησόμεθα τῇ τε φιλοπόνῳ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ ἐπιμόνῳ μελέτῃ τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ θελημάτων

[28] *Or.* 2.14, 2.43. See discussion in Chapter 1.

[29] *Ask.* LR 15.3. Δεῖ δὲ καὶ τὴν τῶν γραμμάτων μελέτην οἰκείαν εἶναι τῷ σκοπῷ· ὥστε καὶ ὀνόμασιν αὐτοὺς τοῖς ἐκ τῶν Γραφῶν κεχρῆσθαι, καὶ ἀντὶ μύθων τὰς τῶν παραδόξων ἔργων ἱστορίας αὐτοῖς διηγεῖσθαι, καὶ γνώμαις παιδεύειν ταῖς ἐκ τῶν Παροιμιῶν, καὶ ἆθλα μνήμης ὀνομάτων τε καὶ πραγμάτων αὐτοῖς προτιθέναι, ὥστε μετὰ τερπνότητος καὶ ἀνέσεως ἀλύπως αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀπροσκόπως τὸν σκοπὸν διανύεσθαι.

[30] See Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind* (2001), 161-79, and Lillian I. Larsen, "The *Apophthegmata Patrum*: Rustic Ruminations or Rhetorical Recitation" (2008).

scriptural heroes. Moreover, drawing on the same language he used in his *Address to Young Men*, Basil insisted that these scriptural maxims would mold the fresh wax of children's souls:

> Therefore the soul should be introduced to every practice (*askēsin*) of the good immediately and from the outset, while it is still plastic and soft, pliable as wax and easily molded by the shapes impressed on it (*euplaston…eti ousan kai apalēn…hōs kēron eueikton, tais tōn epiballomenōn morphais rhadiōs ektupoumenēn*), so that, when reason advances and the condition (*hexeōs*) of discernment develops, it may take its course from the elements it has acquired from the beginning and the imprint (*tupōn*) of piety delivered to it; reason will suggest what is useful, and habit (*ethous*) will lend facility to right action.[31]

In language directly parallel to Basil's descriptions of his own ascetic praxis, here in the *Asketikon* he argued that the "pliable wax" of a youth's soul, easily "impressed" with shapes, needed practice (*askēsis*) to be molded correctly. Basil emphasized his retreat as a community that would mold young souls in this way, in order to foster in them a condition (*hexis*) that followed the "imprint" of piety, which in turn fostered proper habit (*ethos*). The scriptural lessons that Basil advocated for his Annisa community sought to form youths in a way that mirrored—yet exceeded—the habit-forming practices of classical *paideia*. In this way, Basil translated ancient notions of education as habit-forming in order to create his ascetic community as a location to inculcate children with Christian habits. He presented Annisa as a place where, in place of (yet overlapping with) the *habitus* of a well-educated elite male, young students received the *habitus* of an orthodox ascetic Christian.

Just as he had done in *Ep.* 2, moreover, so in the *Asketikon* did Basil present this process of imprinting the soul through scriptural education in terms of sensory and vocal control.

---

[31] *Ask.* LR 15.4. Εὔπλαστον οὖν ἔτι οὖσαν καὶ ἁπαλὴν τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ ὡς κηρὸν εὔεικτον, ταῖς τῶν ἐπιβαλλομένων μορφαῖς ῥᾳδίως ἐκτυπουμένην, πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀγαθῶν ἄσκησιν εὐθὺς καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐνάγεσθαι χρή· ὥστε τοῦ λόγου προσγενομένου, καὶ τῆς διακριτικῆς ἕξεως προσελθούσης, δρόμον ὑπάρχειν ἐκ τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς στοιχείων, καὶ τῶν παραδοθέντων τῆς εὐσεβείας τύπων, τοῦ μὲν λόγου τὸ χρήσιμον ὑποβάλλοντος, τοῦ δὲ ἔθους εὐμάρειαν πρὸς τὸ κατορθοῦν ἐμποιοῦντος.

Withdrawal from city life, he stated, was necessary for an ascetic in order to prevent negative impressions from molding the soul through the eyes and ears:

> That we may not receive incitements to sin through the eyes or the ears (*mēte dia ophthalmōn mēte dia ōtōn*) and so, little by little, become habituated (*prosethisthōmen*) to it, and that, so to speak, forms and impressions of things seen or heard (*tupoi tines kai charaktēres tōn horōmenōn kai akoumenōn*) may not lodge into the soul to its corruption and ruin, and that we might be free for prayer (*proseuchēi*), we ought first of all to seek a retired dwelling.[32]

Such retirement turned one from previous habits that were "estranged from the commandment of Christ" which, over long durations of time, became second-nature.[33] Elsewhere in the *Asketikon*, Basil described self-control (*enkrateia*) as as "setting measures for the tongue, boundaries for the eyes, and simple hearing for the ears."[34] This language certainly paralleled his earlier construction of the retreat at Annisa in *Ep.* 2. In the *Asketikon*, however, the purpose of these passages was not simply to describe an ideal ascetic praxis on an individual level, but to set the terms for asceticism in a community. The use of first-person plural in the passage above highlights this goal: by describing sensory control in terms of the first-person plural ("that *we* may not receive…"), Basil implied not only that individuals were expected to protect themselves from "harmful" sights and sounds, but that by protecting themselves, the community as a whole would also be guarded. The *kephalaia* of Basil's *Asketikon* thus transferred his ideal of

---

[32] *Ask.* LR 6.1. Οὐκοῦν ἵνα μήτε διὰ ὀφθαλμῶν μήτε διὰ ὤτων ἐρεθισμοὺς εἰς ἁμαρτίαν δεχώμεθα, καὶ κατὰ τὸ λανθάνον προσεθισθῶμεν αὐτῇ, καὶ ὥσπερ τύποι τινὲς καὶ χαρακτῆρες τῶν ὁρωμένων καὶ ἀκουομένων ἐναπομείνωσι τῇ ψυχῇ εἰς ὄλεθρον καὶ ἀπώλειαν, καὶ ἵνα δυνηθῶμεν ἐπιμένειν τῇ προσευχῇ, ἀφιδιάζωμεν πρῶτον κατὰ τὴν οἴκησιν.

[33] *Ask.* LR 6.1. Οὕτω γὰρ ἂν καὶ τοῦ προλαβόντος ἔθους περιγενοίμεθα, ἐν ᾧ ἀλλοτρίως ἐζήσαμεν τῶν ἐντολῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ (οὐ μικρὸς δὲ οὗτος ἀγών, τῆς ἑαυτοῦ συνηθείας περιγενέσθαι· ἔθος γὰρ διὰ μακροῦ χρόνου βεβαιωθὲν φύσεως ἰσχὺν λαμβάνει).

[34] *Ask*., LR 16.3. Καὶ γλώσσῃ δὲ μέτρα, καὶ ὀφθαλμοῖς ὅρους, καὶ ὠσὶν ἀπερίεργον ἀκοὴν ὁ ἀκριβὴς τῆς ἐγκρατείας ὁρίζει λόγος.

philosophy—"imprinted" on the soul through scriptural education and sensory/vocal control—onto his community of ascetics at Annisa.

Basil's Hierarchy of Speech

Basil also took particular care to present vocal control at Annisa within a hierarchical community. While in the *Asketikon*, his comments about controlling the senses/voice parallel rhetoric found in *Ep.* 2, he has much more to say in this later text about controlling speech. As discussed in Chapter One, *Ep.* 2 presented guidelines for the voice that reflected the ideal decorum of an elite gentleman. Some of these ideals persist in the *Asketikon*, yet in this text Basil is much more concerned with creating a hierarchy of speech, in which community leaders controlled who could talk, when they could talk, and what they should say. As Lynda Coon has shown, Roman orators linked the right to speak publicly with social hierarchy and masculine prowess, and Latin Carolingian monks controlled speech in their monasteries as a means of controlling the status of bodies.[35] In the fourth century, Basil presented a similar hierarchy of speech in his ascetic community at Annisa. He placed leaders—like himself—in the authoritative position of an elite male orator, and relegated more novice members to a submissive, feminine position. In this way, he presented a system of vocal control within his community that allowed his ascetic curriculum to reinforce the social order that he had absorbed and reproduced through his immersion in classical *paideia*.

The ascetic curriculum Basil presented in the *Asketikon* sought to control these members within an organized hierarchy, in which individuals' education was another means of reinforcing

[35] Coon, *Dark Age Bodies* (2011), 80-97.

their roles within the communal body. Not everyone, Basil made clear, would learn the Scriptures to the extent that he or she desired.[36] Rather, all education must occur within the boundaries of what the community's superiors ordained. There were two ranks of members, those commanded to lead, and those commanded to obey. Only a leader needed to know and memorize (*eidenai kai ekmanthanein*) all the Scriptures, "so that he may teach everyone (*tous pantas didaskēi*) God's will and show to each his duties."[37] Those who did not lead, moreover, should only learn and practice what their superiors assigned to them, and recall the injunctions of Paul to the Romans, "not to think more highly (*huperphronein*) than one ought to think, but to think with self-moderation (*to sōphronein*)" (Rom 12:3).[38] Here, Basil adapted Paul's contrast between over-thinking (*huperphronein*) and self-moderation (*sōphronein*) to present an ideal of regulated learning within his ascetic community, in which members who sought knowledge beyond their station were "over-thinkers." Elsewhere, in response to a question over whether members should be permitted to memorize Scriptures as they wished, he insisted that "it is harmful in any matter to permit anyone a private choice according to their own will—rather, they should undertake all that is decided by those who preside, even if they are unwilling."[39] For Basil, then, ascetic learning was only permissible insofar as it fit within the structure of a wider

---

[36] Women were expected to learn and recite Psalms: see *Ask.* SR 281.

[37] *Ask.* SR 235. Δύο ταγμάτων καθολικωτέρων ὄντων, καὶ τῶν μὲν τὴν προστασίαν πεπιστευμένων, τῶν δὲ εἰς εὐπείθειαν καὶ ὑπακοὴν τεταγμένων, ἐν διαφόροις χαρίσμασι, λογίζομαι, ὅτι ὁ μὲν τὴν προστασίαν καὶ ἐπιμέλειαν τῶν πλειόνων ἐγκεχειρισμένος τὰ πάντων εἰδέναι καὶ ἐκμανθάνειν ὀφείλει, ἵνα τοὺς πάντας διδάσκῃ τὰ θελήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἑκάστῳ ὑποδεικνὺς τὰ αὐτοῦ ἐπιβάλλοντα. See also SR 236. For more on leadership in the *Asketikon* see Sterk, *Renouncing the World* (2004), 49-53.

[38] *Ask.* SR 235. τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ἕκαστος, μεμνημένος τοῦ Ἀποστόλου εἰπόντος, Μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, ἑκάστῳ, ὡς ὁ Θεὸς ἐμέρισε, τὰ ἑαυτῷ ἐπιβάλλοντα σπουδαίως μανθανέτω καὶ ποιείτω, μηδὲν πλέον περιεργαζόμενος, ἵνα γένηται ἄξιος τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ Κυρίου εἰπόντος· Δεῦρο, ἀγαθὲ δοῦλε· ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἦς πιστὸς, ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω.

[39] *Ask.* SR 96. Εἰ παντὶ τῷ βουλομένῳ ἐπιτρέπειν δεῖ γράμματα μανθάνειν, ἢ ἀναγνώσμασι προσέχειν. Τοῦ Ἀποστόλου λέγοντος, Ἵνα μὴ ἃ ἂν θέλητε, ταῦτα ποιῆτε, ἐν παντὶ πράγματι τὸ κατὰ θέλησιν ἰδίαν αἱρετὸν ἐπιτρέπειν τινὶ βλαβερόν ἐστι· πᾶν δὲ τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν προεστώτων ἐγκεκριμένον καταδέχεσθαι χρὴ, κἂν ἀβούλητον ᾖ.

community. His program of ascetic education at Annisa, like elite education in the ancient world, thus became a means of establishing and solidifying social order.

Similar adherence to social order dictated Basil's injunctions about silence for members of his ascetic community. In the *Asketikon*, an important part of fostering proper communal speech was determining when and for whom it was better *not* to speak. Basil declared that novices in the community must practice silence because "if they control the tongue (*glōssēs kratountes*), they will both give sufficient proof of self-control (*apodeixin tēs enkrateias*) and they will learn quietly, eagerly, and without distraction, from those who make use of the word with knowledge, how they ought to ask questions and how to answer in each case."[40] Further, Basil advocated silence to help novices shape all the particularities of their speech:

> There is a tone of voice (*tonos phōnēs*), a measure of speech (*summetria logou*), a fittingness to the occasion (*kairou epitēdeiotēs*), and a particular vocabulary (*rhēmatōn idiotēs*) which are characteristic and distinctive (*oikeia kai diapherousa*) to the pious, which cannot be taught, unless one has unlearned former habits (*ta ek tēs sunētheias apomathonta*). Now silence both induces forgetfulness of the past (*lēthēn tōn proterōn*) through an interval of respite, and affords the leisure (*scholēn*) for the learning of good habits (*tēn tōn agathōn mathēsin*).[41]

For newcomers at Annisa, Basil advocated silence as part of the "unlearning" of habits that lay at the center of his construction of ascetic praxis. Through silence, he argued, newcomers would reveal their self-control (*enkrateia*), unlearn previous habits, and learn proper speech from others. Silence thus functioned within Basil's community to facilitate the process of metaphorically erasing and re-imprinting the soul with proper habits. Moreover, the features of

---

[40] *Ask*. LR 13. Ὁμοῦ τε γὰρ ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ἐγκρατείας ἱκανὴν παρέξονται, γλώσσης κρατοῦντες, καὶ ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ συντόνως καὶ ἀμετεωρίστως μαθήσονται παρὰ τῶν ἐπιστημόνως κεχρημένων τῷ λόγῳ, πῶς δεῖ καὶ ἐρωτᾶν, καὶ ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ ἀποκρίνεσθαι.

[41] *Ask*. LR 13. Ἔστι γὰρ καὶ τόνος φωνῆς, καὶ συμμετρία λόγου, καὶ καιροῦ ἐπιτηδειότης, καὶ ῥημάτων ἰδιότης, οἰκεία καὶ διαφέρουσα τοῖς εὐσεβέσιν, ἣν οὐχ οἷόν τε διδαχθῆναι, μὴ τὰ ἐκ τῆς συνηθείας ἀπομαθόντα· τῆς σιωπῆς ὁμοῦ τε λήθην τῶν προτέρων διὰ τῆς ἀργίας ἐμποιούσης, καὶ σχολὴν πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν μάθησιν παρεχομένης.

speech he detailed—tone, measure, fittingness, and vocabulary—echoed the ideal speech he had expressed in *Ep.* 2, and mirrored elite values of vocal decorum. In the *Asketikon*, however, these ideals functioned within a wider hierarchy, in which novices could only adopt such speech after a period of silence.

This period of silence varied, depending on the individual. While he attributed self-control to those who controlled their tongues, he especially recommended silence for those *unable* to control them (*tois akratesterois tēn glōssan*). For these members, he stated, silence should be complete (*teleia*), until "they are cured of the passion (*pathos*) of rash speech and they are able to learn at leisure when, what, and how they ought to speak."[42] Basil also discouraged laughter, which he claimed was a "sign of lack of control (*akrasias*), a failure to steady emotions, and a looseness of the soul unchecked by strict reason (*tōi akribei logōi*)."[43] The opposition between the self-control (*enkrateia*) of obedient silence and the lack of control (*akrasia, akratesteroi*) of actions such as laughter reinforced Basil's conception of ascetic speech functioning within a hierarchical community. In Basil's rhetoric, those who did not display vocal *enkrateia* needed to be "cured" of a passion (*pathos*). When he presented vocal *akrasia* as a *pathos* that needed curing, he also implied that, if uncured, it could spread to others in the community. As Paul was concerned about the "disease" of sin infecting the Corinthian community, here Basil warned of the "disease" of rash speech infecting his Annisa community. His injunctions on silence thus sought both to train members to control their tongues properly,

---

[42] *Ask*. SR 208. Ἔστι δὲ ὅτε καὶ τοῖς ἀκρατεστέροις τὴν γλῶσσαν, καὶ μὴ δυναμένοις φυλάξαι τὸ, Πᾶς λόγος σαπρὸς ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ ἐκπορευέσθω, ἀλλ' εἴ τις ἀγαθὸς, πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς πίστεως· ἀναγκαία ἡ τελεία σιωπὴ, ἕως ἂν ἐν ταύτῃ τό τε πάθος τῆς ἐν λόγοις προπετείας θεραπευθῶσι, καὶ δυνηθῶσι μαθεῖν ἐπὶ σχολῆς, πότε, καὶ τί, καὶ πῶς λαλεῖν δεῖ.

[43] *Ask*. LR 17.1. Τὸ γὰρ γέλωτι ἀκρατεῖ καὶ ἀσχέτῳ κατέχεσθαι, ἀκρασίας σημεῖον, καὶ τοῦ μὴ κατεσταλμένα ἔχειν τὰ κινήματα, καὶ τοῦ μὴ ἀκριβεῖ λόγῳ τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ χαῦνον καταπιέζεσθαι.

and to prevent those who could not control their tongues from affecting other members of the community.

While silence may have been necessary for certain members, Basil was also concerned to delineate proper speech for those ascetics who were permitted to speak. The ascetic curriculum he presented in the *Asketikon* involved regulating what scriptural recitations community members would perform throughout the day, listed in a daily schedule of prayer and psalmody that would later become the core of the liturgical hours for both eastern and western monasteries.[44] Even aside from their later significance in monastic liturgy, however, Basil's daily schedule functioned to "imprint" his community with proper *habitus* by controlling what words they spoke. At every moment of the ascetics' day, from waking at first light to going to sleep at night (and waking up again for vigils), the words of the Psalms were to be on their mouths, in their ears, and in their minds. Moreover, as part of their daily prayer, Basil even instructed ascetics to perform their own version of the philosophical *hupomnēmata* every day:

> As the day draws to a close, let us give thanks for what has been given us during the day and for what we have done well, and let us confess (*exagoreusis*) what we have left undone, whether voluntary or involuntary, or an inadvertent fault in word of deed or in the heart itself, making atonement for all things through prayer. For the review of past deeds is a great help against falling into the like again.[45]

The word "confess" (*exagoreusis*) here implies that this was, at least ideally, a vocal process of reviewing and declaring one's deeds. Through this program of reciting the Psalms and vocally reviewing the past day's events, Basil sought to regulate the voices of his community around the

---

[44] *Ask.* LR 37.3-5. Silvas, *Asketikon* (2005), 245 n. 406.

[45] *Ask.* LR 37.4. Συμπληρωθείσης δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας, ἡ εὐχαριστία περὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ δεδομένων ἡμῖν ἢ κατωρθωμένων ἡμῖν, καὶ τῶν παρεθέντων ἡ ἐξαγόρευσις, εἴτε ἑκούσιον, εἴτε ἀκούσιον, εἴτε που καὶ λανθάνον πλημμέλημα γέγονεν, ἢ ἐν ῥήμασιν, ἢ ἐν ἔργοις, ἢ κατ᾽ αὐτὴν τὴν καρδίαν, περὶ πάντων ἐξιλεουμένων ἡμῶν διὰ τῆς προσευχῆς τὸν Θεόν. Μέγα γὰρ ὄφελος ἡ ἐπίσκεψις τῶν παρελθόντων πρὸς τὸ μὴ τοῖς ὁμοίοις αὖθις περιπεσεῖν.

clock. In the *Asketikon*, he presented a program in which ascetics would continuously employ their voices toward their ascetic praxis. Through directing their voices to prayer throughout the day and reviewing and confessing their deeds, ascetics were expected to "imprint" proper communal behavior onto their souls.

Basil's construction of a community of proper speakers at Annisa reflected his efforts to construct a well-ordered group of ascetics in which well-educated members guided the thoughts and actions of everyone else. In Basil's ideal community, not everyone needed to learn all of the Scriptures—only the leaders needed to, and they determined the extent to which others would learn. An eager individual who wished to learn more than he or she was instructed was not virtuous, but a potential threat, parallel to the individual ascetic who cultivated an "untrained condition" outside of an ideal community. Newcomers could also pose threats to the community, and so needed to observe silence in order both to "wash away" their previous habits and to "imprint" the new philosophical *habitus* of ascetic life at Annisa. Since silence was a sign of *enkrateia*, Basil also enjoined this practice upon those who could *not* control their tongues. Such control operated around a daily schedule of prayer and recitation that reinforced individuals' role within the wider community—ascetics at Annisa recited specific Psalms at specific times, and they declared their daily actions at the end of each day. Basil's ideal asceticism presented an image of a well-organized hierarchy of speech in which individuals' vocal control reflected their position within the community. This hierarchy worked to reinforce Basil's claim to philosophical *habitus* by presenting his community as an organized body of teachers and learners.

The Visible Appearance of a Properly Imprinted Ascetic

In the *Asketikon*, Basil presented his ascetic community as one in which individuals' eyes, ears, and voices were properly controlled by the words/images of the Scriptures, and in which this control manifested itself within an organized hierarchy. This hierarchy was meant to distinguish Basil's ideal of asceticism from other versions, particularly that of his rival Eustathius, who had been accused of subverting hierarchies through his supposedly gender-bending asceticism. Anna Silvas has observed that part of Basil's effort to distinguish himself from Eustathius appeared in his regulations on dress in the *Asketikon*.[46] As I will show, not only did Basil seek to make his ascetic community visually distinct from that of Eustathius, but that such distinction could only work in connection with the rest of the community-forming elements in the *Asketikon*. While he recommended clothing that responded to Eustathians' alleged gender subversion, the garb that he had recommended would not have been particularly distinctive from that of a Eustathian ascetic. In Basil's rhetoric, it was not only *what* his ascetics wore, but *how* they wore it, that marked them as "legitimate" Christians, as opposed to "heretics" like Eustathius.

Five passages in the *Asketikon*—two in the *Longer Responses* and three in the *Shorter*—ask directly about clothing, both about clothing in general and about specific articles of clothing.[47] These passages highlight Basil's efforts to play upon the perceived connection between clothing and character in antiquity in order to show that his ascetics' clothing was a natural reflection of their virtue. In one of the *Longer Responses*, Basil emphasized the connection between outer clothing and inner character—at Annisa, he insisted, garment must

[46] Silvas, *Asketikon* (2005), 22-3.
[47] *Ask.* LR 22-23, SR 50, 168, 210.

reveal humility (*tapeinophrosunēn*), simplicity (*litotēta*), thrift (*euteles*), and frugality.[48] The emphasis on these features—not only humility (*tapeinophrosunē*), but also simplicity (*litotēs*) and thrift (*euteles*), highlighted his efforts to distinguish his ascetics' garb from that of Eustathius, as the Council of Gangra had used the terms *litotēs* and *euteleia* to describe "orthodox" ascetic garment.[49] Additionally, it is worth recalling that in his letter against Eustathius in 375 (*Ep*. 223), Basil claimed that as a youth, he falsely assumed Eustathius' humble clothing revealed his humility.[50] According to Basil, however, his community, structured around the ideals of elite *paideia*, could "properly" exhibit the qualities of humility, simplicity, and thrift.

In the *Asketikon*, however, Basil placed even more value on proper clothing than he had done in *Ep*. 223. While the latter text sought to delegitimize the Eustathians' clothing, the former presented the clothing of Basil's ascetics as a natural manifestation of their orthodoxy. As he argued, ascetic clothing was supposed to serve as an external marker of a person's legitimacy as a Christian:

> Accordingly, it is fitting that we share among ourselves a common appearance (*schēmati*), and that even from clothing (*endumatos*) a certain distinctive character (*charactēra tina idiazonta*), as it were, identifies the Christian. For all who tend to the same goal are for the most part consistent with each other. Distinctive clothing is also useful in giving advance notice of each, bearing witness of his declaration of the life

---

[48] *Ask.* LR 22.1-2. Προλαβὼν ὁ λόγος τήν τε ταπεινοφροσύνην ἀναγκαίαν ἔδειξε, καὶ τὴν λιτότητα, καὶ τὸ ἐν πᾶσιν εὐτελὲς, καὶ ὀλιγοδάπανον, ὡς ὀλίγας ἐκ τῶν σωματικῶν χρειῶν τὰς ἀφορμὰς τῶν περισπασμῶν ἐγγίνεσθαι ἡμῖν. Ἐκείνοις οὖν τοῖς σκοποῖς ἕπεσθαι χρὴ καὶ τὸν περὶ ἐνδύματος λόγον.

[49] Gangra, Conclusion. καὶ λιτότητα καὶ εὐτέλειαν ἀμφιασμάτων…ἀπερίεργον ἐπαινοῦμεν. See also discussion in Chapter Two.

[50] *Ep.* 223.3. ἡγούμην αὐτάρκη μηνύματα εἶναι τῆς ταπεινοφροσύνης τὸ ταπεινὸν τοῦ ἐνδύματος. See also discussion in Chapter Two.

> according to God, so that those who meet us expect that we will be consistent in our action (*praxin*).[51]

Here, Basil presented appearance (*schēmati*) as a distinctive mark (*charactēra tina idiazonta*) of the ascetic Christian at Annisa, in similar—yet stronger—language as he had done in *Ep*. 2. Such a mark would be visible—a witness—to others that would identify a person as a "proper" Christian and, in theory, correspond to a certain type of behavior (*praxin*). According to Basil, moreover, this clothing was supposed to reveal not only humility, but also (for male ascetics) masculinity. Drawing on the examples of John, Elijah, Peter, Paul, and Job, Basil referred to the belt as a "marker of the man (*to ti idiōma tou andros*)" and a "symbol of a certain manliness (*andreias tinos…sumbolon*)."[52] While in *Ep*. 2, Basil denounced wearing the belt too high as a "womanly" fashion, here he emphasized the the belt (properly worn) as a marker of masculinity. As with his comments about how clothing identified a Christians at Annisa, Basil emphasized the connection between his ascetics' appearance and their legitimate character.

Basil's comments about "masculine" belts was not the only passage of the *Asketikon* in which he linked clothing and gender. One of the questions in the *Shorter Responses* asks Basil to interpret the term "moderate clothing" (*katastolē kosmios*), found in pseudo-Paul's injunction for women to "dress themselves in moderate clothing, with restraint and temperance, not with

---

[51] *Ask.* LR 22.19-20. Ἐκ δὲ τούτου συμβαίνει ἡμᾶς καὶ τῷ σχήματι κοινωνεῖν ἀλλήλοις, καὶ οἱονεὶ χαρακτῆρά τινα ἰδιάζοντα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐνδύματος τῷ Χριστιανῷ ἐπικεῖσθαι. Τὰ γὰρ πρὸς ἕνα σκοπὸν συντείνοντα ὡς τὰ πολλὰ ταυτά ἐστιν ἀλλήλοις. Χρήσιμον δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἐσθῆτος ἰδίωμα προκηρυττούσης ἕκαστον, καὶ προδιαμαρτυρομένης τὸ ἐπάγγελμα τῆς κατὰ Θεὸν ζωῆς· ὥστε ἀκόλουθον καὶ τὴν πρᾶξιν παρὰ τῶν συντυγχανόντων ἡμῖν ἀπαιτεῖσθαι.

[52] *Ask.* LR 23.32-6. Γέγραπται γὰρ, ὥσπερ ἰδίωμά τι τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, τὸ, Ἀνὴρ δασὺς, καὶ ζώνη δερματίνη περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ. Καὶ Πέτρος δὲ ζώνῃ κεχρημένος δείκνυται, ὡς δῆλον ἐκ τῶν τοῦ ἀγγέλου ῥημάτων πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγοντος· Ζῶσαι, καὶ ὑπόδησαι τὰ σανδάλιά σου. Καὶ ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Ἀγάβου προφητείας τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν φαίνεται κεχρημένος ζώνῃ. Τὸν γὰρ ἄνδρα οὗ ἐστιν ἡ ζώνη αὕτη οὕτως δήσουσι, φησὶν, ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις. Καὶ ὁ Ἰὼβ δὲ παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ζώσασθαι προστάσσεται. Ὡς γὰρ ἀνδρείας τινὸς, καὶ τῆς πρὸς τὰ ἔργα ἑτοιμασίας σύμβολον, Ζῶσαι, φησὶν, ὥσπερ ἀνὴρ τὴν ὀσφύν σου.

plaited hair, gold, pearls, or expensive garments."[53] In response, Basil emphasized that not only for women, but for all Christians, "moderate clothing" depended on the occasion and the individual:

> The usefulness [of clothing] is dignified for its particular goal, taking into account time, place, and person. For reason does not approve of the same coverings in time of winter and of summer, nor the same appearance (*schēma*) for the worker and the one resting, nor for the servant and the one being cared for, nor for the soldier and the civilian, nor for man and woman.[54]

Basil's emphasis on proper clothing for proper people reveals his effort to maintain, *not* destroy, traditional elite hierarchies among ascetic Christians at Annisa. This effort carries particular significance in relation to Basil's relationship with Eustathius, who decades before the compilation of the *Asketikon* was called into question for advocating fashion that allegedly subverted traditional boundaries of class and gender. In this passage from the *Asketikon*, Basil presented 1 Timothy 2:9 as proof that different styles of clothing were necessary for different people. In particular, his distinctions between those who serve and those who *are* served, and between men and women, served as refutations of allegedly Eustathian subversions of class and gender boundaries. Along with his efforts to distinguish himself theologically from Eustathius and his partisans, Basil thus sought to highlight sartorial boundary lines between different ascetics. These boundary lines drew a sharp distinction between the appearance of the "genuine" ascetics of Basil's community, who (Basil claimed) adhered to social norms and legitimately displayed humble appearance, and "impostors" like Eustathius, who subverted social norms and wore humble clothing without genuine humility.

---

[53] 1 Tim 2:9. ὡσαύτως καὶ γυναῖκας ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς, μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ.

[54] *Ask.* SR 210. Ἡ πρὸς τὸν σκοπὸν τὸν ἴδιον σεμνοπρεπὴς χρῆσις, ἐστοχασμένη καιροῦ, τόπου, προσώπου, χρείας. Οὐ γὰρ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐγκρίνει ὁ λόγος σκεπάσματα ἐν καιρῷ χειμῶνος καὶ θέρους, οὔτε τὸ αὐτὸ σχῆμα τοῦ ἐργάτου καὶ τοῦ ἀναπαυομένου, τοῦ ὑπηρετοῦντος καὶ τοῦ θεραπευομένου, τοῦ στρατιώτου καὶ τοῦ ἰδιώτου, ἢ ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικός.

Basil's construction of proper appearance at Annisa, moreover, aligned with his efforts to form individuals into a community of ascetics. One question of the *Shorter Responses* asks whether someone who actively chooses thrift (*euteles*) in selecting a cloak (*himation*) or footwear is "diseased with some passion (*poion pathos nosei*)."[55] Basil's response shows that even if thrift (*euteles*) was desirable in his community, individual choice was still a danger: "whoever desires what suits himself in order to be pleasing to people (cf. Gal 1.10, Eph 6.6), is manifestly diseased with trying to please people (*anthrōpareskeian*), and is distracted from God, and even in thrifty clothing he fulfills the passion of ostentation (*pathos tēs perpereias*)."[56] Just as Basil had discouraged over-eager learners of the Scriptures, here he discouraged over-eager dressers. The language of passion and disease (*pathos, nosei*), moreover, highlighted his concern for community, just as when he warned that those who could not control their tongues needed to be silent until they were "cured" of the *pathos* of rash speech. In his warning about the "passion" of over-eager dressing, Basil was concerned not only with a practice that was commonly associated with Eustathius—actively adopting cheap cloaks and sandals—but also with guidelines for structured community. In this way, he distanced himself from allegedly Eustathian clothing, even as he clearly advocated such clothing elsewhere in the *Asketikon*. It was not the clothing itself, he claimed, but the motivation *behind* the clothing, that caused the *pathos* of ostentation. While "real" ascetics wore clothing that "naturally" revealed their humility, those who actively wanted to wear such clothing appeared like the impostor Cynics against whom Julian railed, mistakenly thinking that appearance was the cause, not the effect, of philosophical virtue.

---

[55] *Ask.* SR 50. Ἐάν τις τὰ μὲν πολυτελέστερα τῆς ἐσθῆτος ἀπωθῆται, αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ εὐτελὲς, εἴτε ἱμάτιον εἴτε ὑπόδημα οἱονεὶ θέλῃ ἵνα πρέπῃ αὐτῷ, εἰ ἁμαρτάνει, ἢ ποῖον πάθος νοσεῖ.

[56] *Ask.* SR 50. Ὁ θέλων ἵνα πρέπῃ αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸ ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσαι, φανερός ἐστιν ἀνθρωπαρέσκειαν νοσῶν, καὶ μετεωριζόμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ πάθος τῆς περπερείας καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς εὐτελέσι πληροφορῶν.

Basil's comments on clothing in the *Asketikon* thus reflected the ideal structure of his community as a whole. He presented an image of individual members at Annisa who appeared as orthodox ascetics and philosophers not only by means of their habits and learning, but also their visible clothing. While their clothing would not have been particularly distinct from that adopted by "heretical" groups like Eustathius', Basil's rhetoric drew a line between his community, who wore ascetic clothing the "right" way, and others, who wore it for attention. Such a rhetorical distinction functioned within Basil's broader efforts to present himself and his community with the *habitus* of an elite Christian philosopher, in opposition to allegedly subversive non-elite "heretics" such as Eustathius. With ragged cloaks and worn-down shoes, ascetics at Annisa were likely not particularly distinguishable from other groups of ascetics in late antique Cappadocia. Basil, however, wrote meaning onto the garment worn by members of his community in order to connect the significance of clothing at Annisa to the broader significance of life in his ascetic retreat. If members of his community were to be "imprinted" with philosophical *habitus* by controlling their senses, learning as commanded, and limiting their speech, their clothing was a sign of this imprinting. For Basil, however, this clothing could only display such significance on an ascetic *within* a wider community—those who *chose* to dress humbly were guilty of the "passion" of ostentation. The system of teaching and learning asceticism that Basil advocated in the *Asketikon* sought to subjugate *all* individual actions—even choice of garment—to the discretion of community leaders. In this way, Basil's self-presentation as a proper Christian philosopher relied on his authority as the moderator of not only his own body/soul, but also the body/soul of his entire community.

Gregory of Nyssa's *On Virginity* in Relation to Basil's Ascetic Community

Like his older brother Basil, Gregory of Nyssa presented philosophical self-moderation within a structured community as the ideal form of ascetic praxis. In 370, he composed his first written treatise, *On Virginity*, in which he promoted his brother's retreat at Annisa as just such a community. In the words of Peter Brown, Gregory "committed himself to a formal panegyric in praise of virginity," in order to show Cappadocian elites that "sexual renunciation did not necessarily lead to Spirit-filled extremes—such as a life of holy vagrancy and an indifference to sexual dangers," the type of accusations commonly levied against Eustathians and Messalians.[57] Mark Hart, however, has questioned whether this treatise meant to call people to Basil's ascetic community. He argues that since certain parts of this treatise discouraged celibacy as an "easier" path to virtue than married life, Gregory's praise of celibacy was ironic, and that "it is difficult to agree wholeheartedly…that Gregory wrote *De Virginitate* [the Latin title of this treatise] to encourage people to join the celibate communities being organized by his brother Basil."[58] Yet as Valerie Karras has persuasively shown, Gregory critiqued "traditional" late antique views of both celibacy *and* marriage. He viewed both of these life choices as pathways to virtue *or* vice, depending on how one lived: a properly-guided celibate life was more virtuous than a properly-guided married life, but a properly-guided married life was more virtuous than an *improperly*-guided celibate life.[59] Even if he did not see it as the *only* path to virtue, Karras shows, Gregory did indeed see celibate life as the ideal path, "using his brother Basil's service-oriented

---

[57] Brown, *Body and Society*, 2nd ed. (2008), 291-2.
[58] Mark D. Hart, "Gregory of Nyssa's Ironic Praise of the Celibate Life," *Heythrop Journal* 33 (1992), 1-19, 2. The discouragement of celibate life (for certain people) appears most prominently in Greg. *DV* 7-8.
[59] Valerie A. Karras, "A Re-Evaluation of Marriage, Celibacy, and Irony in Gregory of Nyssa's *On Virginity*," *JECS* 13:1 (2005), 111-121.

monasticism as a model."[60] Karras offers an important rebuttal to Hart's argument, as well as some useful nuance to Gregory's presentation of marriage and celibacy in *On Virginity*. Her argument, moreover, emphasizes that even if Gregory did not encourage everyone to join Basil's ascetic community, he still conceived of this community as an ideal.

Gregory's advocacy of Basil's ascetic community paralleled not only his brother's effort to distinguish his ascetics from Eustathians and Messalians, but also his brother's use of the language of community formation around the ideals of *paideia*. The habits he advocated reflected and reinforced elite values of structure, moderation, and control. In *On Virginity*, Gregory presented "proper" asceticism as the cultivation of self-moderation (*sōphrosunē*), and insisted that it could only be achieved under the tutelage of an experienced ascetic teacher, and preferably with reference to written guidelines. For Gregory's readers in fourth-century Cappadocia, these exhortations would have immediately conjured images of Basil's Annisa community. Thus, *On Virginity* argued that this community was an ideal ground for teaching and learning asceticism. Further, while he presented his brother's community as an ideal, he also attacked rival forms of asceticism present in Cappadocia during his lifetime. By declaring that ascetics like the Eustathians and Messalians were branded, tattooed, and scarred with the markings of their impiety, he inverted the positive language of imprinting in order to label these rivals as others. While elites commonly viewed education as a means of imprinting habits onto the metaphorical wax tablet of the soul, Gregory marked the souls of his enemies with more negative bodily imagery. By rhetorically branding, tattooing, and flogging other ascetics, he

[60] Karras, "A Re-Evaluation of Marriage" (2005), 121.

further asserted the legitimacy of his brother's structured communal asceticism.

Teaching and Learning

For Gregory, as for Basil, asceticism was a process of teaching individuals to exhibit the self-moderation so cherished by educated elites in the ancient world. In *On Virginity*, Gregory presented ascetic praxis, properly performed, as a means of maintaining equilibrium (*isokrateia*) in the body.[61] Like his older brother, he explicitly advocated for a well-balanced ascetic regimen that was neither to soft nor too harsh: neither "burying the mind through plumpness of flesh," nor making it "attenuated and lowly, worried about the labors of the body."[62] For Gregory, the ultimate goal of self control (*ho teleōtatos tēs enkrateias skopos*) was not the misery of the body (*tēn tou sōmatos…kakopatheian*), but the facility for the service of the soul (*tēn tōn psuchikōn diakonēmatōn eukolian*).[63] Gregory of Nyssa thus mirrored both Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus in presenting an ideal asceticism that reflected elite ideals of a middle ground between excessive care and lack of care for the body.

The Nyssen, moreover, emphasized the importance of community in achieving such moderation. He argued that ascetics needed to be taught by an experienced guide in order to avoid falling into the extremes of luxury or squalor. *On Virginity* thus placed the reader in the role of a student seeking knowledge from a wise teacher, and Gregory presented both himself (as

---

[61] See Raphael Cadenhead, "Corporeality and *Askesis*: Ethics and Bodily Practice in Gregory of Nyssa's Theological Anthropology," *Studies in Christian Ethics* 26:3 (2013): 281-99 at 286. For Gregory's view of the body more broadly, see Kevin Corrigan, *Evagrius and Gregory: Mind, Soul, and Body in the 4th Century* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009), esp. 46-49 and 133-155.

[62] Greg. *DV* 22.1. μήτε διὰ πολυσαρκίας καταχωννύντας τὸν νοῦν μηδ' αὖ πάλιν ταῖς ἐπεισάκτοις ἀσθενείαις ἐξίτηλον αὐτὸν καὶ ταπεινὸν ποιεῖν καὶ περὶ τοὺς σωματικοὺς πόνους ἠσχολημένον.

[63] Greg. *DV* 22.2. Οὗτος ὁ τελεώτατος τῆς ἐγκρατείας σκοπός, οὐχὶ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ σώματος βλέπειν κακοπάθειαν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν τῶν ψυχικῶν διακονημάτων εὐκολίαν.

author of the treatise) and his brother in the role of this teacher. In the prologue he suggested Basil, "the most pious bishop and our father," as a teacher to educate (*paideuein*) ascetic students through "living voice (*he zōsa phōnē*) and stirring examples of good deeds."[64] At the end of the treatise, Gregory repeated this exhortation. He informed his readers that written teachings (*engraphoi didaskaliai*) existed to inform those interested in celibate life. These "written teachings" likely referred to the writings of his older brother, who by 370 had compiled at least a preliminary version of the *Asketikon*.[65] While the recommendation of ascetic teachers could, on the surface, refer either to individual teachers (like Jerome) or to a more structured community (like Basil's), the emphasis on written teachings, as well as Gregory's personal circumstances, makes it more likely that Gregory had the latter community in mind. When he wrote that ideal ascetic praxis occurred under the tutelage of an experienced teacher, and with reference to written teachings, his contemporary readers would have easily thought of his older brother's work at Annisa.

In this way, Gregory declared to his readers that in order receive proper instruction in Christian philosophy, one did not need to travel to Egypt or Syria—an ideal model of this way of life was present in Asia Minor. While he recommended written guidelines as an aid for ascetics, he argued that a more effective (*energestera*) guidebook came from teaching through actions

---

[64] Greg. *DV* Praef.2. Καὶ ἐπειδὴ μὴ τοσοῦτον τὰ ἐν τοῖς διηγήμασιν ὑποδείγματα δύναται πρὸς κατόρθωσιν ἀρετῆς ὅσον ἡ ζῶσα φωνὴ καὶ τὰ ἐνεργούμενα τῶν ἀγαθῶν ὑποδείγματα, ἀναγκαίως πρὸς τῷ τέλει τοῦ λόγου τοῦ θεοσεβεστάτου ἐπισκόπου καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν ἐπεμνήσθημεν, ὡς μόνου δυνατῶς ἔχοντος τὰ τοιαῦτα παιδεύειν. Most scholars of *On Virginity* accept this as Basil. See Michel Aubineau, *Grégoire de Nysse: traité de la virginité*, SC 119 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966), 31; Brown, *Body and Society*, 2nd ed. (1988); 291, Karras, "A Re-evaluation of Marriage" (2005), 120; Silvas, *Gregory of Nyssa* (2007), 22.

[65] Greg. *DV* 23.1. Τὰ δὲ καθ' ἕκαστον, ὅπως τε χρὴ βιοτεύειν τὸν ἐν τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ ταύτῃ ζῆν προελόμενον καὶ τίνα φυλάττεσθαι καὶ τίσιν ἐπιτηδεύμασιν ἀσκεῖν ἑαυτόν, ἐγκρατείας μέτρα καὶ διαγωγῆς τρόπον καὶ πάντα τὸν ἐπιβάλλοντα τῷ τοιούτῳ σκοπῷ βίον, ὅτῳ φίλον δι' ἀκριβείας μαθεῖν, εἰσὶ μὲν καὶ ἔγγραφοι διδασκαλίαι ταῦτα διδάσκουσα.

(*didachēs…dia tōn ergōn*) than from teaching through words (*dia tōn logōn*), and to receive such teaching required a living instructor (*paideountos*).[66] According to Gregory, a living, breathing instructor offered training at a level that written words could not afford:

> Right here (*entautha*) is the workshop of the virtues (*to tōn aretōn ergastērion*), where this progressing life has been purified (*ekkekathartai*) to the pinnacle of perfection. And there is lots of opportunity that this heavenly life be taught through actions (*dia tōn ergōn didaskesthai*), either from those silent or those who speak, since every thought (*logos*) considered apart from deeds (*dicha tōn ergōn*), even if it happens to be especially adorned (*kekallōpismenos*), is like a soulless image (*eikoni…apsuchōi*) displaying certain flowery characteristics with dyes and colors. But "the one who does and teaches (*poiōn kai didaskōn*)," as the Gospel says (Matt. 5:19), this is the one who is truly (*alēthōs*) able to live, and is in the prime of beauty, efficient (*energos*) and stirring.[67]

Gregory's insistence on the immediacy of ascetic training (*entautha*) refuted vagrant monks such as the Messalians who wandered from place to place: true ascetics, as Gregory conceived of them, could perform their praxis while staying put. The term *entautha* exhorted his readers that they did not need to travel to the deserts of Egypt or Syria in order to find an ascetic master, as young Basil had done in pursuit of Eustathius. Implicitly, the wandering asceticism practiced by groups such as the Messalians was unnecessary—in Gregory's rhetoric, philosophical virtue was best achieved in a stable location. Because of his family's work at Annisa, worthy teachers were right at home for Cappadocian Christians wishing to embrace a life of philosophical self-moderation. This interpretation reinforces the notion that Gregory, who wrote this work while at

---

[66] Greg. *DV* 23.1. ἐνεργεστέρα δὲ τῆς ἐκ τῶν λόγων διδαχῆς ἡ διὰ τῶν ἔργων ἐστὶν ὑφήγησις, καὶ οὐδεμία πρόσεστι δυσκολία τῷ πράγματι, ὡς δεῖν ἢ μακρὰν ὁδοιπορίαν ἢ ναυτιλίαν πολλὴν ὑποστάντας ἐπιτυχεῖν τοῦ παιδεύοντος.

[67] Greg. *DV* 23.1. Ἐνταῦθα τὸ τῶν ἀρετῶν ἐργαστήριον, ἐν ᾧ πρὸς τὸ ἀκρότατον τῆς ἀκριβείας ὁ τοιοῦτος βίος προϊὼν ἐκκεκάθαρται. Καὶ πολλή ἐστιν ἐξουσία καὶ σιωπώντων ἐνταῦθα καὶ φθεγγομένων τὴν οὐράνιον ταύτην πολιτείαν διὰ τῶν ἔργων διδάσκεσθαι, ἐπεὶ καὶ πᾶς λόγος δίχα τῶν ἔργων θεωρούμενος, κἂν ὅτι μάλιστα κεκαλλωπισμένος τύχῃ, εἰκόνι ἔοικεν ἀψύχῳ ἐν βαφαῖς καὶ χρώμασιν εὐανθῆ τινα χαρακτῆρα προδεικνυούσῃ· ὁ δὲ ποιῶν καὶ διδάσκων, καθώς φησί που τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, οὗτος ἀληθῶς ζῶν ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος καὶ ὡραῖος τῷ κάλλει καὶ ἐνεργὸς καὶ κινούμενος.

Annisa, was encouraging this retreat in the same way that Basil did, as the ideal arena for shaping the Christian soul. By stressing the immediacy of living, breathing teachers of ascetic praxis, Gregory encouraged his readers to pursue the style of stable, communal ascetic life that his brother was advocating at Annisa.

Additionally, the cosmetic language Gregory deployed here emphasized this communal ascetic life as "genuine," in opposition to other types of "false" ascetic praxis. He described "theoretical" teaching, divorced from any living example, as a statue adorned with dyes to make it *appear* living without actually being alive. Like Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Julian, Gregory of Nyssa described the external coverings of a "false" body with the verb "adorn" (*kallōpizein*). In contrast, one who both acted and taught represented a genuine educator, living truly (*alēthōs*). Understanding Gregory's exhortations in relation to the ascetic community at Annisa gives this dichotomy between statue-decorators and genuine teachers particular significance. When Gregory claimed that the teachers of asceticism available "right here" offered truth, in place of the "well-adorned" words of others, he implied that the style of ascetic community he promoted was far superior to alternatives in the same way that elites considered an "unkempt and unadorned" style of appearance to be more philosophical than excessive concern for external beauty.

Gregory, then, constructed asceticism as a philosophical discipline that required teaching by example. He likened this "discipline" of asceticism to other intellectual pursuits that required teachers, like foreign languages and medical practice: because there existed experienced people in both of these fields, those interested in learning them had guides available for their own

instruction.[68] Just so, Gregory insisted, with the "medicine of souls (*tēs tōn psuchōn iatrikēs*)—I mean philosophy—from which we learn the cure (*therapeian*) for every affectation that can touch the soul (*pathous tou tēs psuchēs haptomenou*), there is lots of opportunity to learn from one who has acquired this condition (*hexin*) through long and abundant experience."[69] His appeal to medical terminology (*therapeia, pathos, hexis*) echoed Basil's language in the *Asketikon*, discussed above: Basil warned against certain "passions" that needed to be "cured" in order to preserve the health of the community. Like his brother, Gregory constructed ascetic discipline as a means of curing passions (*pathē*) and cultivating beneficial conditions (*hexeis*). The emphasis on ascetic teaching as a means of cultivating a condition (*hexis*), moreover, further parallels Basil's notions of asceticism as a means of forming an ideal *habitus*. For both Gregory and Basil, an ideal condition did not come from individual, disorganized asceticism: Basil warned against the "untrained condition" of individualists, and Gregory emphasized that an ascetic "condition" needed to be learned. Gregory, by drawing on such terminology, presented asceticism as a practice of curing passions and cultivating conditions in a way that mirrored his brother's rhetoric in the *Asketikon*.

Branding, Tattooing, and Whipping

While Gregory presented asceticism in a way that reflected his and Basil's ideals, he also lambasted "extremist" ascetics for failing to achieve these ideals. *On Virginity* devoted

---

[68] Greg. *DV* 23.2.

[69] Greg. *DV* 23.2. τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ τῆς τῶν ψυχῶν ἰατρικῆς, τῆς φιλοσοφίας λέγω, δι' ἧς παντὸς πάθους τοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς ἁπτομένου τὴν θεραπείαν μανθάνομεν, οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνάγκη στοχασμοῖς τισι καὶ ὑπονοίαις μετιέναι τὴν ἐπιστήμην, ἀλλ' ἐξουσίᾳ πολλῇ τῆς μαθήσεως παρὰ τοῦ διὰ μακρᾶς τε καὶ πολλῆς τῆς πείρας κτησαμένου τὴν ἕξιν.

considerable space to attacking rival ascetics, who failed to develop their praxis within a community of teachers and learners. Gregory insisted that without the aid of a proper teacher, ascetics were doomed to fall into one of two extremes: either they would "endure in fasting to the point of death," or "practice celibacy in name only," while indulging in "secular" pleasures like excessive food and "cohabiting with women, calling such a companionship 'brotherhood'."[70] These extremes existed on the ends of Gregory's ascetic spectrum, and paralleled the spectrum of appearance advocated by educated elites in antiquity—not too much care, and not too little. On the one side was the excessively "harsh" ascetic who starved him/herself, and on the other, the excessively "soft" ascetic who indulged in libertine pleasures like food and sex. Yet on both extremes of this spectrum, Gregory listed behaviors that his readers could have associated with his Eustathius and his followers. On one end, Eustathians were denounced for excessively "harsh" lifestyles and condemnations of marriage, and on the other, Eustathians were denounced for breaking "standard" gender boundaries by allowing men and women to live together. Gregory thus presented a spectrum of ascetic behavior that placed his and Basil's ideal structured asceticism—which required teaching in community—in the middle, and Eustathian ascetics at either (or both) extremes.

Gregory's rhetoric against those he considered extremist ascetics inverted Basil's language of asceticism as a means of imprinting habits onto the metaphorical wax tablet of the soul. In *On Virginity*, rival ascetics did not imprint their souls with holy teachings, but with

---

[70] Greg. *DV* 23.4. Ἐκ τούτων γὰρ ἔγνωμεν καὶ τοὺς τῷ λιμῷ μέχρι θανάτου ἐγκαρτεροῦντας, ὡς «τοῦ θεοῦ ταῖς τοιαύταις εὐαρεστουμένου θυσίαις», καὶ πάλιν ἄλλους ἐκ διαμέτρου πρὸς τὸ ἐναντίον ἀποστατήσαντας, οἳ μέχρις ὀνόματος τὴν ἀγαμίαν ἐπιτηδεύσαντες οὐδὲν διαφέρουσι τοῦ κοινοῦ βίου, οὐ μόνον τῇ γαστρὶ τὰ πρὸς ἡδονὴν χαριζόμενοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναιξὶ κατὰ τὸ φανερὸν συνοικοῦντες καὶ ἀδελφότητα τὴν τοιαύτην συμβίωσιν ὀνομάζοντες, ὡς δὴ τὴν πρὸς τὸ χεῖρον ὑπόνοιαν ὀνόματι σεμνοτέρῳ περικαλύπτοντες.

impiety. These rivals included Messalians, as well as Eustathians. Gregory warned against idle (*aergoi*) ascetics, who considered the works of the commandments (*ta erga tōn entolōn*) harmful to the soul (*blabēn…tēs psuchēs*), erased from themselves (*paragrapsamenoi*) the apostolic exhortations from their minds, ate elegantly and not from their own work, and made idleness (*agrian*) their art of life (*technēn biou*).[71] Wandering Messalians were consistently attacked for not working for their food—as discussed above, Basil's *Asketikon* specifically remonstrated ascetics who shunned manual labor.[72] Gregory, moreover, inverted the common language of asceticism as habit-forming in order to attack these "idle" wanderers. While Basil had frequently presented asceticism as a means of washing away previous teachings and imprinting holy words onto the metaphorical wax tablet of the soul, here Gregory inverted this presentation: idle ascetics, he argued, washed away the words of the Scriptures from their souls.

Gregory's inversion of Basil's ideal ascetic imprinting also applied to Eustathians. He argued that "extremists" who wholly rejected the benefits of marriage debased the teachings of the church by attributing to them the words of pseudo-Paul (1 Timothy 4.2), "their conscience is branded with a hot iron [*kekautēriasmenous*]."[73] Such people, he claimed, "deserting the guidance of the spirit for the teaching of demons (*tēs tōn daimonōn didaskalias*), engraved scars and blisters upon their hearts (*oulas tinas kai enkaumata tais kardiais heautōn encharassousi*)."[74]

---

[71] Greg. *DV* 23.3. Ἐκ τούτων εἰσὶν οἱ παρὰ τῆς Σοφίας ὀνομασθέντες ἀεργοί, οἱ τὰς ὁδοὺς ἑαυτῶν ἀκάνθαις στρώσαντες, οἱ βλάβην ἡγούμενοι τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν περὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν ἐντολῶν προθυμίαν, οἱ παραγραψάμενοι τὰς ἀποστολικὰς παραινέσεις καὶ μὴ τὸν ἴδιον ἄρτον εὐσχημόνως ἐσθίοντες, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ προσκεχηνότες τέχνην βίου τὴν ἀργίαν ποιούμενοι.
[72] *Ask.* SR 207.
[73] Greg. *DV* 7.1. τὴν ἡδονὴν λέγω, πλὴν εἰ μὴ τάχα διὰ τοὺς τὰ δόγματα τῆς ἐκκλησίας παραχαράσσοντας τῶν τοιούτων χρεία λόγων ἂν εἴη, οὓς «κεκαυτηριασμένους τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν» ὁ ἀπόστολος ὀνομάζει.
[74] Greg. *DV* 7.1. ὅτι καταλιπόντες τὴν ὁδηγίαν τοῦ πνεύματος διὰ τῆς τῶν «δαιμόνων διδασκαλίας» οὐλάς τινας καὶ ἐγκαύματα ταῖς καρδίαις ἑαυτῶν ἐγχαράσσουσι.

In fourth-century Cappadocia, a reference to people who renounced marriage altogether certainly would have evoked Eustathians. In 370, when Gregory wrote *On Virginity*, the conflict between his brother and Eustathius was escalating significantly. By refuting the sort of extremism of which Eustathius was accused, Gregory sought to delegitimize Basil's former mentor as an ascetic leader, and promote his brother's community as a legitimate ground for orthodox ascetic praxis. He "branded" Eustathians as extremists in *On Virginity*, drawing on metaphors of bodily mutilation to separate them from the genuine ascetic virtues he praised. As with his attack on "idle" Messalians, here too Gregory inverted Basil's notions of ascetic praxis as a process of imprinting the soul in order to renounce rivals. According to Gregory's rhetoric, the "teaching of demons" promoted by marriage-renouncing Eustathians left its own marks on the soul—scars and blisters engraved upon the heart, and a hot iron branded on the conscience.

Gregory further deployed language of bodily mutilation in order to distinguish allegedly extremist ascetics from the philosophical self-moderation (*sōphrosunē*) he and other elites advocated. The language of bodily mutilation was a complex ground in which Gregory balanced different ideals of Roman elites and Christian ascetics. Gregory deployed this language to brand the bodies and souls of his enemies as non-elite others who could not display the *sōphrosunē* of a "genuine" ascetic. In his view, those who wholly rejected marriage—even though they themselves had been born from marriage—failed to achieve the self-moderation that Christian ascetics must cultivate:

> He who oversteps self-moderation (*parelthōn tēs sōphrosunēs to basimon*) and stumbles past the median of virtue (*huperpesōn tou mesou tēs aretēs*) falls as if from a precipice into "the teaching of demons (*tēi didaskaliai tōn daimonōn*)," "branding with a hot iron (*kautēriazōn*)," as the apostle says (again, 1 Tim 4:2), "his conscience." In declaring marriage abominable, he tattoos himself (*heauton stizei*) with the reproaches of

> marriage: for if the tree is bad, as the Gospel says (Matt. 7:18), then the fruit of the tree will certainly be like it. So if a person is the offshoot and fruit of the tree of marriage, then the reproaches of marriage become reproaches of the one who cast them. But those people are branded culprits (*stigmatiai*), flogged (*katamemōlōpismenoi*) on their conscience with the absurdity of their teaching (*tēi atopiai tou dogmatos*); they are disgraced through such things.[75]

From an elite standpoint, this language of bodily mutilation served Gregory's purpose well. Here, his references to branding, tattooing, and flogging challenged Eustathian ascetics' claim to the philosophical capital of *sōphrosunē*. In particular, Gregory's use of tattoos and flogging metaphors was particularly significant, as these bodily scars were loaded with symbolic meaning in Greek and Roman antiquity.[76] Typically, such marks carried a negative connotation: as educated elites viewed unblemished bodies as indicators of nobility, tattoos and scars from flogging marked criminals and slaves as inferiors whose bodies were owned by someone else. Yet freeborn members of some religious communities—Christian and non-Christian—turned this mark of subjugation into a symbol of piety, tattooing themselves voluntarily to distinguish themselves as slaves of their god. Christian authors, moreover, often described the bodily scars of martyrs, confessors, and ascetics as sorts of tattoos that revealed wearers' adherence to God through bodily suffering. Indeed, as discussed in the previous chapter, in the *Life of Macrina*

---

[75] Greg. *DV* 7.2-3. ὁ δὲ παρελθὼν τῆς σωφροσύνης τὸ βάσιμον καὶ ὑπερπεσὼν τοῦ μέσου τῆς ἀρετῆς, οἷον κρημνῷ τινι «τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῶν δαιμόνων» ἐγκατηνέχθη «καυτηριάζων», καθώς φησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος, «τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν». Ἐν ᾧ γὰρ βδελυκτὸν εἶναι τὸν γάμον ὁρίζεται, ἑαυτὸν στίζει τοῖς τοῦ γάμου ὀνειδισμοῖς· εἰ γὰρ τὸ δένδρον κακόν, καθώς φησί που τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ ὁ καρπὸς πάντως τοῦ δένδρου ἄξιος. Εἰ δὴ τοῦ φυτοῦ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν γάμον βλάστημα καὶ καρπός ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, τὰ τοῦ γάμου ὀνείδη πάντως τοῦ προφέροντος γίνεται. Ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνοι μὲν στιγματίαι τὴν συνείδησιν καὶ καταμεμωλωπισμένοι τῇ ἀτοπίᾳ τοῦ δόγματος διὰ τῶν τοιούτων ἐλέγχονται.

[76] For tattooing in antiquity and late antiquity, see esp. C.P. Jones, "Stigma and Tattoo," in Jane Caplan (ed.), *Written on the Body: the Tattoo in European and American History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), 1-17, and W. Mark Gustafson, "*Inscripta in Fronte*: Penal Tattooing in Late Antiquity," *Classical Antiquity* 16:1 (1997), 79-105. For the relation between tattooing and Christian rhetoric in particular, see Susanna Elm, "'Pierced by Bronze Needles': Anti-Montanist Charges of Ritual Stigmatization in Their Fourth-Century Context," *JECS* 4:4 (1996), 409-439. For discussion of how early Christians discussed slavery within the social and cultural framework of the ancient Roman world, see J. Albert Harrill, *Slaves in the New Testament: Literary, Social, and Moral Dimensions* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006).

Gregory himself included a story of a scar (*stigma*) on his sister's chest, revealed only at the end of her life, that came from God and served as a symbol of her holiness.[77] Thus the tattoo, which typically carried negative connotations of felony, servitude, and subjugation, could be transformed into a positive marker of religious piety among Christians, and particularly among ascetics who wished to reveal their devotion through bodily subjugation.

As an elite fourth-century Christian, Gregory would likely have been aware of the complexity of meaning that tattoos and branding carried in Late Antiquity. In *On Virginity*, he separated "extremist" ascetics from the capital of elite self-moderation by rhetorically branding (*kautēriazōn*), tattooing (*stizein*, *stigmatias*), and whipping (*mōlōpizein*) them, and by specifying that these bodily mutilations were a result of their impiety, not their *askēsis*. Since such markings were commonly found on the bodies of criminals and slaves, they contrasted significantly with the "positive" marks of learning and status that Greek and Roman elites sought to carry. As a highly-educated Roman, Gregory sought to delegitimize those whom he considered subversive ascetics by describing traditionally lower-class marks on their bodies. His use of stigmatizing language carried further significance, moreover, in light of fourth-century Christian debates over asceticism. At a time when people linked the bodily suffering of ascetics with that of Christ, rigorous ascetic discipline turned ascetics' very bodies into potential locations of authority, often in opposition to the discipline of upper-class educated Christians like Gregory, who advocated asceticism as a means of achieving philosophical moderation. Thus, Gregory's stigmatizing language delegitimized "extremist" ascetics on multiple levels: not only were they slaves and criminals, but their ascetic praxis produced on their bodies *stigmata* of "improper teaching," *not*

---

[77] *VM* 31. For analysis, see Virginia Burrus, "Macrina's Tattoo," in *The Cultural Turn in Late Ancient Studies* (2005), 103-116.

of service to God. "Extremists," then, appeared in Gregory's rhetoric as neither properly-educated Romans nor proper Christian servants.

Gregory's rhetorical branding of rival ascetics in *On Virginity* served as a counter-example to the ideal middle-ground asceticism he presented in this text. While he wrote that a proper teacher like his brother Basil offered both a living example and written guidelines for asceticism within a stable, structured, community, not everyone acknowledged Basil as such a teacher, nor his community as such an ideal ground for ascetic praxis. According to Gregory, however, those who did not acknowledge his and Basil's ideal asceticism were marked with impiety, just as much as those who did were marked with piety. In place of the "imprints" of divine teaching, Gregory marked those he considered extremists with brands, tattoos, and scars from flogging, all signifying these rivals as non-elite. These marks sought to echo the community-building in which his brother Basil engaged at Annisa by distinguishing the ascetics of this community (models of order and control) from alleged extremists. In *On Virginity*, not only did Basil offer an ideal ascetic community at Annisa, but those who disputed this ideal in favor of less structured forms of asceticism were branded, tattooed, and flogged, in order that the audience could recognize them as non-elite others.

Conclusion

This examination of Basil's and Gregory of Nyssa's presentation of ascetic community has shown how these Cappadocians constructed their retreat at Annisa as the ideal ground in which to learn and perform their version of Christian philosophy. At Annisa, they argued, individuals revealed their philosophy by adhering to elite ideals of self-moderation and self-

control, and by doing so within a structured community. By labeling—and, in Gregory's case, branding—groups such as the Eustathians and the Messalians as subversive extremists, they sought to separate these rivals from the philosophical capital which several fourth-century communities of Christians sought to claim. In Basil's and Gregory's rhetoric, in order to mold one's self to the *habitus* of a controlled philosopher, one must be part of a structured community of orthodox Christian ascetics. It was necessary to *learn* asceticism, and this learning must occur under the tutelage of experienced teachers. In the *Asketikon*, Basil constructed himself as such a teacher by transferring the values he had advocated in *Ep.* 2 to apply to a whole community of ascetics. In *On Virginity*, Gregory likewise promoted his brother as a teacher of asceticism, who could guide individuals to develop their praxis so that they did not fall from the middle path that he and Basil claimed to represent.

Basil's and Gregory's emphasis on Annisa as an ideal ascetic community highlights the importance of their debates over philosophical *habitus* in fourth-century community formation. Several fourth-century individuals—Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus, Julian, Eustathius, Herakleios, Maximus, to name a few—asserted their authority by presenting themselves as philosophers. Such self-presentation was intimately linked with authority in the religious debates of the fourth century, as these individuals all sought to assert themselves as figures whose status as a "proper" philosopher allowed them to guide others to the Divine. At Annisa, Basil and Gregory presented an ideal image of the results of this guidance. By constructing an ideal community of ascetics, they claimed themselves as leaders of this community, and asserted their own legitimate philosophical capital through their ability to impart philosophy to others. In their rhetoric, the line between themselves and rivals such as Eustathius

was also a line between those who adopted their version of asceticism—and with it, their version of orthodoxy—and those who adopted that of Eustathius. By aligning their asceticism with the ideals of order and structure promoted by educated elites, Basil and Gregory presented themselves as the "right" kind of philosophers, and as leaders of the "right" kind of philosophical community at Annisa. This community, for them, stood as an ideal of ascetic praxis and education that aligned their elite ideals with Christian orthodoxy and orthopraxy.

CHAPTER FIVE
Saintly Bodies: Memorializing Orthodox Christian Philosophers

Up to this point, I have discussed how the Cappadocians and Julian presented themselves as philosophers through their habits and their clothing (Chapters One and Two), how the Gregorys presented their female relatives as both philosophers and aristocratic women (Chapter Three), and how Basil and Gregory of Nyssa transferred their ideals of individual self-presentation to reflect onto a wider community (Chapter Four). In all of these chapters, I have emphasized how Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, and the emperor Julian drew on classical ideals of the philosophical *habitus*, which they absorbed through their elite education, in order to mark themselves as legitimate religious leaders and their rivals—who sought to adopt a similar *habitus*—as non-elite frauds.They claimed that because self-moderation (*sōphrosunē*) was imprinted deep within their souls, they naturally exhibited "proper" philosophy in a way that confirmed the elite social and gender hierarchies at whose pinnacle they stood, and qualified them to lead others to the Divine.

In this final chapter, I will examine the development of this self-presentation in biographic memorials written between 380 and 381, a particularly crucial time for the pro-Nicene Christian faction to which the Cappadocians belonged. As the previous chapter had done, this chapter will focus on two particularly rich texts—Gregory of Nyssa's memorials to Basil and Gregory Thaumaturgus (d. 270)—in order to highlight the development of philosophical self-presentation as a tool for the formation of pro-Nicene communities.[1] By memorializing Basil in

[1] In this chapter, I will always designate Gregory Thaumaturgus by his nickname, to avoid confusion.

January 381, Gregory turned the model philosophical community that he and his brother had promoted at Annisa into a basis for strengthening a wider pro-Nicene community. In his memorial to Thaumaturgus in May of the previous year, he revealed how a legendary bishop from his homeland exhibited the same philosophical virtues that he and Basil had promoted in the 370s. Both of these memorials can be read together as part of the Nyssen's rhetorical effort to solidify pro-Nicenes in the eastern empire around the ideals of Christian philosophy that all three of the Cappadocians promoted. Indeed, Gregory's effort at pro-Nicene solidification is also present in a third oration, given in honor of the Antiochene bishop Meletius. Meletius, who died suddenly during the proceedings of the Council of Constantinople in 381, was a prominent leader of the later fourth-century pro-Nicenes, and received eulogies from multiple Christian bishops (among them Gregory) who were in Constantinople at the time of his death.[2] However, since Gregory's oration to Meletius does not deal as extensively with the philosophical ideals present in the memorials to Basil and Thaumaturgus, I will omit it from my analysis of Gregory's memorials.[3]

To be sure, there survive other contemporary memorials, like Libanius' *Epitaph for Julian* or Gregory of Nazianzus' famous *Funeral Oration to Basil*, that are worthy of

[2] Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places* (2014), 15-9.
[3] As Andrea Sterk has observed, the funeral oration to Meletius "does not develop in any depth the themes [of ascetic leadership]…in Nyssan's encomium of Basil" (Sterk, *Renouncing the World* [2004], 85).

examination for their presentation of philosophical ideals.[4] Here, however, I will focus on Gregory of Nyssa's memorials on their own because of the particular emphasis that the Nyssen places on linking audience, author, and subject in his rhetoric. In his memorials to Basil and Thaumaturgus, Gregory presented his works as not simply biographies of prominent Christian philosophers, but as lessons in Christian philosophy itself, lessons which could be absorbed and imprinted in the same way that ancient education was thought to imprint habits into students' souls. Gregory presented himself, as author, as someone who could transfer the philosophical *habitus* of Christian greats like Basil and Thaumaturgus into the minds and souls of others.

Gregory's memorials continued the Cappadocians' efforts at forming communities around an elite ideal of philosophy, as discussed in the previous chapter. Basil and Gregory had both promoted Annisa as a place where a community of "proper" (i.e., orthodox) Christian ascetics could be created by teaching and learning within a structured curriculum. After Basil's death, Gregory deployed his brother's memory, along with the memory of a legendary third-century Christian bishop, as a means of solidifying a wider Christian community, consisting of both ascetics and laypeople, yet still resting on the foundation of the Cappadocians' ideal Christian philosophy. This endeavor formed a significant part of Gregory's efforts to assert his authority as bishop during a time when church politics were particularly complicated in the eastern Empire.

---

[4] For analysis of Libanius' memorialization of Julian, see Urbano, *The Philosophical Life* (2013), 186-203; Hans-Ulrich Wiemer, *Libanios und Julian: Studien zum Verhältnis von Rhetorik und Politik im vierten Jahrhundert n. Chr.* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1995), 247-268. For Gregory of Nazianzus' *Funeral Oration to Basil*, see George A. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors*, A History of Rhetoric 3 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983), 228-37; Frederick W. Norris, "Your Honor, My Reputation: St. Gregory of Nazianzus's Funeral Oration on St. Basil the Great," in *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (2000), 140-59; David Konstan, "How to Praise a Friend: St. Gregory of Nazianzus's Funeral Oration for St. Basil the Great," *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (2000), 160-79; Jostein Børtnes, "Eros Transformed: Same-Sex Love and Divine Desire. Reflections on the Erotic Vocabulary in St. Gregory of Nazianzus's Speech on St. Basil the Great," *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (2000) 180-93; Neil McLynn, "Gregory Nazianzen's Basil: the Literary Construction of a Christian Friendship," *SP* 37 (2001), 178-93.

Basil's death in late 378 left his ascetics at Annisa, the church at Caesarea, and pro-Nicene Christians throughout the Empire without a leader.[5] His death, brought on by a sudden illness, came soon after the publication of his theological rival Eunomius' *Apology for the Apology*, which rebuked the polemic Basil had composed against him in 365.[6] This work launched a major personal attack against Basil, as Eunomius particularly assailed him for his relationship to Eustathius, at the same time that Basil (as previous chapters have shown) was striving to distance himself from his former mentor.[7] Not long after, moreover, Basil's older sister Macrina fell ill at Annisa, where she had led a community of female ascetics; she died in July 379.[8] The loss of both Basil and Macrina within a year was a major blow to the community of ascetics at Annisa, especially to Gregory of Nyssa, who considered both of these older siblings as his philosophical teachers.[9] In less than a year, Gregory lost two siblings and personal mentors, and faced a daunting challenge from a theological rival.

During this turbulent period, Gregory of Nyssa emerged as his brother's theological, pastoral, and ascetic successor. Just before Basil's death, Gregory was recalled from the exile imposed on him by the Homoian emperor Valens, who died at the military disaster in Adrianople

---

[5] There is debate over the date of Basil's death. Rousseau (Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* [1994], 360-3) Vaggione (Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus* [2000], 304-11), and T.D. Barnes (T.D. Barnes, "The Collapse of the Homoeans in the East," *SP* 29 [1997]: 3-16) argue for the traditional date of January 1, 379. The biggest point for the January 1, 379 argument is the delivery of each of the Gregorys' funeral orations in January and the setting of St. Basil's Day in the Greek calendar on January 1. However, since there was no set time period in the fourth century between someone's death and their canonization as a saint, Basil need not have died on January 1. Anna Silvas (*Gregory of Nyssa* [2007], 32-9) argues for late September 378, following the work of Pierre Maraval (Pierre Maraval, "Retour sur quelques dates concernant Basil de Césarée et Grégoire de Nysse," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 99 [2004]: 153-7).

[6] Vaggione, *Eunomius* (2000), 302-5.

[7] Eunomius, *AA* 1, in Vaggione, *Eunomius: the Extant Works* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 99-100.

[8] Silvas, *Gregory of Nyssa* (2007), 32-9.

[9] For Nyssen's view of both Macrina and Basil as teachers, see Limberis, *Architects of Piety* (2011), 115-9.

in August 378.[10] Valens' successor Theodosius was sympathetic to the pro-Nicene cause, and with his accession in early 379, Gregory sought to strengthen his faction's presence throughout eastern bishoprics. From late 378 to the Council of Constantinople in May 381, he delivered several homilies in both Nyssa and Caesarea, attended the pro-Nicene council of Antioch that sent Gregory of Nazianzus to Constantinople, visited and supported the ascetic community at Annisa, composed the first two books of his *Against Eunomius*, settled an episcopal succession in Pontus, and was even pressed to succeed Eustathius as bishop of Sebasteia (though he returned to his see in Nyssa).[11] As Basil had emerged in the 370s as a key leader of pro-Nicene Christians, so Gregory stepped into this role after his brother's death.

It is within this emergence as a pro-Nicene authority in Cappadocia that Gregory memorialized his brother Basil and Gregory Thaumaturgus. As Andrea Sterk has argued, these memorial orations reveal Gregory of Nyssa's development of Basil's ideal of an ascetic bishop.[12] When Gregory developed his brother's ideal, he constructed images of bishops who *embodied* and *performed* an ideal philosophy that aligned with his version of orthodoxy, and presented his memorials as a means of *transferring* this ideal to his audience. According to Gregory these men, as models of philosophy, served as vessels of divine wisdom. After they died, the divine wisdom that they embodied in life became available to the pro-Nicene Christian community through spoken and written celebrations of their lives. Gregory stressed the ability of his memorials, as texts, to implant the philosophical virtues of Basil and Thaumaturgus into the minds of those who listened to his words.

---

[10] For a narrative of the events leading up to the military disaster at Adrianople, see Noel E. Lenski, *Failure of Empire* (2002) , 325-41. For the exiles of Gregory of Nyssa and others under Valens, see Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy* (2004), 240-3, and Vaggione, *Eunomius* (2000), 311.
[11] Silvas, *Gregory of Nyssa* (2007), 39-46.
[12] Sterk, *Renouncing the World* (2004), 100-10.

Memorializing and Materializing in Late Antique Biographies

In my discussion of Gregory of Nyssa's memorials, I draw particularly on Arthur Urbano's study of "biographic literature" as a category that includes multiple ancient genres—including lives, philosophical histories, hagiographies, and funeral orations—in which the text illustrated the life of a famous person as a moral exemplar to readers/listeners.[13] While Gregory's *Life* of Gregory Thaumaturgus differed in genre from his *Funeral Oration* to Basil, both of these texts offered moral exemplars of Christian leaders. Moreover, the subjects' embodiment of philosophical virtue was especially crucial to this portrayal. As Urbano has argued, biography was a key arena in the formation of philosophical communities—both Christian and "pagan"—in Late Antiquity:

> Biography could be used to define, delimit, and promote the characteristics of the philosophical life. As a pedagogical tool, biographies presented models for imitation. Authors enlisted noble figures of the recent and distant past, praising them as founders, exemplars, and transmitters of knowledge and virtue.[14]

Moreover, memorials like Gregory's drew links not only between the audience and a prominent individual, but between life and death, and between author, subject, and audience. In the words of Thomas Hägg and Philip Rousseau, in Late Antiquity "biography and panegyric dealt, certainly, with issues of morality and imitation; but, in certain forms, they also represented an attitude to death, or more precisely to the appropriate relationship between the dead and the living."[15] This theory of biography was certainly relevant to the texts produced by Gregory of

---

[13] Urbano, *The Philosophical Life* (2013), 16-7. For more on the literary aspects of biographies and their development in antiquity, see Patricia Cox, *Biography in Late Antiquity: a Quest for the Holy Man*, TCH 5 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983), 3-16; Simon Swain, "Biography and Biographic in the Literature of the Roman Empire," in Mark J. Edwards and Simon Swain (eds.), *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 1-37; Thomas Hägg and Philip Rousseau, "Introduction: Biography and Panegyric," in *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (2000) 1-28.

[14] Urbano, *The Philosophical Life* (2013), 24.

[15] Thomas Hägg and Philip Rousseau, "Introduction: Biography and Panegyric" (2000), 24.

Nyssa, particularly as he was embroiled in political and theological disputes between 378 and 381 and sought to assert himself as a pro-Nicene authority. His memorials to Basil and Thaumaturgus offered him opportunities to promote these Christians as paragons of his version of philosophy, orthodoxy, and the close connection between the two (as Gregory saw it). Moreover, by presenting his works as means of linking his audience to these bishops' virtue, he drew a connection between the living and the dead, and presented himself as a key intermediary between these realms.

Recent classical and late antique studies of memory are also relevant to this chapter's focus on Gregory of Nyssa's biographic memorials.[16] To memorialize someone, of course, was not to present a neutral, objective account of the person's life. As Harriet Flower has observed, memory of the past is inextricably tied up in the concerns of the present:

> It is impossible to travel back in time to recover every detail, to relive past experience as if moment by moment. Nor would such a journey even be desirable. Rather, we pay attention to memories of the past in a present that is by definition not the same as the time that is being invoked as "past." Similarly, active recalling itself (re)creates that past from fragmented pieces of evidence, whether in the human brain or on the basis of an archive or at the physical site of some historical action. The image of the past that is most alive in human memory is seen as a road that leads from that past into the present.[17]

As Flower argues, accounts of the past are naturally bound to concerns of the present: "the meaning of memory is its effect within its own particular political community."[18] Similarly, Charles Hedrick has remarked that "it is through memory that the silent dead infest the living,

---

[16] For recent analyses of the politics of memory in the ancient world, see Mary J. Carruthers, *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric, and the Making of Images, 400-1200,* Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 34 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), esp. 46-57; Hedrick, *History and Silence* (2000); Harriet I. Flower, *The Art of Forgetting: Disgrace and Oblivion in Roman Political Culture* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2006); Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places* (2014), 67-91.
[17] Flower, *The Art of Forgetting* (2006), 1.
[18] Flower, *Art of Forgetting* (2006), 7.

and it is through memory that the authority of the past is internalized."[19] When recalling the life of a dead person, whether this person was a close relative, an emperor, or a distant legend, Greek and Roman authors deployed memories of the "silent dead" in ways that created authority for themselves in the present. In memorializing Basil and Thaumaturgus I argue, Gregory constructed these bishops' lives based on fragmented evidence, both from his own interaction with these figures (Basil) and from stories he had heard as a youth (Gregory Thaumaturgus). The fragmented evidence he selected reflected his concerns to solidify pro-Nicene orthodoxy in the years surrounding the Council of Constantinople in 381.

In this interplay of past and present, Gregory drew on his personal memory in order to craft a collective memory of prominent bishops, and thus brokered a relationship between the heroes of the Christian past and his own pro-Nicene community in the early 380s. Recent scholars have observed Gregory's self-presentation as such a broker in his *Life of Macrina*, which I discussed in Chapter Three. As Derek Krueger has shown, for late ancient Greek Christians, writing biographies of saints served as an act of piety in itself—by recording the lives of holy Christians, authors achieved their own holiness.[20] Krueger highlights the *Life of Macrina* as a particularly salient example of this trend. This text, he argues, by blurring the lines between writing and speech, constructed the act of narration as a form of sacrificial offering, a thanksgiving to God in the same way that the prayers of daily liturgy or the eucharistic communion were acts of thanksgiving: by making Macrina present to readers of the *Life*, Gregory paralleled the actions of prayer and communion, which made the body of Christ present

[19] Hedrick, *History and Silence* (2000), 169.
[20] Krueger, *Writing and Holiness* (2004), esp. 1-9.

to worshipers.[21] Additionally, as Patricia Cox Miller argues, Gregory presented his sister on the boundary between the physical and spiritual worlds, emphasizing the divine presence in her body through both her ascetic praxis and working of miracles.[22] Both Krueger and Miller have observed the interplay between body and text, and between audience and subject, in Gregory's hagiography of his sister.

Miller's discussion of the *Life of Macrina*, moreover, takes place within her study of the increasing interest among fourth- and fifth-century authors in the presence of the sacred in the physical world, which she dubs the "material turn."[23] This turn involved greater emphasis on the physical senses of readers and listeners in the development of hagiography. In hagiography, Miller emphasizes, late ancient authors sought to bring the bodies of dead saints into the minds of their audience through vivid rhetoric that engaged the senses:

> Hagiographical images of saintly bodies taught the reader how to bring together the "real" and the transcendent, the material and the spiritual, in a single image. As ephemeral and tangible at once, saints were presented in hagiography as visual paradoxes, and these paradoxical bodies were signs of transfiguration at work in the world.[24]

In addition to her discussion of the *Life of Macrina*, Miller highlights a homily of Gregory's, delivered in February 381 at the martyr shrine of saint Theodore, as an example of this vivid rhetoric. She demonstrates how in this homily, Gregory's rhetorical embellishments, like the embellishments of the marble and paintings in the martyr-saint's shrine, engaged all the senses—not just sight—of his audience, and imbued the martyr's relics with holiness.[25] The rhetoric that

---

[21] Krueger, *Writing and Holiness* (2004), 110-32. See also *idem*, "Writing and the Liturgy of Memory in Gregory of Nyssa's *Life of Macrina*," *JECS* 8:4 (2000), 483-510.
[22] Miller, *The Corporeal Imagination* (2009), 125-6.
[23] Miller, *The Corporeal Imagination* (2009), 3-7.
[24] Miller, *The Corporeal Imagination* (2009), 12.
[25] Miller, *The Corporeal Imagination* (2009), 2-3, 55-6.

Gregory deployed to memorialize Theodore sought to bring this saint into the minds of his listeners by inviting them to see, hear, smell, and touch his presence through Gregory's description of his shrine. Miller thus emphasizes this text as another example of Gregory's adaptation of biographic memorials in a way that emphasized connectivity between author, subject, and audience.

I argue that Gregory's rhetoric connecting the bodies of authors and their audiences to the bodies of saints served as a type of Christian learning. As Miller stressed, the images of bodies *taught* readers how to view the Divine in the material world. Since hagiographic memorials taught readers/listeners—and, I contend, "taught" is indeed the correct phrase—these texts show how biographic memorials serve to promote the author as a teacher of an ideal version of philosophy, and through this, a legitimate leader of a religious community. Not only did Gregory draw on the rhetorical training he received from his exposure to *paideia* in order to write biographic memorials, he also drew on his *paideia* to present these memorials as lessons in a style of philosophy that was explicitly pro-Nicene. If classical education was a process of conditioning bodies and souls to internalize and externalize particular traits based on the words and images that students heard and saw, Gregory presented his biographic memorials as a means of achieving such conditioning through absorbing the virtue of holy Christians through speaking, hearing, and reading about their lives.

I argue that in his memorials to Basil and Thaumaturgus, Gregory presented himself as a teacher of Christian ascetic philosophy who could condition his readers/listeners to absorb the virtue of other prominent bishops. By praising the philosophical *habitus* of these two bishops, and by emphasizing his role as author in implanting this *habitus* into the souls of others, Gregory

asserted his own authority as both legitimate philosopher and pro-Nicene leader. At a time when "orthodoxy" was hotly contested, Gregory deployed the memory of previous bishops—both recently-deceased brother Basil and the legendary Thaumaturgus—in order to craft these men as ideal philosophers whose philosophy was naturally connected to their orthodoxy. Gregory's memorials to these bishops thus show what was at stake in the philosophical self-presentation in which he, the other Cappadocians, and Julian engaged in the second half of the fourth century. By connecting himself, past bishops, and his audience to his ideals of philosophy and Christian orthodoxy, Gregory sought to assert himself as a model philosopher who could properly lead his followers to God.

Orthodoxy, Philosophy, and *Habitus* in Gregory of Nyssa's Memorial to Basil

On January 1, 381, Gregory delivered his *Funeral Oration to Basil* in Caesarea.[26] This oration fused Basil's philosophy and pro-Nicene orthodoxy into a model of Christian virtue for his audience to absorb by listening to his words. David Konstan has argued that this oration to Basil, unlike the one that Gregory of Nazianzus would present a year later, de-emphasizes the Nyssen's personal relation to Basil, instead elevating him to the level of sainthood by associating

[26] See Pierre Maraval, "Chronology of Works," in Lucas Francisco Mateo-Seco and Giulio Maspero (eds.), *The Brill Dictionary of Gregory of Nyssa*, trans. Seth Cheney (Boston: Brill, 2010), 153-69, 164-5. Maraval follows the dating presented originally in Jean Daniélou, "Chronologie des sermons de Grégoire de Nysse," *Revue des sciences religieuses* 29:4 (1955), 346-72, 351-3. Silvas is more confident, marking the oration as "the one date at this period on which Gregory can be located precisely" based on evidence from Gregory's correspondence with Libanius and his *Homily on Theodore* (Silvas, *Gregory of Nyssa* [2007], 45-6). The Nyssen's funeral oration has received substantially less analysis than that of the Nazianzen. The most complete analysis (though more literary than historical) is Sister James Aloysius Stein, A.M., *Encomium of Saint Gregory Bishop of Nyssa on His Brother Saint Basil: A Commentary, with a Revised Text, Introduction, and Translation* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1928), xvii-xcvi. For a more recent discussion of Gregory's presentation of Basil as an ideal bishop, see Sterk, *Renouncing the World* (2004), 100-5. Sterk does well to highlight the oration's image of Basil's asceticism as an element of his abilities as leader, yet only discusses that of Basil's education in passing.

him with prominent biblical figures—in particular Moses, Elijah, John the Baptist, and Paul.[27] As a result, Konstan argues, Basil exists in the Nyssen's oration on a higher plane than that of regular humans:

> His discourse constructs a barrier between Basil, who is written into a sacred text that is not so much ancient as transcendently enduring, and those outside the narrative space, whether the speaker himself or his audience, who take Basil as their ideal. There is no communion between these realms: in saying nothing of Basil's family, Gregory is, of course, saying nothing of his own.[28]

While Gregory did indeed eschew discussion of his personal relationship to Basil, and did place him in the ranks of scriptural prophets and apostles, I argue that this did not entirely cut his brother off from the realm of mortals. On the contrary, the very purpose of the Nyssen's memorial to Basil was to *create* communion between these realms. Painting a picture of Basil's philosophical *habitus*, inculcated from a young age by his grasp of both traditional and Christian learning, was essential to this endeavor.

To accomplish this communion between the saintly Basil and the mortal audience, Gregory's *Funeral Oration to Basil* constructed his brother as both a model of a pro-Nicene Christian philosopher *and* as a lesson in pro-Nicene Christian philosophy. First, he presented Basil himself as an ideal student and teacher, who through his knowledge of both Greek classics and sacred Scriptures defended the pro-Nicene Christian community against the attacks of both "pagans" and "heretics." Second, Gregory argued, Basil coupled his intellectual capabilities with proper cultivation of his body through ascetic praxis, in which he resembled scriptural greats such as Elijah and John the Baptist in both appearance and action. Finally, Gregory explicitly

---

[27] David Konstan, "How to Praise a Friend" (2000), 160-79. For the biblical comparisons as a means of elevating Basil to biblical sainthood, see also Sterk, *Renouncing the World* (2004), 101-4.
[28] Konstan, "How to Praise a Friend" (2000), 165.

fashioned his oration as a means not only of telling about Basil's life, but of *imprinting* Basil's virtue into the souls of his audience, conditioning his listeners to receive lessons in Christian education in the same way that Basil himself, when living, advocated reading the Scriptures to imprint the virtue of past heroes into the soul. Indeed, Gregory sought to construct Basil's life as the embodiment of the skill (*technē*) of asceticism he had promoted in *On Virginity* a decade earlier, as discussed in the previous chapter. In his *Funeral Oration to Basil*, this "*technē* of Basility" represented both the philosophical asceticism he advocated in *On Virginity*, as well as the pro-Nicene orthodoxy he was promoting in the early 380s.

Basil the pro-Nicene Philosopher

Gregory established Basil as an ideally educated Christian at the very outset of his oration. He began by setting the celebration of his brother, "a teacher and shepherd," within the yearly sequence of apostles' feasts, thus identifying him as a teacher by linking him with the original teachers of Christ's message.[29] He then turned to an extensive praise of Basil that constructed him as a model of Christian *paideia*, absorbed through his natural habits and intellectual capabilities:

> I am speaking about him, the vessel of election (cf. Acts 9:15), lofty in life and in speech (*hupsēlon biōi kai te logōi*), Basil, pleasing to God from birth, hoary in his habits (*ēthesi*) from youth, educated like Moses in all wisdom of external knowledge (*ton paideuthenta men kata Mōüsea pasēi sophiai tōn exōthen logōn*; cf. Acts 7:20, 7:22), yet by sacred letters (*tois de hierois grammasin*) he was nourished, raised, and matured from infancy

[29] *IBF* 1.17-24. εἰσὶ δὲ οὗτοι· Στέφανος, Πέτρος, Ἰάκωβος, Ἰωάννης, Παῦλος· εἶτα μετὰ τούτους φυλάξας τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τάξιν ἐξάρχει τῆς παρούσης ἡμῖν πανηγύρεως ὁ ποιμὴν καὶ διδάσκαλος. τίς οὗτος; εἴπω τὸ ὄνομα, ἢ ἀρκεῖ ἡ χάρις ἀντὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος δεῖξαι τὸν ἄνδρα; διδάσκαλον γὰρ καὶ ποιμένα μετὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἀκούσας, ἐνόησας πάντως τὸν μετὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους ποιμένα τε καὶ διδάσκαλον. For Basil as a teacher (*didaskalos*) in this oration, see *IBF* 8.13, 11.18, 13.1, 13.12, 14.12, 15.2, 16.1, 16.11, 16.13, 17.1, 17.5, 17.13, 17.18, 18.9, 19.4, 20.4, 20.9, 20.29, 22.17, 22.6, 22.23, 26.24, 27.15, 27.16, 27.18, 27.21, 27.26.

> to manhood, and therefore he taught (*didaskōn*) everyone in all wisdom, both divine and external (*en pasēi sophiai tēi theiai te kai tēi exōthen*).[30]

Gregory promoted Basil as a model Christian, inculcated from a very young age in the "hoary habits" of an old wise man. While Basil, writing *Ep.* 2 in 358, had emphasized the need to "unlearn" his previous habits at Annisa, here Gregory claimed that his brother had never required such unlearning: he already possessed "correct" habits as a youth, and was pleasing to God even from birth. Along with these habits, Gregory also promoted his brother's education by praising his expertise with "external" (*exōthen*) learning while emphasizing the superiority of his Christian education: while Basil (like Moses) received "external" *paideia*, his connection to sacred letters (*hiera grammata*) ran much deeper, described as a nourishing presence from the very start of his life to the beginning of his adulthood. The language of nourishment, indeed, provided another claim to Basil's "natural" grasp of learning from a young age. Gregory conceived of Christian spiritual formation in terms of "nourishment"—especially the nourishment of infants through breast milk—in several of his works, including the *Funeral Oration to Basil*.[31] Basil himself, after all, had stressed in his *Address to Young Men* the importance of molding youths from the very beginning of their lives, while their minds were still malleable like fresh wax.[32] Gregory drew on the metaphor of nourishment to argue the same point. By learning both "external" and sacred letters—the latter serving as nourishment from birth—Basil appeared in the introduction to Gregory's memorial as an exemplary Christian

---

[30] *IBF* 1.24-31. τοῦτον λέγω, τὸ σκεῦος τῆς ἐκλογῆς, τὸν ὑψηλὸν βίῳ τε καὶ λόγῳ, Βασίλειον, τὸν ἀστεῖον τῷ Θεῷ ἐκ γεννήσεως, τὸν τοῖς ἤθεσι πολιὸν ἐκ νεότητος, τὸν παιδευθέντα μὲν κατὰ Μωϋσέα πάσῃ σοφίᾳ τῶν ἔξωθεν λόγων, τοῖς δὲ ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν ἐκ βρέφους καὶ μέχρι τῆς τελειώσεως συντραφέντα καὶ συναυξηθέντα καὶ συνακμάσαντα, ὅθεν διδάσκων πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ τῇ θείᾳ τε καὶ τῇ ἔξωθεν. The "vessel of election" in Acts 9:15 is Paul.

[31] John David Penniman, "Fed to Perfection: Mother's Milk, Roman Family Values, and the Transformation of the Soul in Gregory of Nyssa," *Church History* 84:3 (2015), 495-530.

[32] *Ad adul.* 5.5-9. See discussion in Chapter 1.

student. Thus, at the very beginning of his *Funeral Oration to Basil*, Gregory constructed his brother as a model of Christian philosophy whose early exposure to "correct" knowledge had made him a natural in this role.

Gregory also connected Basil's grasp of both sacred and secular wisdom to his brother's status as a champion of pro-Nicene orthodoxy. As he continued his introduction, he emphasized Basil's ability to use both "external" and sacred learning properly to defend Christians against the attacks of their enemies:

> As a brave, experienced man, arming himself through each type of learning (*di'hekateras paideuseōs*) against his adversaries, he seized his opponents with each, overcoming in each those who think that they are somehow strong in either type against the truth: by means of the Scriptures he overcame those who propound the Scriptures with heresy, and by means of their own learning (*tēs idias…paideuseōs*) he entrapped the *Hellēnes*.[33]

Gregory treated Basil's intellectual achievement as part of his status as a pro-Nicene Christian, emphasizing his learning as a means to overcome both non-Nicenes and non-Christians who equally failed to possess "true" *paideia*. Stressing Basil's victories over non-Nicenes was particularly vital for Gregory in January of 381, just months before the beginning of the Council of Constantinople that would confirm the pro-Nicenes' theology as imperially sanctioned Christian doctrine.[34] By promoting Basil's use of both Christian and non-Christian knowledge against opponents who allegedly mis-used this knowledge, he implicitly attacked rivals like Eunomius' claims to be Christian teachers—in their polemic, both Basil and Gregory had

---

[33] *IBF* 1.31-6. οἷόν τις ἀριστεὺς περιδέξιος δι' ἑκατέρας παιδεύσεως τοῖς ἀντιτεταγμένοις ἑαυτὸν ἀνθοπλίζων ᾕρει δι' ἀμφοτέρων τοὺς προσπαλαίοντας, ὑπερέχων ἐν ἑκατέρῳ τοὺς ἐν θατέρῳ τινὰ κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ἰσχὺν ἔχειν νομίζοντας, τοὺς μὲν ἐκ τῆς αἱρέσεως τὰς Γραφὰς προβαλλομένους ταῖς Γραφαῖς ἀνατρέπων, Ἕλληνας δὲ διὰ τῆς ἰδίας αὐτῶν συμποδίζων παιδεύσεως.

[34] For the events leading up to and including the council, see Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy* (2004), 251-60 and Vaggione, *Eunomius* (2000), 319-25.

questioned the ways in which Eunomius applied Greek philosophy to Christian theology.[35] Indeed, later in his memorial to Basil, Gregory would make this attack more explicit, accusing "people capable of embracing all evil—I mean Arius, Aëtius, Eunomius, Eudoxius, and many others in addition to these," of bringing back "idolatry under the name of Christianity."[36] His picture of Basil as a Christian who embodied ideal learning in both sacred and secular realms thus operated to discredit his and Gregory's theological rivals, Eunomius in particular. While Basil and Gregory accused Eunomius of "improperly" applying Greek philosophy to scriptural interpretation, Gregory presented Basil "properly" applying it to attack the pro-Nicene Christian community's enemies.

Gregory's *Funeral Oration to Basil*, then, was another component of his effort to write against non-Nicene opponents at the beginning of Theodosius' reign. His portrayal of Basil was that of a Christian philosopher who, because he did not misappropriate non-Christian knowledge, was able to defeat opponents both within and outside of the Christian community. In addition to this control over secular and sacred wisdom, Gregory also praised his brother's ascetic image in order to promote him as a model of pro-Nicene Christian philosophy. He sought to bring his brother's humble ascetic body before the eyes of his listeners as a paragon of the ideal Christian's appearance. As argued in the previous chapter, both Basil and his brother Gregory promoted ascetic life at Annisa as the ideal arena for absorbing and reproducing a Christian philosophical *habitus*. Gregory continued this promotion in his funeral oration by emphasizing

---

[35] See especially Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (1994), 93-132; Vaggione, *Eunomius* (2000), 79-93, 147, and discussion in Introduction. For more detailed analysis of how Basil and Gregory objected to Eunomius' logic, see Radde-Gallwitz, *Transformation of Divine Simplicity* (2009), 113-42, 177-82; DelCogliano, *Basil of Caesarea's anti-Eunomian Theory* (2010), 51-2, 135-52.

[36] *IBF* 10.1-6. Καὶ ὅλος ἐμπεσὼν ὁ ἀποστάτης ἀνθρώποις πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν κακίαν ἱκανοῖς χωρῆσαι, Ἀρείῳ τε λέγω καὶ Ἀετίῳ, Εὐνομίῳ Εὐδοξίῳ, καὶ πρὸς τούτοις καὶ πολλοῖς ἄλλοις, δι' ὧν ἐκλείπουσαν ἤδη τὴν εἰδωλολατρείαν πάλιν, καθὼς εἴρηται, τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ ἐπανήγαγεν.

his brother's ascetic praxis, particularly by associating Basil with Elijah and John the Baptist, two scriptural heroes that early Christians claimed as models of asceticism.[37] Basil, indeed, had praised both in the *Asketikon*.[38] In Gregory's *Funeral Oration to Basil*, Basil's asceticism connected to his proper grasp of Christian and non-Christian knowledge, and helped to paint an image of Basil as an exemplary philosopher whose external appearance reflected his internal virtue.

Elijah's divinely-commanded withdrawal (1 Kings 17:2-7) made him an ideal ascetic model for fourth-century Christians like Gregory of Nyssa. In the *Funeral Oration* to Basil, Gregory presented a detailed description of the prophet's physical features that connected him visually to the ascetics of his day:

> And afterwards…when Ahab….led the Israelite people to revolt with him, then God raised up Elijah…a man who, because of his disdain for care of the body, was unkempt (*auchmōnta*) in his face and shadowed by the mass of his own hair, a recluse (*idiastēn*) in his way of life, holy to behold because of his unsmiling countenance (*semnon prosidein en ameidei tōi prosōpōi*), and focused in his gaze (*sunneneumenon tōi blemmati*), covering with a goat-skin as much of his body as is more fittingly concealed, enduring the open air on the rest of his body and not at all distracted by the unevenness of heat and cold.[39]

---

[37] For Elijah and John as ascetic models in Late Antiquity, see Sterk, *Renouncing the World* (2004), 3, 22, 102-3, 127, 144, 211, 216, 223, 235, Claudia Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity* (2005), 111, and Martin Meiser, "Johannes der Täufer als Asket," in Hans-Ulrich Weidemann (ed.), *Asceticism and Exegesis in Early Christianity: the Reception of New Testament Texts in Ancient Ascetic Discourses*, Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus: Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 101 (Bristol, CT: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 78-91. For Christian reading of asceticism into the Old Testament more broadly, see Elizabeth A. Clark, *Reading Renunciation* (1999).

[38] *Ask.* LR 23.32. For Basil's advocacy of humble ascetic appearance, see Chapter 2.

[39] *IBF* 5.7, 10-11, 13-20. μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ…ὅτε Ἀχαὰβ…συναπέστησεν ἑαυτῷ τὸν Ἰσραηλίτην λαόν, τότε ἀναδείκνυσιν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν Ἠλίαν…ἄνδρα, ἐν ὑπεροψίᾳ τῆς θεραπείας τοῦ σώματος, αὐχμῶντα τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ τῷ πλήθει τῶν ἰδίων τριχῶν σκιαζόμενον, ἰδιαστὴν τῷ βίῳ, σεμνὸν προσιδεῖν ἐν ἀμειδεῖ τῷ προσώπῳ, καὶ συννενευμένον, τῷ βλέμματι δέρματι αἰγείῳ τοσοῦτον τοῦ σώματος σκέποντα ὅσον εὐπρεπέστερόν ἐστι καλυπτόμενον, τῷ δὲ λοιπῷ διακαρτεροῦντα πρὸς τὸν ἀέρα καὶ οὐδὲν πρὸς τὴν ἐκ τοῦ θάλπους τε καὶ κρύους ἀνωμαλίαν ἐπιστρεφόμενον. The full story of Elijah and Ahab comes from 1 Kings 16:29-22:54.

This *ekphrasis* crafted a vivid image of the prophet Elijah as an ascetic.[40] Significantly, the unkempt hair and filthy clothing that Gregory described on Elijah paralleled the physical features Basil himself had advocated for ascetics at Annisa. Here, the Nyssen's *ekphrasis* of Elijah linked the Old Testament prophet and Basil to one another. Those familiar with Basil's ascetic community at Annisa and the physical appearance advocated in the *Asketikon* would certainly have seen the connection, and would have imagined Basil in the *ekphrasis* of the prophet. Additionally, they could have easily contrasted this ascetic image of Elijah with fourth-century pro-Nicene caricatures of Arius, Aëtius, Eunomius, and Eudoxius as "anti-monks."[41] Ascetic appearance, moreover, was not the only respect in which Basil copied Elijah, according to Gregory. The prophet, Gregory declared, punished (*sōphronizei*) the people of Israel and "healed (*therapeuei*) the disease of idols" among them.[42] Elijah's role in providing healing (*therapeuein*) to cure the Israelites of their idolatry under Ahab paralleled Basil's role against the "idolatries" of anti-monastic non-Nicenes. By constructing this parallel, Gregory reinforced the presentation of Basil as a leader who used his self-moderation (*sōphrosunē*) to "heal" his community, in the same way Basil had described the necessity to heal "passions" within his community at Annisa.[43] Gregory's vivid description of the ascetic Elijah linked this Hebrew prophet to Basil in both appearance and in deed, thus presenting Basil as both ascetic and community leader.

---

[40] Stein, *Encomium of Saint Gregory* (1928), lxxxv.
[41] Richard Vaggione, "Of Monks and Lounge Lizards: 'Arians,' Polemics, and Asceticism in the Roman East," in Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams (eds.), *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993), 181-214.
[42] *IBF* 5.20-4. ὃς ἀναφανεὶς τῷ λαῷ, τῇ τε διὰ τοῦ λιμοῦ μάστιγι σωφρονίζει τὸν Ἰσραήλ, καθάπερ τινὶ σκυτάλῃ τῇ τοιαύτῃ πληγῇ τῆς ἀταξίας τοῦ λαοῦ καθαπτόμενος· μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ καὶ τῷ θείῳ πυρὶ τῷ περὶ τὴν ἱερουργίαν γεγενημένῳ θεραπεύει τὴν περὶ τὰ εἴδωλα νόσον.
[43] *Ask.* SR 50, *Ask.* SR 208. See discussion in Chapter Four.

Later in his oration, Gregory again took up the connection between Basil and Elijah by listing character traits his brother had shared with the prophet:

> What then are those things of our teacher that he holds in common with those observed in the prophet? Zeal in faith, enmity against oath-breakers, love for God, desire for what truly exists while not falling off to material things, a circumspect life in all things, an austere mode of living, a gaze tightened by the tension of his soul (*blemma tōi tonōi tēs psuchēs sunteinomenon*), unaffected dignity, a silence more effective than words, a care for things hoped for, a disdain for things visible, a similar concern for everything that appeared before him, whether he should come upon someone great in glory, or one lowly and despised should appear. These and similar things are those in which the life of our teacher imitates the wonders of Elijah.[44]

With this litany of positive qualities in which Basil copied Elijah, Gregory further asserted the legitimacy of his brother's asceticism. Basil, Gregory argued, embodied Elijah in not only looks, but also life. In addition to the *ekphrasis* of Elijah's ragged body that would have conjured up images of Basil's ascetic appearance, here Gregory asserted that Basil's likeness to this Old Testament prophet included attitudes and habits befitting a Christian philosopher. Particularly intriguing in Gregory's list of common qualities is his description of Basil's "gaze tightened by the tension of his soul." As discussed in Chapter One, Basil had presented ascetic praxis at Annisa as a process of controlling the senses and the voice, and had referred to the effects that visual and aural stimuli had on the "tension" of the soul. Here, Gregory's presentation of Basil presented his brother as one who had indeed achieved the proper "tension" in his soul. As with the legendary Elijah, so too did Basil appear as an ascetic whose bodily praxis corresponded to

---

[44] *IBF* 16.1-11. Τίνα οὖν ἐστιν ὅσα τοῦ διδασκάλου ἡμῶν πρὸς τὰ ἐν τῷ προφήτῃ θεωρούμενα τὴν κοινωνίαν ἔχει; ζῆλος πίστεως, δυσμένεια κατὰ τῶν ἀθετούντων, ἀγάπη πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, ἐπιθυμία τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος πρὸς οὐδὲν τῶν ὑλικῶν ἀπορρέουσα, ζωὴ διὰ πάντων ἐξητασμένη, βίος κατεσκληκώς, βλέμμα τῷ τόνῳ τῆς ψυχῆς συντεινόμενον, σεμνότης ἀνεπιτήδευτος· ἡσυχία λόγου ἐνεργεστέρα, φροντὶς περὶ τῶν ἐλπιζομένων, καταφρόνησις τῶν ὁρωμένων, ὁμοτιμία πρὸς πᾶν τὸ φαινόμενον, εἴτε τις τῶν ὑπερόγκων ἐν ἀξιώματι τύχοι, εἴτε τῶν ταπεινῶν τε καὶ ἀπερριμμένων προφαίνοιτο. ταῦτά ἐστι καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐν οἷς μιμεῖται ὁ τοῦ διδασκάλου βίος τὰ τοῦ Ἠλίου θαύματα.

virtuous character. Unlike "impostors" like Eustathius, Basil's ragged asceticism (as Gregory presented it) confirmed rather than concealed virtue.

For Gregory, an association of Basil to John the Baptist naturally complemented the one to Elijah. John, after all, appeared in the Gospels "in the spirit and power of Elijah."[45] In his *Funeral Oration to Basil*, Gregory, acknowledged that it would be difficult to compare anyone to John the Baptist, the first "among those born of women."[46] Still, he detailed a list of ascetic virtues that he claimed made the comparison valid between Basil and John, including his brother's disdain for the soft and luxurious (*malakēn te kai tethrummenēn*) way of life in favor of what was strong and manly (*to karterikon kai andrōdes*), his exposure to the elements, his bodily exercise (*katagumnazōn to sōma*) through fasting and self-control (*enkrateia*), and his combination of city and "desert" life.[47] As Andrea Sterk has remarked, this final feature highlighted Basil's balance of the active and contemplative life, which allowed him "to combine the virtues of monastic life with active pastoral care," one of the fundamental goals of classical education: to apply philosophical training achieved in private seclusion to the duties of leadership within the public sphere.[48] Significantly, Gregory connected this balance directly to Basil's masculinity: through his rejection of "feminine" qualities like softness and luxury in favor of what was "masculine," and through his ascetic exercise of self-control (*enkrateia*), he

---

[45] Luke 1:17. καὶ αὐτὸς προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει Ἠλίου. Gregory of Nyssa referred to this passage when he introduced John the Baptist into his funeral oration: *IBF* 6.2.

[46] Matt 11:9. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐκ ἐγήγερται ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν μείζων Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ. Introduction to Gregory's comparison: *IBF* 13.1-5.

[47] *IBF* 13.13-19. τίς οὐκ οἶδεν ὅπως μαλακήν τε καὶ τεθρυμμένην τοῦ βίου δίαιταν πολεμίαν ἡγήσατο, ἐν παντὶ τὸ καρτερικὸν καὶ ἀνδρῶδες πρὸ τῶν ἡδέων θηρώμενος, ἡλίῳ θαλπόμενος, κρύει παραβαλλόμενος, νηστείαις καὶ ἐγκρατείαις καταγυμνάζων τὸ σῶμα, ταῖς πόλεσιν ὡς ἐν ἐρήμοις ἐνδιατρίβων οὐδὲν εἰς ἀρετὴν ἐκ τῆς συντυχίας παραβλαπτόμενος, καὶ πόλεις τὰς ἐρημίας ἀπεργαζόμενος;

[48] Sterk, *Renouncing the World* (2004), 103. The city/desert association surely also referred to Athanasius' Antony, who famously made the desert a city of monks (*VA* 14.7)

appeared to Gregory's readers as an exemplary Christian philosopher who balanced action and contemplation.

Gregory also constructed this parallel between Basil and John the Baptist in order to present his brother as a pro-Nicene champion. He compared Basil's face-to-face meeting with the Homoian emperor Valens in 372 to John the Baptist's confrontation with Herod.[49] Just as Basil followed Elijah in "curing" his community of "idolatry," Gregory declared, so he followed John in speaking to rulers with the free speech (*parrhēsia*) befitting a philosopher: "John spoke freely (*parrhēsiazetai*) to Herod, and this one spoke freely to Valens."[50] This praise of Basil's *parrhēsia* in the face of a Homoian emperor certainly would have been politically current in 381, and Gregory of Nazianzus would likewise emphasize this encounter in his oration a year later.[51] Here, what is particularly intriguing about the Nyssen's account is that it focused on *parrhēsia* as a natural function of Basil's asceticism: because Basil embodied the ascetic virtues of John the Baptist, Gregory argued, he also performed the same philosophical *parrhēsia*. For Gregory, moreover, Basil performed this *parrhēsia* to an even greater degree than John, as his brother spoke not to a provincial ruler, but to the emperor of the world, and did so not over one woman, but in defense of the "true" religion.[52] Thus, Gregory's parallel between Basil and John reinforced the parallel he drew between Basil and Elijah: in both cases, Basil appeared as a proper philosopher not only in his ascetic praxis, but also in his actions defending the pro-Nicene community.

---

[49] For the historical context of this meeting, see Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (1994), 173-4.
[50] *IBF* 14.4-5. παρρησιάζεται πρὸς τὸν Ἡρώδην Ἰωάννης, καὶ οὗτος πρὸς Οὐάλεντα. For *parrhēsia* as a symbol of *paideia* in Late Antiquity, see Brown, *Power and Persuasion* (1992), 61-70.
[51] *Or.* 43.52.
[52] *IBF* 14.5-14.

Imprinting Basil onto the Audience

Gregory's rhetoric painted a picture of Basil as a student, a teacher, a champion against heretics, and a humble ascetic. The audience was expected to envision Basil as a model of proper (pro-Nicene) Christian philosophy, a philosophy that manifested itself through his knowledge, his ascetic habits, and his actions against the enemies of the "right" Christian community. Yet according to Gregory, there was a purpose to his encomium beyond simply admiring his brother's character and acknowledging his sainthood. Gregory expected his listeners, by envisioning Basil, to impress his virtue into their souls and to carry it on their bodies. This expectation is most clear at the conclusion of his oration, in which Gregory suggested that a *true* encomium to Basil operated through deeds (*ergōn*) rather than speech (*logou*):

> But what does this mean? That through memory of [Basil] our lives become better than is their habit. For just as in the case of a signet's bezel, when a most beautiful shape appears in the groove, the wax imprinted by the seal (*ho entupōtheis tēi sphragidi kēros*) has transferred the beauty which lies in the groove to itself, having assumed the entire character (*ton holon charaktēra*) of the seal in its own imprints (*tois idiois tupois*), and no one could, through speech, so bring into description the well-ordered grace of the carving as well as the one pointing to the beauty fashioned upon the wax (*tou kērou… memorphōmenon*): in the same manner, if one were to glorify the virtue of the teacher with mere speech, while another were to adorn (*kallōpizoi*) his own life through imitating the teacher, the praise fulfilled through life would be more efficacious than lofty speech.[53]

---

[53] *IBF* 26.11-27. τίς οὐκ οἶδεν ὅτι πᾶς λόγος τῶν ἔργων διεζευγμένος μάταιος καθ' ἑαυτόν ἐστι καὶ ἀνυπόστατος; ἡ δὲ τῶν ἔργων φύσις ἐν ὑποστάσει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τὸ λεγόμενον δείκνυσιν. οὐκοῦν προτιμότερος ἂν εἴη τοῦ λόγου ὁ διὰ τῶν ἔργων πληρούμενος ἔπαινος. τοῦτο δέ ἐστι τί; τὸ διὰ τῆς μνήμης ἐκείνου τὸν βίον ἡμῖν γενέσθαι τῆς συνηθείας βελτίονα. καθάπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ δακτυλίου σφενδόνης καλλίστης τινὸς ἐν γλυφίδι προφαινομένης μορφῆς, ὁ ἐντυπωθεὶς τῇ σφραγῖδι κηρὸς εἰς ἑαυτὸν τὸ ἐγκείμενον τῇ γλυφίδι κάλλος μετήνεγκεν, ὅλον τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῆς σφραγῖδος τοῖς ἰδίοις τύποις ἀναμαξάμενος· καὶ οὐκ ἄν τις οὕτω διὰ τοῦ λόγου τὴν εὐδιάθετον τῆς γλυφῆς ὥραν εἰς ὑπογραφὴν ἀγάγοι, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ κηροῦ δεικνύων μεμορφωμένον τὸ κάλλος· τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, εἰ ὁ μὲν λόγῳ ψιλῷ τοῦ διδασκάλου τὴν ἀρετὴν ἀποσεμνύνοι, ἕτερος δὲ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ βίον καλλωπίζοι διὰ τῆς πρὸς ἐκεῖνον μιμήσεως, ἐνεργότερος ἂν εἴη τοῦ ὑψηλοῦ λόγου ὁ διὰ τοῦ βίου πληρούμενος ἔπαινος.

Just as a seal on a ring shows its own form in the wax it impresses, Gregory announced, so Basil's life should reveal its "form" through others' imitation of his virtue. Gregory's use of imprinting language shows an important way in which he adapted the language of habit-formation that he and his brother deployed to describe ascetic praxis at Annisa. In the *Funeral Oration to Basil*, Gregory described learning proper Christian behavior in terms of imprinting a wax seal, just as Basil had described his ascetic retreat as a process of erasing and re-inscribing the wax tablet of the soul. For Gregory, however, Basil himself could be imprinted (*entupoun*) on the souls of his listeners, who were to adorn (*kallōpizein*) themselves with imitation of Basil. In this way Basil became, for Gregory, not merely the ideal teacher, but also the very substance, of Christian learning.

Gregory's conclusion further stressed Basil's role as both teacher and lesson of pro-Nicene Christian philosophy. As he exhorted his listeners, "by imitating the moderate one (*sōphrona*) with self-moderation (*sōphrosunēi*) in the things we do, let us praise him with worthy virtue, and let the wonder of the wise man in everything be fulfilled by sharing his wisdom."[54] After once again lauding his brother's ascetic rejection of the "world" and its "material" wealth, Gregory reminded his audience that his oration was a lesson in *sōphrosunē*, and that he and his brother were the teachers of this lesson. Similar to what he had done a little over a decade earlier in *On Virginity*, he constructed Basil's life as a "discipline" (*technē*) that could be taught and learned:

> For the student will be completed when he is just like the teacher. And indeed in other occupations, one who has been a student (*mathēteusas*) to a physician, a geometrician, or

[54] *IBF* 27.1-4. Οὕτως οὖν, ἀδελφοί, καὶ ἡμεῖς μιμησάμενοι τῇ σωφροσύνῃ τὸν σώφρονα οἷς ποιοῦμεν, κατ' ἀξίαν τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπαινέσωμεν, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα ὡσαύτως τὸ θαῦμα τοῦ σοφοῦ ἐν τῇ μετουσίᾳ τῆς σοφίας πληρούσθω.

> a rhetor, will be an unworthy praiser of his teacher's discipline (*technēs*) if he should admire his guide's knowledge in speech alone, but reveal within himself nothing worthy of admiration. For someone will say to him, "How can you call the physician your teacher, when you yourself are no physician? How can you call yourself a geometrician's student when you are ignorant of geometry?" But if someone shows in himself (*en heautōi*) the discipline in which he was a student (*tēn technēn hēi emathēteuse*), he exalts in his own knowledge the one who has guided him in the discipline (*ton tēs technēs kathēgēsamenon*). Thus we who magnify Basil the teacher must reveal his lesson in our lives (*tōi biōi deixōmen tēn mathēteian*), becoming that which made him famous and great to God and to people, in Jesus Christ our Lord, for whom glory and power forever and ever.[55]

After praising the discipline (*technē*) of asceticism in the first treatise he wrote back in 370, Gregory now turned his funeral oration to his brother into a praise of the "*technē* of Basility." The comparisons to the disciplines of medicine and geometry—the former comparison also appearing in *On Virginity*—show that the intellectual world of classical *paideia* was not far from Gregory's mind as he exalted his brother. The emphasis on Basil's life as a discipline similar to those of medicine and geometry echoed what Gregory had argued a decade earlier in *On Virginity*: Christian life was a lesson, and Basil was the ideal teacher to impart this lesson. At the same time, however, in the *Funeral Oration* Basil was the lesson itself, and Gregory's words were the curriculum. Gregory, through his oration praising Basil the teacher of Christian philosophy, became himself the teacher of the "discipline" of Basil's holy life. Gregory sought to imprint this holiness into the souls of his audience through his words of praise and his

---

[55] *IBF* 27.15-29. κατηρτισημένος γὰρ ἔσται μαθητὴς ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν, ὁ ἰατρῷ μαθητεύσας, ἢ γεωμέτρῃ, ἢ ῥήτορι, ἀναξιόπιστος ἐπαινέτης τῆς τοῦ διδασκάλου τέχνης γενήσεται, εἰ τῷ μὲν λόγῳ θαυμάζοι τοῦ καθηγητοῦ τὴν ἐπιστήμην, ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ δὲ δεικνύοι μηδὲν τοῦ θαύματος ἄξιον. ἐρεῖ γάρ τις πρὸς αὐτόν· πῶς λέγεις ἰατρὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ διδάσκαλον, αὐτὸς ἀνιάτρευτος ὤν; ἢ πῶς μαθητὴν σεαυτὸν τοῦ γεωμέτρου λέγεις ἀπείρως τῆς γεωμετρίας ἔχων; ἀλλ' εἴ τις ἐν ἑαυτῷ δείκνυσι τὴν τέχνην ᾗ ἐμαθήτευσε, σεμνύνει τῇ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐπιστήμῃ τὸν τῆς τέχνης καθηγησάμενον. οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ Βασίλειον αὐχοῦντες διδάσκαλον τῷ βίῳ δείξωμεν τὴν μαθητείαν, ἐκεῖνο γινόμενοι, ὅπερ αὐτὸν ὀνομαστόν τε καὶ μέγαν Θεῷ καὶ ἀνθρώποις ἐποίησεν, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

exhortations to action. By doing so, he strove to claim both his brother and himself as ideal Christian philosophers.

Gregory of Nyssa's *Funeral Oration to Basil* thus placed his brother on the level of sainthood, while offering others a path to connect with him on this lofty level. This oration fit into to Gregory's broader pro-Nicene campaign after Basil's death. By emphasizing his brother's intellectual prowess in both Christian and non-Christian wisdom as his weapon against "heretics," he sent a clear message that Basil, *not* rivals like Eunomius, appropriately applied classical knowledge to the theological debates of fourth-century Christians in the East. Yet Gregory's presentation of Basil as a legitimate Christian philosopher involved more than his use of Greek philosophy: Gregory linked his brother's ascetic praxis directly to his role as a pro-Nicene champion. Just as Elijah fought Ahab, so Basil fought Aëtius, Eunomius, and company. Just as John the Baptist confronted Herod, so Basil confronted Valens. Each of these comparisons asserted Basil as a genuine ascetic by emphasizing his bodily praxis alongside his virtuous action. Gregory's rhetoric, however, did more than simply praise his brother as an ideal philosopher. By encouraging his audience to practice Basil's life like a *technē*, Gregory presented his brother as both philosoph*er* and philosoph*y*, and to imprint this model into the souls of his listeners. While Gregory certainly put Basil on a higher level than that of regular mortals, the words of his oration offered a way to access this level by absorbing and reproducing the philosophical *habitus* Basil embodied.

The *Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus*, Projecting pro-Nicene Philosophy into the Past

Gregory of Nyssa's encomium to his brother Basil may offer the most salient example of how he sought to inculcate his audience with ideals of philosophy and pro-Nicene orthodoxy by connecting them to a prominent deceased bishop, but it was not the only such example. Indeed, less than a year before he delivered his *Funeral Oration to Basil*, Gregory composed another text in which he projected pro-Nicene orthodoxy onto the life of Gregory Thaumaturgus, a legendary third-century bishop from Pontus. Delivered orally to an audience in May of 380 and likely revised in writing for later circulation, the *Life* of Thaumaturgus brought this famous Christian of third-century Asia Minor into Gregory's debates over philosophy and religious orthodoxy in the later fourth century.[56] This *Life*, like all ancient biographies/hagiographies, was far from a simple portrayal of reality. As Vasiliki Limberis has noted, Gregory deployed the memory of Thaumaturgus to emphasize his family's connection to a saint who was popular in Cappadocia.[57] Further, as Samuel Rubenson has noted, the *Life* particularly emphasized Thaumaturgus' ability both to master "secular" education and to apply it to the greater quest for divine wisdom.[58] Here, I argue that Thaumaturgus was essential to Gregory's efforts at presenting a Christian philosophy that was distinctly pro-Nicene. In the *Life* of Thaumaturgus, Gregory projected pro-Nicene orthodoxy onto a prominent bishop from the past, thus lending legitimacy to his own theological faction. Thaumaturgus, in Gregory's rhetoric, appeared as the same kind of philosopher that Basil was—one who applied his "proper" use of secular and sacred wisdom to fighting enemies

---

[56] For analysis of the *Life's* relation to the historical Gregory Thaumaturgus, see Raymond Van Dam, "Hagiography and History: the Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus," *Classical Antiquity* 1:2 (1982), 272-308; Stephen Mitchell, "The Life and *Lives* of Gregory Thaumaturgus," in Jan Willem Drijvers, J.W. Watt (eds.), *Portraits of Spiritual Authority: Religious Power in Early Christianity, Byzantium, and the Christian Orient*, Religions in the Greco-Roman World 137 (Boston: Brill, 1999), 99-138; Sterk, *Renouncing the World* (2004), 106-10.
[57] Limberis, *Architects of Piety* (2011), 133-5.
[58] Samuel Rubenson, "Philosophy and Simplicity" (2004), 125-6.

of the church. Indeed, for his audience, the enemies that Gregory presented Thaumaturgus battling would have been easily identifiable with Aëtius and Eunomius. Additionally, Gregory presented Thaumaturgus as an ideal Basilian ascetic, whose withdrawal from city life and disdain for things worldly equipped him to spot "real" virtue from the false adornments of rivals.

As was the case with his *Funeral Oration to Basil*, moreover, Gregory intended his audience to absorb these fused ideals of pro-Nicene orthodoxy and asceticism by listening to the words that he spoke. At the beginning of his *Life* of Thaumaturgus, Gregory presented this text as a means of connecting author, subject, and audience. He called on the aid of the Holy Spirit, "so that so noble a man [Thaumaturgus] may be displayed to those who are here in his memory just as he was seen on the occasion of his deeds by those who were there at the time."[59] In this introduction, Gregory sought to engage his audience's senses: listeners were to learn about Thaumaturgus' virtues by *visualizing* them. The introduction's sensory language focused particularly on the interplay between sight and sound:

> But the speech, if it is done right, has such grace that the benefit to the hearers will be common, just like the beacon, for those who are steering towards it from the open sea, directs those who are sailing aimlessly on the ocean in the dark. Therefore I think we both need to take equal care in this endeavor, you in listening and I in speaking. For it is clear than when his life of virtue, like a beacon of fire, shines out to our souls through

[59] *VGTh* 1. Ἔστι δὲ αὕτη, κατά γε τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον, ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάρις, ἡ καὶ πρὸς τὸν βίον καὶ πρὸς τὸν λόγον τοὺς περὶ ἑκάτερον τούτων ἐσπουδακότας δι' ἑαυτῆς ἐνισχύουσα. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ὁ λαμπρὸς ἐκεῖνος καὶ περίβλεπτος βίος τῇ δυνάμει κατωρθώθη τοῦ Πνεύματος· εὐχῆς ἔργον ἐστὶ, τοσαύτην ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον βοήθειαν, ὅση γέγονε παρὰ τὸν βίον ἐκείνῳ, ὡς μὴ κατόπιν εὑρεθῆναι τῆς ἀξίας τῶν κατορθωμάτων τὸν ἔπαινον, ἀλλὰ τοιοῦτον ἐπιδειχθῆναι τοῖς παροῦσι διὰ τῆς μνήμης τὸν ἄνδρα, οἷος ἦν τοῖς κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων ὁρώμενος.

> memory, it becomes a path toward the good both for the speaker and the listeners (*hodos pros to agathon tōi te diexionti kai tois akouousi*).[60]

Not only did Gregory of Nyssa stress benefits of hearing in his introduction to the *Life* of Thaumaturgus, his analogy to the beacon intertwined hearing and sight. While his words entered the audience through the ears, they provided the same benefit to the eyes that a bright light in the darkness offered sailors. As discussed previously, rhetorical *ekphrasis* connected sound and sight, as the words a speaker heard in an oration were meant to evoke images within the listener's mind.[61] While not an official *ekphrasis*, Gregory's language here drew on the same goal of bringing images before the mental eyes of his listeners. Additionally, Gregory's claim that this biographical oration would benefit both hearers *and* the speaker (himself) blurred the lines between teacher and student. As speaker, he imparted words in order to edify the souls of his audience, while those words offered the same benefit to himself. After all, *he* was not the beacon, *Thaumaturgus* was. Yet by speaking words about Thaumaturgus, Gregory placed himself in the active role of teaching, imparting words to his passive audience. This ambiguity situated Gregory as both teacher of his audience and student of Thaumaturgus. As with the "*technē* of Basility," the lesson that Gregory's Thaumaturgus imparted offered his audience a model life in which pro-Nicene orthodoxy and ascetic praxis naturally intertwined to reveal a proper Christian philosopher.

---

[60] *VGTh* 2. ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἡ τοιαύτη τοῦ λόγου χάρις, εἰ προσηκόντως γένοιτο, κοινὸν ἔσται τῶν ἀκουόντων τὸ κέρδος, καθάπερ ὁ πυρσὸς τοῖς ἐκ θαλάσσης προσπλέουσιν ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν εὐθύνων τοὺς ἐν τῷ ζόφῳ πλανωμένους κατὰ τὸ πέλαγος· ἴσης οἶμαι δεῖν πρὸς τοῦτο τῆς σπουδῆς ἑκατέροις, ὑμῖν τε πρὸς τὴν ἀκρόασιν, καὶ πρὸς τὸν λόγον ἐμοί. Δῆλον γὰρ, ὅτι πυρσοῦ δίκην διὰ τῆς μνήμης ἐκλάμψας ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἡμῶν ὁ κατ' ἀρετὴν αὐτοῦ βίος, ὁδὸς πρὸς τὸ ἀγαθὸν τῷ τε διεξιόντι καὶ τοῖς ἀκούουσι γίνεται.

[61] Webb, *Ekphrasis* (2009), 7-9; Harrison, *Art of Listening* (2013), 35. See also discussion in Chapter One.

Thaumaturgus the anti-Eunomian Philosopher

In Gregory's rhetoric, Thaumaturgus' life provided a worthy lesson both to himself as narrator and his audience as listeners/viewers. This lesson actively promoted Thaumaturgus as a pro-Nicene Christian philosopher, just as Gregory would present Basil less than a year later. While Thaumaturgus lived and died a century before the theological controversies in which Basil and Gregory were immersed, by projecting his orthodoxy onto Thaumaturgus the Nyssen sought to legitimize his philosophical self-presentation through the memory of a past saint. To do so, Gregory constructed his text as a form of Christian *paideia* that modified its secular counterpart. He claimed to distinguish his *Life* from conventional panegyrics: "no one of those educated (*pepaideumenōn*) in divine wisdom should seek to praise someone spiritually commendable with the artistic (*technikais*) devices of *encomia*, as is the custom of those outside (*tōn exō*)."[62] Yet the structure of the *Life* shows that Gregory included many "artistic devices" of panegyric: praise of the subject's homeland, city, and family; youth and early education; moral qualities; life and accomplishments; death; comparison to other great figures.[63] The presence of these traditional panegyrical features, however, functions as part of the very message that the *Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus* sought to convey: Christian *paideia* was different from (and better than) its secular counterpart, because it adapted the techniques of classical learning in way that properly edified speakers and audiences with divine wisdom.

Gregory's description of Thaumaturgus' education highlights this adaptation. According to the *Life*, Thaumaturgus mirrored Basil in possessing the disposition of a mature adult in

---

[62] *VGTh* 4. Μηδεὶς δὲ τῶν τῇ θείᾳ σοφίᾳ πεπαιδευμένων κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἔξω συνήθειαν ταῖς τεχνικαῖς τῶν ἐγκωμίων ἐφόδοις ἐπαινεῖσθαι ζητείτω τὸν πνευματικῶς ἐπαινούμενον.
[63] Van Dam, "Hagiography and History" (1982), 278-9.

youth.[64] This disposition manifested itself in a series of philosophical virtues, including wisdom (*sophia*), self-moderation (*sōphrosunē*), self-control (*enkrateia*), modesty (*atuphon*), freedom from anger (*aorgēton*), and disdain for possessions (*tōn chrēmatōn huperopsia*).[65] Gregory followed this litany of positive qualities with an extended simile to Abraham, who had applied Chaldean philosophy to contemplate divine wisdom.[66] Like Abraham, Gregory argued, Thaumaturgus set "external" knowledge toward a loftier goal:

> In just the same way also this Great One, when he had assiduously acquainted himself with external (*exō*) philosophy, through the things by which Hellenism (*Hellēnismos*) convinces most people, by these same things he was led to the understanding of Christianity (*Christianismou*), and forsaking the mistaken worship of his ancestors, he sought the truth of reality, since he had been taught (*didachtheis*), from the very things at which those outside (*tois exōthen*) labor, the incoherence of Greek teachings (*Hellenikōn dogmatōn*).[67]

By emphasizing his knowledge—and, indeed, conquest—of "external" learning, Gregory distinguished Thaumaturgus' education in the same way that he distinguished the structure of his text. Just as Gregory did not follow the standard conventions of "outside" panegyric, so Thaumaturgus did not follow the standard path of "outside" education: instead, he was taught in Greek teachings only to reject them in favor of Christian truth. In this way, Gregory claimed, Thaumaturgus was not only like Abraham, but also like Moses, who "was educated in all wisdom of the Egyptians (*Acts* 7:22)" before learning divine wisdom, just as Thaumaturgus,

---

[64] *VGTh* 11.

[65] *VGTh* 12. Γίνεται δὲ αὐτῷ πρώτη τῆς κτήσεως τῶν ἀρετῶν, ἡ περὶ τὴν σοφίαν σπουδή. Ταύτῃ δὲ συνείπετο καθάπερ τις πῶλος συνεζευγμένη ἡ σωφροσύνη· πρὸς ἀμφότερα δὲ σύμμαχος ἦν ἡ ἐγκράτεια· τὸ δὲ ἄτυφον αὐτῷ καὶ ἀόργητον, τῇ τῶν χρημάτων ὑπεροψίᾳ συγκατωρθώθη.

[66] *VGTh* 12.

[67] *VGTh* 12. οὕτω καὶ ὁ Μέγας οὗτος, τῇ ἔξω φιλοσοφίᾳ δι' ἐπιμελείας καθομιλήσας, δι' ὧν ὁ Ἑλληνισμὸς τοῖς πολλοῖς βεβαιοῦται, διὰ τούτων ὡδηγήθη πρὸς τὴν τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ κατανόησιν, καὶ καταλιπὼν τὴν πεπλανημένην τῶν πατέρων θρησκείαν, ἐζήτει τὴν τῶν ὄντων ἀλήθειαν, ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν πεπονημένων τοῖς ἔξωθεν διδαχθεὶς τὸ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν δογμάτων ἀσύστατον.

"passing through all the learning (*paideuseōs*) of the Greeks," became a "student (*mathetēs*) of the Gospel."[68] Gregory's presentation of Thaumaturgus' education highlighted this third-century saint as an ideal Christian philosopher who, like Basil, both mastered "external" learning and applied it to his quest for divine wisdom.

According to Gregory, Thaumaturgus' proper application of classical *paideia* naturally opposed him to the petty squabbling of "other" philosophers. As he continued his praise of Thaumaturgus' education, he argued that other philosophers cared more about the subtleties of language and argumentation than about divine wisdom:

> For after he saw Greek and barbarian philosophy alike divided (*schizomenēn*) into different conceptions in their opinions about the divine (*tais peri tou Theiou doxais*), and he saw the leaders of the teachings not converging toward one another but competing to consolidate each position separately by subtlety of logic (*tēi perinoiai tōn logōn*), he left them to refute each other as if in a civil war. He, for his part, embraced the solid discourse (*logon*) of faith which has its foundation in no fancy logical footwork (*logikēi periergiai*) or artistic snares (*technikais plokais*), but rather was announced to all in simplicity of expression (*di'haplotētos rhematōn*), and which manifests its trustworthiness because it is above proof. For if what was said were such that it could be comprehended by the power of human thoughts (*anthrōpinōn logismōn*), it would in no way differ from Greek wisdom, for they have the opinion that what they are able to comprehend is the same as what is. But since comprehension of the transcendent nature is inaccessible to human reasonings (*anepibatos…anthrōpinois logismois*), on this

---

[68] *VGTh* 14. Διὰ ταῦτα, καθὼς περὶ τοῦ Μωϋσέως φησὶν ἡ Γραφὴ, ὅτι ἐπαιδεύθη πάσῃ σοφίᾳ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων· οὕτως καὶ ὁ Μέγας οὗτος, διὰ πάσης ἐλθὼν τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων παιδεύσεως, καὶ γνοὺς τῇ πείρᾳ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς δογμάτων τὸ ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀσύστατον, μαθητὴς τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου καθίσταται. For Moses as a model for late ancient bishops, see Sterk, "On Basil, Moses and the Model Bishop: the Cappadocian Legacy of Leadership," *Church History* 67:2 (1998), 227-53; Claudia Rapp, "Comparison, Paradigm, and the Case of Moses in Panegyric and Hagiography," in Mary Whitby (ed.), *The Propaganda of Power: the Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (Boston: Brill, 1998), 277-98.

> account faith replaces thoughts (*pistis anti tōn logismōn ginetai*), extending itself to those things which are above reason and comprehension.[69]

While this passage certainly draws on a common Christian *topos* contrasting the simplicity of divine learning with the fancy sophistry of "worldly" knowledge, it is hard to miss its relevance to Gregory's fourth-century theological conflicts.[70] Indeed, later in the *Life* Gregory would more explicitly present Thaumaturgus as a champion of orthodoxy against "those who were debasing the true teaching, and through the plausibility of their proposals often made the truth ambiguous, even to experts."[71] Here, in the description of Thaumaturgus' early education, the "other" schools of Greek and barbarian philosophy, divided (*schizomenēn*) and following their own opinions (*doxai*), represented Christian groups that Gregory would have considered heretical. In particular, the contrast between forming opinions (*doxai*) about the Divine through human logic (*perinoia tōn logōn*, *logikē periergia*, *technikai plokai, anthrōpinoi logismoi*) and the simplicity of Thaumaturgus' "genuine" faith jabbed at Eunomius.[72] Indeed, Gregory was composing the first two books of *Against Eunomius* at around the same time that he first delivered his *Life* of Thaumaturgus orally. Thaumaturgus' conquest of "secular" philosophy thus turned into a

---

[69] *VGTh* 13. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ εἶδεν πρὸς διαφόρους ὑπολήψεις ἐν ταῖς περὶ τοῦ Θείου δόξαις σχιζομένην τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν καὶ τὴν βάρβαρον ὁμοίως φιλοσοφίαν, καὶ τοὺς τῶν δογμάτων προεστηκότας, οὔτε πρὸς ἀλλήλους συμβαίνοντας, καὶ τὸ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἕκαστον κρατύνειν τῇ περινοίᾳ τῶν λόγων φιλονεικοῦντας· τούτους μὲν ὥσπερ ἐν ἐμφυλίῳ πολέμῳ ὑπ' ἀλλήλων ἀνατρεπομένους κατέλιπεν· καταλαμβάνει δὲ τὸν ἑστῶτα λόγον τῆς πίστεως, τὸν οὐδεμιᾷ λογικῇ τινι περιεργίᾳ καὶ τεχνικαῖς πλοκαῖς κρατυνόμενον, ἀλλὰ δι' ἁπλότητος ῥημάτων ὁμοτίμως πᾶσι καταγγελλόμενον· ὃς ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ὑπὲρ τὴν πίστιν εἶναι, τὸ πιστὸν ἔχει. Εἰ γὰρ τοιοῦτον ἦν τὸ λεγόμενον, ὡς τῇ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων λογισμῶν δυνάμει καταλαμβάνεσθαι, οὐδὲν ἂν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς σοφίας διήνεγκε (κἀκεῖνοι γὰρ, ὅπερ ἂν καταλαβεῖν ἐξισχύσωσιν, ἐκεῖνο καὶ εἶναι δοξάζουσιν), ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀνεπίβατός ἐστι λογισμοῖς ἀνθρωπίνοις τῆς ὑπερκειμένης φύσεως ἡ κατάληψις, τούτου χάριν ἡ πίστις ἀντὶ τῶν λογισμῶν γίνεται, τοῖς ὑπὲρ λόγον τε καὶ κατάληψιν ἑαυτὴν ἐπεκτείνουσα.

[70] For the theme of Christian simplicity, see especially Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire* (1991), 155-88.

[71] *VGTh* 29. ἦσαν γὰρ δὴ καὶ τότε τινὲς, οἱ τὴν εὐσεβῆ διδασκαλίαν παραχαράττοντες, διὰ τῆς πιθανότητος τῶν ἐπιχειρημάτων, ἀμφίβολον ποιοῦντες πολλάκις καὶ τοῖς συνετοῖς τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

[72] For these themes in Gregory's *Against Eunomius*, see esp. *CE* 1.1.430, 1.1.367, 2.1.81-2, 2.1.94-5, 2.1.97.

conquest of the errors Gregory saw in the theological methods of non-Nicenes like Eunomius. The *topos* of Christian simplicity served Gregory well as he turned Thaumaturgus into a rhetorical weapon against Christians whom he accused of *mis*using Greek *paideia*. Just as he claimed that Basil applied his education to fighting Eunomian "heretics," here too he memorialized Thaumaturgus fighting Eunomians a century before they even existed. In doing so, he sought to assert the the superiority of his and his brother's ideal philosophy/orthodoxy transcended temporal boundaries.

Thaumaturgus the Basilian Ascetic

Gregory's description of Thaumaturgus' appropriation of *paideia* thus opposed the simplicity of "genuine" (pro-Nicene) Christian learning against the fanciful rhetorical footwork deployed by "heretics." As the ideal teacher of both Gregory and his audience, Thaumaturgus provided a model of this Christian learning that others could absorb through speaking, hearing, and visualizing his life, similar to how Gregory would present his brother in the *Funeral Oration to Basil*. In addition to this overlap between Thaumaturgus and Basil in their uses of *paideia*, these two bishops also appear in Gregory's rhetoric as ideal ascetics. Gregory, indeed, promoted Thaumaturgus as a model ascetic in a way that would have immediately linked him to Basil in the minds of his audience. Gregory presented this third-century saint's initial attraction to ascetic life in terms that echoed Basil's original retreat from Caesarea to Annisa in 357. As the *Life* narrates, after Thaumaturgus came back from his schooling in Alexandria, "all the people looked

at the man, and all were expecting him to share his learning (*dēmosieuein…tēn paideusin*) in common assemblies."[73] He, however, preferred withdrawal to engagement in the assemblies:

> But that Great One, knowing when it was fitting for true philosophy to be made public by those who seek to understand it accurately, so that he may not be wounded in soul by the love of honor—for the praise of listeners is dangerous, slackening the healthy tension of the soul (*tēs psuchēs ton suntonon*) with a certain arrogance and love of glory—for this reason he made silence his example, displaying the treasure which lay within not by words but by deed. Separating himself from the commotions of the marketplace and from town life altogether, he lived in a remote place alone with himself, and through himself with God. He made little account of the whole world and those in it, not busy running kingdoms, not looking for posts of leadership, not listening to anyone explain how some public matter was being managed.[74]

This passage offers another *topos* of Christian biography, that of the world-renouncing ascetic. This *topos*, however, held particular significance to Gregory, as he sought to construct his and Basil's retreat at Annisa as a training ground for Christian philosophy. Indeed, the tone of this passage about Thaumaturgus' withdrawal from urban society parallels portrayals of city life given in both Gregory's *On Virginity* and Basil's *Asketikon* and *Ep*. 2. Gregory's Thaumaturgus, by ignoring positions of leadership and city affairs—the traditional gifts of elite *paideia* in antiquity—clearly mirrored Basil. Gregory, moreover, emphasized Thaumaturgus' withdrawal as a sensory process. His claim that hearing affected the *tonos* of the soul paralleled Basil's language in *Ep.* 2, as both argued that withdrawal was necessary because in regular city life,

---

[73] *VGTh* 24. Παντὸς δὲ τοῦ ἔθνους πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα βλέποντος, καὶ πάντων προσδεχομένων δημοσιεύειν αὐτὸν ἐν κοινοῖς συλλόγοις τὴν παίδευσιν, ὡς ἄν τινα καρπὸν σχοίη τῶν μακρῶν πόνων τὴν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εὐδοκίμησιν.

[74] *VGTh* 24. εἰδὼς ὁ μέγας ἐκεῖνος ὅθεν προσήκει τὴν ἀληθῆ φιλοσοφίαν παρὰ τῶν ἀκριβῶς μετιόντων δημοσιεύεσθαι, ὡς ἂν μήποτε φιλοτιμίᾳ τινὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τρωθείη (δεινὸς γάρ ἐστι τῶν ἀκουόντων ὁ ἔπαινος, τύφῳ τινὶ καὶ φιλοδοξίᾳ τῆς ψυχῆς ὑποχαυνῶσαι), τούτου χάριν ἐπίδειξιν ποιεῖται τὴν σιωπὴν, ἔργῳ δεικνὺς τὸν ἐγκείμενον θησαυρὸν, οὐχὶ ῥήμασι, καὶ τῶν κατ' ἀγορὰν θορύβων, καὶ καθόλου τῆς ἐν ἄστει διαγωγῆς ἑαυτὸν χωρίσας, ἐν ἐσχατιᾷ τινι ἑαυτῷ μόνῳ συνῆν, καὶ δι' ἑαυτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ, μικρὸν παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ λόγον ποιούμενος, οὐ βασιλείας πολυπραγμονῶν, οὐκ ἀρχὰς ἐξετάζων, οὐ πῶς διοικεῖταί τι τῶν κοινῶν διεξιόντος ἀκούων.

certain "worldly" sounds entered the soul and "loosened" it.[75] Gregory's language even suggested that improper hearing would make the soul more porous, and thus susceptible to negative influences: the verb *hupochaunoun* ("to slacken") was related to the adjective *chaunos* ("porous," "spongy"). In Gregory's rhetoric, Thaumaturgus maintained the strength of his soul through ascetic withdrawal in order to prevent praise from entering his ears and weakening it.

Later in the *Life*, another account highlights Gregory's attribution of ascetic authority to Thaumaturgus in a way that reveals the ideals of elite culture and pro-Nicene orthodoxy that he and Basil promoted. In this account, which occurs after Thaumaturgus' election as bishop of Neocaesarea, Thaumaturgus comes to Comana, a small town in Pontus, in order to settle a dispute over who should become the town's bishop (an endeavor in which Gregory himself was engaged in 380). While the people promoted candidates based on their physical beauty and eloquence, Thaumaturgus only sought someone who lived virtuously, regardless of appearance and/or education. After he rejected several well-qualified candidates, someone sarcastically suggested he pick a simple coal-burner named Alexander. Thaumaturgus, taking the request seriously, summoned Alexander.[76] When the coal-burner entered, the others mocked his filthy appearance:

> Yet to [Thaumaturgus'] clear-sighted (*dioratikōi*) eye, the spectacle furnished a great astonishment: a man in extreme poverty and unkempt body, who respected himself (*pros heauton blepōn*) and so exulted in this appearance (*schemati*), which was most ridiculous to uneducated eyes (*apaideutois ophthalmois*).[77]

---

[75] *Ep.* 2.2. See discussion in Chapter One.
[76] *VGTh* 64-5.
[77] *VGTh* 65. τῷ δὲ διορατικῷ ἐκείνῳ ὀφθαλμῷ πολλὴν παρεῖχεν ἔκπληξιν τὸ γινόμενόν τε καὶ ὁρώμενον· ἀνὴρ ἐν ἐσχάτῃ πενίᾳ, καὶ ἀπημελημένῳ τῷ σώματι πρὸς ἑαυτὸν βλέπων, καὶ οἷον ἐπαγαλλόμενος τούτῳ τῷ σχήματι, ὃ τοῖς ὃ τοῖς ἀπαιδεύτοις ὀφθαλμοῖς ἦν ἐπιγέλαστον.

Because his eye could "see through" (*dioratikos*, *dia* + *horan*) external façades, Gregory argued, Thaumaturgus could determine Alexander's character underneath the filth of his apparent profession, in contrast to the "uneducated" (*apaideutoi*) eyes of those mocking the coal-burner. Indeed, as Gregory took care to emphasize, Alexander was not *actually* a coal-burner, but a philosopher who only took up coal-burning to show his disdain for the "secular" world.[78] Gregory even listed an alternate version of this story, in which Alexander, a flourishing youth, "thought that it was dangerous to his goal of self-moderation (*sōphrosunē*) to display the beauty of his body like someone flaunting his natural endowment," and therefore "donned coal-burning as a kind of ugly mask (*prosōpeion*), and through it he trained (*egumnazeto*) his body for virtue by hard work, and concealed his beauty with coal dust while at the same time he used the earnings from his labors for the service of the commandments."[79] Gregory thus attached this coal-burner's filthy appearance directly to his embodiment of philosophical *sōphrosunē*.

As the story continues, once Thaumaturgus discerns Alexander's "genuine" status as a philosopher, he sends out the others and has the coal-burner/philosopher washed and clothed in some of his own garments.[80] After bringing everyone back in, he reveals Alexander, clean and beautiful, and remonstrates the stunned audience of former mockers for their lack of discernment:

---

[78] *VGTh* 66.

[79] *VGTh* 67. Ἄλλως δὲ, καὶ ὑπερανθῶν τῇ νεότητι, σφαλερὸν ἡγεῖτο τῷ τῆς σωφροσύνης σκοπῷ, φανερὸν ποιεῖν τὸ κάλλος τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὥσπερ ἐμπομπεύων τῇ εὐκληρίᾳ τῆς φύσεως· ἤδει γὰρ χαλεπῶν καταπτωμάτων ἀφορμὴν τοῖς πολλοῖς τὸ τοιοῦτον γινόμενον. Ὡς ἂν οὖν μήτε πάθοι τι τῶν ἀβουλήτων, μήτε πάθους ὑπόθεσις ἀλλοτρίοις ὀφθαλμοῖς κατασταίη, διὰ τοῦτο καθάπερ τι προσωπεῖον εἰδεχθὲς τὴν ἀνθρακοποιίαν ἑκουσίως ἑαυτῷ περιτίθησι, δι' ἧς τὸ σῶμα τοῖς πόνοις πρὸς ἀρετὴν ἐγυμνάζετο, καὶ τὸ κάλλος τῷ ῥύπῳ τῶν ἀνθράκων ἐπεκαλύπτετο, καὶ ἅμα τὸ ἐκ τῶν πόνων αὐτῷ προσγινόμενον εἰς ἐντολῶν ὑπηρεσίαν ᾠκονόμητο.

[80] *VGTh* 68.

> ‘You have suffered nothing new,’ the teacher (*didaskalos*) said to them, ‘misled by your eyes and entrusting the judgment of the beautiful to sense alone (*tēi aisthēsei monēi*). For sense is a risky criterion of the truth of real things, since it blocks the entrance into the depth of understanding.’[81]

The newly-revealed philosopher then addresses the crowd, immediately proving the legitimacy of Thaumaturgus’ discerning eye with a “speech full of understanding (*plērēs dianoias ho logos*), but not particularly adorned (*kekallōpismenos*) with the flower of dialect (*lexeōs*).”[82] Indeed, Gregory stresses, Alexander’s speech is so simple that “one of the insolent youths from Attica who was visiting them ridiculed his dialect’s lack of beauty (*to akalles tēs lexeōs*), since it was not adorned with Attic fanciness (*tēi periergiai tēi Attikēi kekallōpisto*).”[83] This brazen youth is then immediately “chastened by a divine vision (*ek theioteras opseōs sōphronisthēnai*)” of shining doves that represented the divine favor granted to Alexander, thus proving the value of the philosopher/coal-burner’s speech.[84] The Attic youth thus appears as a foil to Alexander, opposing his simple speech because of his own appreciation for rhetorical adornment. Naturally, the *Life* shows Thaumaturgus and Alexander on the right side of the argument, supported by divine favor.

---

[81] *VGTh* 69. Πάντων δὲ πρὸς τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον ἐπιστραφέντων, καὶ θαυμαστικῶς πρὸς τὸ φαινόμενον διακειμένων, Οὐδὲν καινὸν πεπόνθατε, φησὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ διδάσκαλος, ὀφθαλμοῖς ἀπατηθέντες, καὶ τῇ αἰσθήσει μόνῃ τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ κάλλους ἐπιτρέψαντες. Σφαλερὸν γὰρ κριτήριον τῆς τῶν ὄντων ἀληθείας ἡ αἴσθησις, τὴν πρὸς τὸ βάθος τῆς διανοίας εἴσοδον δι’ ἑαυτῆς ἀποκλείουσα.

[82] *VGTh* 70. Πάντων δὲ πρὸς τὸν νέον ἱερέα ἀποβλεπόντων, προτραπείς τινα πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν λόγον ποιήσασθαι, ἔδειξεν εὐθὺς ἐν προοιμίοις τῆς ἀρχῆς ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἄψευστον ἐπ’ αὐτῷ τοῦ μεγάλου Γρηγορίου τὴν κρίσιν. Ἦν γὰρ αὐτῷ πλήρης διανοίας ὁ λόγος, ἧττον τῷ ἄνθει κεκαλλωπισμένος τῆς λέξεως.

[83] *VGTh* 70. Ὅθεν τις τῶν νέων ἀγέρωχος ἐκ τῆς Ἀτθίδος αὐτοῖς ἐπιχωριάζων, τὸ ἀκαλλὲς τῆς λέξεως ὑπεγέλασεν, ὅτι μὴ τῇ περιεργίᾳ τῇ Ἀττικῇ κεκαλλώπιστο.

[84] *VGTh* 70. ὅν φασιν ἐκ θειοτέρας ὄψεως σωφρονισθῆναι, ἰδόντα περιστερῶν ἀγέλην ἀμηχάνῳ τινὶ διαλάμπουσαν κάλλει, καί τινος ἀκηκοέναι λέγοντος, Ἀλεξάνδρου τὰς περιστερὰς εἶναι ταύτας, ἃς ἐν γέλωτι ἐκεῖνος πεποίηται. The symbolism of doves related Alexander to Christ, upon whom the Holy Spirit descended in the shape of a dove at baptism (Matt. 3:16, Mark 1:10, Luke 3:22, John 1:32).

This story reveals how Gregory brought his elite background into his memorial to Thaumaturgus in order to construct an ideal philosophical *habitus* that reflected upper-class Roman values. In the *Life*, Alexander's effort to conceal his physical beauty underneath the ragged façade of a coal-burner mirrored the humble appearance promoted by other authors who sought to fashion themselves and their followers as philosophers. Like Basil's *Ep.* 2 or Julian's *Misōpōgon*, Gregory's *Life* of Thaumaturgus offered the message that a filthy body provided as much (if not more) access to divine virtue as the well-groomed body of an educated elite. At the same time, however, Gregory needed to assure his audience that a humble appearance was only an effective marker of philosophical virtue when it was worn on the body of an elite. Gregory's insistence that Alexander was a philosopher in disguise reveals his underlying belief that educated leaders naturally came from elite backgrounds. As Andrea Sterk has remarked, "despite appearances…the charcoal burner was in reality neither from the lower social classes nor completely uneducated."[85] Here, Gregory sought explicitly to distinguish his and Basil's ideal philosophical *habitus* from that of rivals like Eustathius. Like his older brother Basil, Gregory promoted an ascetic praxis that advocated humility and simplicity in appearance. Yet also like his brother, he maintained social hierarchies within his ascetic praxis and stigmatized supposed egalitarian ascetics like the Eustathians as "extremist" impostors who only presented humble appearance for show. In the *Life* of Gregory Thaumaturgus, the story of Alexander promoted the idea that philosophical virtue was the prerogative of the educated elite. This humble figure showed not that coal-burners could be philosophers, but that philosophers should be like coal-

[85] Sterk, *Renouncing the World* (2004), 109.

burners. This message echoes both Gregory's and Basil's rhetoric about the ascetic community at Annisa.

Just as importantly, the (elite) philosophical *habitus* Gregory praised on Alexander further reflected anti-Eunomian rhetoric. Gregory presented a dichotomy between divine wisdom and secular learning, contrasting a simple—yet truly intelligent—holy man with a smooth-talking Greek. Just like his previous account of Thaumaturgus distancing himself from the quibbling of non-Christian philosophers, Gregory's account of Alexander the coal-burner-turned-priest would have easily been interpreted as an attack on Eunomius. In *Against Eunomius*, Gregory called his and Basil's rival an Atticist—and not even a good one, at that. This text labeled Eunomius' language as the "flowers of old Attica," whose style and diction "blossomed sweetly and colorfully," accused Eunomius of "pretending to be an Attic (*hupattikisas*)," and sarcastically marked him as a "new Atticist."[86] It is thus easy to read the account of an Attic youth who mistakenly mocked Alexander's speech as another attack on Eunomius. Gregory's story about Alexander implied that Thaumaturgus—and, by connection, Gregory and Basil—lay claim to authentic Christian philosophy, while Eunomius was an arrogant neo-Atticist.

Gregory's picture of Thaumaturgus—conquerer of "secular" *paideia*, student of divine wisdom, rejector of fanciful logic and theological quarrels, ascetic who preserved the strength of his soul, discerner of genuine philosophical virtue—reveal his efforts to map the ideals of pro-Nicene Christian philosophy that he and Basil advocated onto the pre-Nicene past. In this endeavor, Gregory emphasized his text as a connection between author, audience, and subject, in

---

[86] Flowers blossoming: *CE* 1.1.482. Ὅρα τὰ ἄνθη τῆς ἀρχαίας Ἀτθίδος, ὡς ἐπαστράπτει τῇ συντάξει τοῦ λόγου τὸ λεῖον καὶ κατεστιλβωμένον τῆς λέξεως, ὡς γλαφυρῶς καὶ ποικίλως τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ λόγου περιανθίζεται. Eunomius as neo-Atticist: *CE* 1.1.64. πάνυ σοβαρῶς τῇ λέξει τῶν εἰσφρησάντων ὑπαττικίσας…παρὰ τῷ νέῳ ἀττικιστῇ ἐνομίσθη.

similar terms as he would later construct his *Funeral Oration to Basil*. Gregory wrote a model of philosophy onto Thaumaturgus that would have allowed his audience to see an immediate connection between this third-century saint and Basil, and through Basil, himself. By speaking about Thaumaturgus, he sought to bring the saint's virtue into his own day through his voice, and to imprint this virtue onto his audience through their ears and their eyes. In this process, Gregory deployed the memory of Thaumaturgus in order to promote his theological agenda and to assert his own authority as a legitimate philosopher, whose *habitus* could be seen both on the leaders of the present and the saints of the past.

Conclusion

As the previous chapter had done, this chapter has focused on how Cappadocian ideals of philosophical self-presentation applied to broader goals of community formation. Gregory's efforts to solidify the pro-Nicene Christian community of the fourth-century East lay at the heart of his memorials to Basil and Thaumaturgus. By enshrining these two bishops as models of Christian philosophy, and linking their performance of this philosophy to his version of orthodoxy, Gregory argued that "genuine" Christian philosophers were necessarily pro-Nicene. In Gregory's rhetoric, Basil and Thaumaturgus were both proper Christian philosophers who embodied the virtues of past scriptural heroes in mind, body, and soul. These bishops, like all subjects of ancient biographies, provided exemplars for their audience to follow.

By memorializing them, moreover, Gregory turned Basil and Thaumaturgus into more than just exemplars. Through vivid sensory rhetoric that invited his audience to visualize these bishops in their minds, he sought to connect the virtue of these men directly to those who heard

—and later, read—his words. While biography had long served as an avenue to present moral exemplars in antiquity, the "material turn" of Late Antiquity made these exemplars more vividly present in the texts that praised them. Gregory, then, not only sought to *show* his audience the models of educated Christians like Basil, he wished to *imprint* these models into their souls. In this way, memorials turned the educated figures of the past not only into teachers, but also lessons, of Christian philosophy. Gregory wished his readers/listeners to internalize the virtue of Basil and Thaumaturgus by hearing/reading his memorials and absorbing the virtues he described. This process mirrored the sensory process of scriptural learning promoted by Basil for ascetics at Annisa—indeed, Gregory's biblical comparisons intimated that by reading the Scriptures, readers could indeed envision the bishops he memorialized. While Basil had sought to imprint his audience with the virtues of past scriptural heroes, Gregory now sought to imprint his audience with the virtues Basil, as well as those of past heroes like Thaumaturgus, whom he retroactively turned into a model of pro-Nicene orthodoxy.

In this way, Gregory's memorials offer a sort of culmination to the strategies of philosophical self-presentation in which the Cappadocians and Julian all engaged. While Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Julian all presented their philosophical *habitus* as imprinted into their souls and manifest on their bodies, now Gregory of Nyssa constructed speaking about this *habitus* as a means of "imprinting" the souls of his audience. This *habitus*, he argued, was a feature not only of individual leaders or even an ascetic community like Annisa, but of the entire pro-Nicene community, a community justified by the virtue of past saints. An essential part of Gregory's prolific literary campaign in the years following Basil's death, then, was to apply philosophical self-presentation to past bishops (both recently and long dead), himself (as speaker

about these bishops' lives), and the wider pro-Nicene community (who could absorb their virtues by hearing/reading about them). His memorials to Basil and Thaumaturgus stress that philosophy and pro-Nicene orthodoxy were (and always had been) inseparable, and that the signs of such "legitimate" philosophy were both manifest in the lives of past Christian saints, and transferrable to those who viewed, heard, and spoke about them.

CONCLUSION

In the preceding analysis of the Cappadocians and Julian, I have argued that fourth-century debates among Roman elites over classical culture (*paideia*) and religious orthodoxy (both Christian and Hellenic) involved more than disputes over doctrine and ritual. When Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nyssa contrasted ascetic praxis at Annisa with the imposture of Eustathius' following, or when Julian contrasted his shaggy image with the effeminate luxury of his Constantinian predecessors, or when Gregory of Nazianzus retroactively caricatured Julian's demeanor during their school days at Athens, these men asserted that *habitus* was just as important as knowledge and theology in establishing who were the "right" people to lead their followers to the "right" God or gods. Their intellectual battles thus involved classical ideas about the body as much as they involved constructions of doctrine and ritual. For the Cappadocians and Julian, as well as for most ancient thinkers—especially during the "material turn" in Late Antiquity—the body was as important a vessel and marker of holiness as the soul.[1] In the Cappadocians' and Julian's rhetoric, orthodoxy and orthopraxy were both imprinted into the soul and inscribed onto the body: if one did not comport one's self properly, he/she could not possibly possess proper notions about the Divine, and vice versa.

This idea of orthodoxy relied on ideals that these men absorbed through their experiences with *paideia*. Whether fourth-century elites considered philosophy a quest for the Christian God or the traditional Greco-Roman gods, the claim to the status of philosopher lent legitimacy to one's cause, and the Cappadocians and Julian argued from opposing religious camps that their

[1] For the "material turn," see Miller, *Corporeal Imagination* (2009), 3-7, and discussion in Chapter Five.

absorption in *paideia* "naturally" presented them with such legitimacy. By presenting themselves as philosophers whose noble birth, proper education, and ascetic praxis all imprinted within them a "natural" right to serve as religious leaders, the Cappadocians and Julian drew on longstanding classical Greek and Roman notions about the ideal philosopher, and applied them to promote themselves and their positions in fourth-century inter- and intra-religious controversies.

True philosophical virtue, according to these elite authors, was deeply engrained in the soul through education, and visibly manifest on the body through behavior, dress, and demeanor. In the late 350s and early 360s, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Julian all argued that they possessed such virtue, which they carried "naturally" thanks to their correct education and ascetic praxis. According to their rhetoric, just as soft wax was impressed with the markings of writing instruments and seals, so too were their souls stamped from youth by teachings—for Basil and Gregory, the Scriptures, and for Julian, the Greek classics—that produced within them the necessary habits befitting a philosopher. This imprinting of the soul mirrored ancient notions of classical *paideia*, yet applied these notions to reflect these authors' positions on proper religion (whether Christianity or Hellenism). These men argued that self-moderation (*sōphrosunē*), cultivated through controlling the entry of words and images into their souls through their eyes/ears and the exit of words through their mouths, came naturally to them, because of the habits that had been imprinted onto the "wax tablets" of their souls. These habits, in turn, reflected their authority to lead others to the Divine.

This rhetoric of imprinting habits corresponded to the Cappadocians' and Julian's comments about appearance. Basil, the Nazianzen, and Julian all valued a certain level of unkempt appearance—shaggy hair, long beard, and worn clothing—as a signal of their

philosophical virtue. Yet each was well aware that others, who espoused different theological and philosophical positions than they did, could also adopt such an appearance, and thus weaken (in their minds, at least) the connection between appearance and character that they sought to strengthen. If a philosopher's virtue was visible on his body, did a certain style of appearance automatically reveal one as a philosopher? Basil, Gregory, and Julian all answered a resounding "no." Each of these men faced intra-religious challenges to their authority—Basil from Eustathius, Gregory from Maximus, and Julian from Herakleios—in which they drew on common elite caricatures of impostor philosophers in order to denounce these challengers as frauds. According to the Cappadocians and Julian, anyone could wear a thick cloak or grow out their hair, but in their case, the habits that were imprinted onto their souls through education meant that their appearance was the effect, not the cause, of their philosophical legitimacy.

The Cappadocians' and Julian's self-presentation also involved adapting ideals of gender to their fourth-century struggles. Rhetoric linking their philosophy to masculinity is particularly prevalent in examples such as Julian's assertion of his rugged manliness in the *Misopōgōn* and in Gregory of Nazianzus' caricature of Maximus as effeminate. Yet while the standard image of an ancient philosopher was male, the Cappadocians also promoted an ideal feminine philosophy, which they attributed to their sisters and mothers. The images that Gregory of Nazianzus presented of his sister and mother Gorgonia and Nonna, and that Gregory of Nyssa presented of his and Basil's sister Macrina, served both to praise these women as philosophers and assert their willingness to subjugate themselves to male authorities. In their rhetoric, the ideal philosophy that they praised for their sisters and mothers corresponded to ancient perceptions of the physical and intellectual differences between men and women, and presented these women—unlike the

alleged cross-dressers of Eustathius' following—as both ideal Christian philosophers and dutiful elite women. When discussing the bodies of Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina, the Nazianzen and the Nyssen made sure to represent these bodies as markers of philosophical and matronly virtue alike. These women appeared in the texts that their male relatives composed as women who were wise yet silent, philosophical yet subjugated. They were presented as teachers to their brothers and leaders of female ascetics, yet at the same time eager to show their deference to male priests. Their ideal feminine philosophy thus did not threaten the traditional gender boundaries that Roman elites generally preserved. By praising the virtue of their female relatives in this way, the Gregorys implied that as elite men, the virtue of their households' women reflected well upon themselves.

As evidenced by the Gregorys' efforts to craft specific images of their female relatives, the Cappadocians were concerned to promote a version of Christian philosophy that adhered to traditional elite ideals of gender. Basil's and Gregory of Nyssa's writings show the promotion of similar elite ideals within a larger ascetic community at their family retreat at Annisa. While Basil, the Nazianzen, and Julian all presented their own individual bodies as markers of proper philosophy, the writings of Basil and his brother Gregory show that the communal body was just as important to them. At Annisa, Basil and the Nyssen presented a type of philosophical school that adapted the goals of classical *paideia* to constructing an ascetic Christian community. This community, they argued, was the best place to learn the "discipline" (*technē*) of Christianity—the ideal philosophy for Basil and Gregory—because of the structured hierarchy and curriculum of scriptural learning they promoted. According to Basil and Gregory, the organized community at Annisa imprinted community members with the knowledge and habits necessary for a "genuine"

body of Christian worshipers. The model of learning they promoted at Annisa sought to distinguish their community from rival Christian groups, such as the Eustathians and Messalians. Unlike these "heretical" factions, they argued, their school at Annisa molded individuals into a proper community of Christian teachers and learners, divided by rank and gender to reflect traditional elite values of order.

Gregory of Nyssa expanded this effort at community formation after the death of his brother Basil in 378. More was at stake in the Cappadocians' battles over philosophy and orthodoxy than authority in Cappadocia alone—these battles took place in the midst of intra-Christian controversies whose impact was felt across the Empire. Nowhere is this impact more present than in Gregory of Nyssa's memorial orations, delivered just before the Council of Constantinople in 381. In the months leading up to this pivotal council, the memorials Gregory composed to his brother Basil and to the legendary Pontic bishop Gregory Thaumaturgus constructed these men as models of philosophy and orthodoxy in the same way that the other Cappadocians and Julian had presented themselves in life. The Nyssen, however, placed special emphasis on his memorials as a means of connecting his audience—and through his audience, the entire body of pro-Nicene Christians—to the virtues of both recently and long-deceased bishops. With his memorials, Gregory emphasized the connectivity between author, audience, and subject: he wished his audience to be imprinted with the stamp of Basil's life, and asserted that those both hearing and speaking about Thaumaturgus would receive the benefits of this saint's virtuous life. His language called on his audience to envision these saints' virtues by hearing the words that he spoke. By doing so, he claimed, his audience could absorb Basil's and Thaumaturgus' virtue in the same way that elite students were to absorb the ideals of *paideia*:

Gregory expected his audience to learn his ideal Christian philosophy not only by reading and hearing about heroes from the biblical past, but also by hearing about recent saints who embodied these heroes' virtues. In this way, Gregory presented these bishops as both exemplars of Christian philosophers and lessons themselves in Christian philosophy. Further, by aligning their philosophy with pro-Nicene orthodoxy (even before this orthodoxy existed, in Thaumaturgus' case), Gregory adapted Cappadocian ideals of philosophical self-presentation to reflect not simply on one community of Christians (as was the case with Annisa), but on the entire body of pro-Nicene Christians. As broker between the dead legends of the past and the pro-Nicene community of the present, Gregory situated himself as a philosophical leader who both embodied and transferred the virtues of past community leaders.

From Basil's *Ep.* 2 in 358 to Gregory of Nyssa's *Funeral Oration to Basil* in 381, the writings explored in this study have shown that in the rhetoric of the highly-educated Cappadocians and Julian, the construction of boundaries between Christians and *Hellēnes*, and between the "right" and "wrong" kinds of each of these groups, was inextricably connected to classical notions of how an elite man of *paideia* should comport himself. Scholars have long recognized the contributions of the Cappadocians and Julian in these two areas—religious orthodoxy and classical *paideia*—in the fourth century, and have even begun to explore them alongside one another (most notably in the works of Raymond Van Dam and Susanna Elm).[2] What I add to this line of scholarship is the importance of self-presentation, performance, and embodiment to these battles over *paideia* and religious orthodoxy among fourth-century elites. The Cappadocians and Julian, despite their religious differences, all agreed not only that an ideal

[2] Van Dam, *Kingdom of Snow* (2002); Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (2012). See discussion in introduction.

philosopher was also a religious leader, but also that such a religious leader needed to carry himself with certain habits, actions, and appearance that were thought to reveal his "natural" possession of philosophy. Just like Roman educational theorists like Quintilian and pseudo-Plutarch, the Cappadocians and Julian conceived of their education as a combination of nature and nurture: because of their proper birth and upbringing, they possessed the disposition needed to be philosophical leaders. Whether as emperor or bishop, each of these men sought to lead their followers to the "right" Divine by imprinting their communities with the same habits and ideals with which they themselves (as they believed) were imprinted.

For the Cappadocians and Julian, then, actions were as important as words in their self-presentation as philosophers. Their asceticism, demonstrated through practices such as withdrawal from city life, renunciation of sex, fasting, limited sleep, wearing simple clothing, and continuous prayer to God or the gods, offered them an arena in which to communicate their legitimacy as philosophers. While most fourth-century elites valued some level of ascetic renunciation as a vital component of the philosopher's *habitus*, the Cappadocians and Julian asserted that they practiced the *right* level of renunciation, and that they thus displayed the authority necessary to lead others—both ascetics and non-ascetics—to the Divine. In their rhetoric, they promoted asceticism in order to establish their bodies, as well as the bodies of their family members and followers, as signals of their self-control, self-moderation, and proper devotion to God or the gods. Their bodies, then, were as much a part of their fourth-century debates over classical *paideia* and religion as were the texts they absorbed in the classroom.

The Cappadocians' and Julian's competitions between different theological and philosophical rivals were thus also competitions between different bodies—on the one hand,

those bodies whose ascetic self-moderation "naturally" revealed philosophical legitimacy, and on the other, those bodies which, either through excessive luxury or excessive squalor (or even both), belonged to impostors. Neither the Hellenism promoted by the emperor Julian nor the pro-Nicene Christianity promoted by the Cappadocians was the only form of religious orthodoxy current in fourth-century Asia Minor. There is no reason to believe that Basil, the Gregorys, or Julian naturally appeared more convincingly as philosophers than did rivals like Eustathius, Maximus, and Herakleios. Indeed, the fact that the Cappadocians and Julian fought so hard to delegitimize these rivals indicates the opposite: that they saw them as threats to their own authority, threats who needed to be branded as fraudulent tricksters. By emphasizing their own "natural" possession of philosophy/orthodoxy, which (they argued) had been inculcated in them from youth and developed properly through ascetic praxis, the Cappadocians and Julian separated themselves and their communities from others, whom they caricatured as non-elite frauds dressing like philosophers while seeking personal glory and subverting traditional class and gender boundaries. In their rhetoric, orthodoxy was naturally evident on the body, while heresy could be exposed by those (like them) who knew how to read the body.

These rhetorical battles over classical *paideia*, religious orthodoxy, and the bodies upon which these features were inscribed were not limited to Cappadocia. During the second half of the fourth century, as imperial support for Christianity increased after the brief reign of the emperor Julian, similar battles took place all over the Mediterranean. Christians and *Hellenēs* in both the Greek East and the Latin West fought to define and defend their claims to the cultural capital of philosophy against both inter- and intra-religious rivals. Just to the southeast of Cappadocia, in Antioch the *Hellēn* sophist Libanius and the Christian priest John Chrysostom

competed—against both each other and other rivals—over the legitimate right to claim themselves and their followers as "real" philosophers.[3] While Chrysostom conceived of the ascetics in the Antiochene hinterland as such philosophers, Libanius decried them as filthy hooligans. In Egypt, similar contests took place in the metropolis of Alexandria, where Christian and Hellenic students alike withstood the tumult of violent events such as the destruction of the Serapion and the murder of the Hellenic teacher Hypatia.[4] In the Egyptian desert, meanwhile, a rising movement of asceticism created a boom in literature praising those like Antony who (according to his educated biographer Athanasius) revealed philosophical virtue by withdrawing from the traditional urban world of *paideia*.[5] Conversely, at Athens, the decades after the emperor Julian saw a greater association between classical philosophy and Hellenic religion among the teachers of this famous center of *paideia*.[6] In their debates over *paideia* and religion, the Cappadocians and Julian were by no means unique among intellectuals of the later fourth-century East. New religious options and new avenues of authority for later Roman elites meant that claims to the legitimate *habitus* of an elite philosopher were up for grabs between multiple people throughout the Greek-speaking regions of the empire.

Nor indeed were these contests unique to the East—the treasures of classical *paideia* were also up for grabs among western intellectuals. In Rome, classical literature was an essential component of aristocrats' claims to status, whether those aristocrats were Christians or

---

[3] Cribiore, *The School of Libanius* (2007); *eadem*, *Libanius the Sophist* (2013); Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* (2006); Sandwell, *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity* (2007); Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places* (2014).
[4] Watts, *City and School* (2006), 169-203.
[5] Brakke, *Athanasius and Asceticism* (1995), esp. 253-65.
[6] Watts, *City and School* (2006), 48-78.

"pagans."[7] For example, both the "pagan" Symmachus and the Christian Ambrose, the two opposing voices in the dispute over whether to restore Rome's Altar of Victory in 384, were both steeped in the elite culture of Roman *paideia*. The Christian Jerome, meanwhile, who spent the first part of his literary career in the 380s in Rome, famously dreamed that he was beaten—by Christ himself—for following Cicero and not Christ.[8] His scholarship throughout his life, however, shows how thoroughly he had internalized the classical *paideia* to which he had been exposed as a youth, and how integral this *paideia* was to his self-presentation as an ascetic and biblical exegete.[9] Moreover, his correspondence with Roman aristocratic women, both in the city of Rome and later in Bethlehem, highlights the same concerns to distinguish "genuine" ascetic women from attention-seeking impostors that the Gregorys displayed in their presentations of Gorgonia, Nonna, and Macrina.[10] At the same time, Jerome's Origenist conflict with his one-time friend Rufinus manifested itself in writings on asceticism and *paideia*, as well as in theological disputes.[11] Both Jerome and Rufinus translated ascetic works from Greek into Latin (Rufinus, indeed, translated Basil's *Asketikon*), and both accused each other of mis-using classical knowledge along the same lines as the Cappadocians had denounced Eunomius.[12] In North Africa, meanwhile, Jerome's contemporary Augustine constructed *paideia* as a body of knowledge that well-advised Christians (like himself) could selectively pilfer, as Moses had

---

[7] Hedrick, *History and Silence* (2000), 171-213. For more on Roman literary culture at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth centuries, focusing on the difficulty in determining whether an author of this time was a Christian or "pagan" (and whether they were militant apologists of "paganism") based on their classicizing writing, see also Alan Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 206-30, 353-626.
[8] Jerome, *Ep.* 22.30.
[9] Williams, *The Monk and the Book* (2006), 1-23, 147-66, 200-32; Chin, *Grammar and Christianity* (2008),
[10] Wilkinson, *Modesty in Late Antiquity* (2015); Teresa M. Shaw, "*Askesis* and the Appearance of Holiness" *JECS* 6:3 (1998), 485-500.
[11] For more on the Origenist controversy, see Elizabeth A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: the Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992).
[12] Chin, *Grammar and Christianity* (2008), 78-87.

despoiled the treasures of the Egyptians.[13] The texts that all these authors produced reflected similar questions about classical knowledge and fourth-century orthodoxy/orthopraxy that the Cappadocians and Julian had raised in the 360s and 370s.

It is likely that a similar approach to the one taken in this dissertation—focusing on elite bodies and self-presentation as equally essential to debates over *paideia* and orthodoxy as reading lists and textual interpretation—would yield intriguing results in studies of these other important fourth-century controversies. After all, the culture of *paideia* that connected the Cappadocians and Julian to each other linked elites all over the Roman Empire. Even across the cultural and linguistic divide between Greek East and Latin West, young highborn students learned to absorb a similar elite *habitus* whether they grew up reading Greeks like Homer and Plato or Romans like Vergil and Seneca. In the fourth century, this *habitus* was at the center of competitions over *paideia* and religious orthodoxy as much as any text was. Whether highborn elites like the Cappadocians, Julian, and Libanius, who conceived of themselves as the "natural" heirs to *paideia*, or new elites like Augustine and Jerome, who sought to assert their own mastery (and superiority) over the treasury of classical wisdom, the authors of the chief literary sources of the later fourth century were trained within a social system that valued habits, dress, and demeanor just as much as (if not even more than) merit and intellect. At a certain level, indeed, ancient elites would have viewed this dichotomy between *habitus* and intellect as a false one: according to elite rhetoric, those (like the Cappadocians and Julian) who were correctly trained would naturally have both.

---

[13] Chin, *Grammar and Christianity* (2008), 88-93.

The main contention of this dissertation is that similar logic linking *habitus* to merit and intellect informed battles over religious orthodoxy in the fourth century. The development of Christian orthodoxy during this time is usually depicted as a contest over trinitarian theology and ecclesiastical authority, yet ancient assumptions about behavioral habits, physical appearance, and bodily comportment were just as essential to this process. While Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa would probably have insisted that correct understanding of the Trinity was a more important qualification for a bishop than a humble cloak or a downcast gaze, they also tended to agree that in the ideal situation, these physical features naturally corresponded with correct theological understanding. According to the Cappadocians' rhetoric, moreover, their possession of these features distinguished them from allegedly non-Christian leaders. Similarly, Julian considered his devotion to the gods a more important symbol of his philosophy than his shaggy beard, yet was also keen to insist that this beard was just as much a part of his deeply-engrained philosophical *habitus*. When the Cappadocians and Julian aligned their "right" religious teachings with "right" habits, demeanor, and dress, they argued that their positions on philosophy and theology were correct not only because of their textual authenticity (whether the texts in question were Greek classics, Christian scriptures, or both), but because *they themselves* promoted these positions. In the Cappadocians' and Julian's rhetoric, their bodies, imprinted with "correct" habits and displaying "correct" appearance, revealed their authority to lead others to the "correct" Divine, thus solidifying the "correct" communal body of worshipers.

As this case study of the Cappadocians and Julian has suggested, in Late Antiquity the competition over this body of worshipers was, at its heart, a competition over the categories and

ideals with which educated Greeks and Romans for centuries had judged individual bodies. According to these elite authors, their bodies, imprinted with the ideal philosophy (whether pro-Nicene Christian or Hellenic) necessary for an educated leader, "naturally" corresponded to their authority to guide their communities of co-religionists—both elites and non-elites, ascetics and non-ascetics—to the correct God or gods.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Adamantius. "The *Physiognomy* of Adamantius the Sophist." Edited and Translated by Ian Repath. In *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul: Polemon's* Physiognomy *from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam*, edited by Simon Swain, 487-547. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Aeschylus. *Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoediae*. Edited by D.L. Page. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Ammianus Marcellinus. *History*. Edited with a facing-page English translation by J.C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library, 300, 315, 331. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Anonymous Latinus. "Anonymous Latinus, *Book of Physiognomy*." Edited and Translated by Ian Repath. In *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul: Polemon's* Physiognomy *from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam*, edited by Simon Swain, 549-635. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Apuleius. *Apulei Platonici Madaurensis pro se de magia liber (Apologia)*. Edited by Rudolf Helm. Leipzig: Teubner, 1905 and 1963.

Athanasius. *Athanase d'Alexandrie: Vie d'Antoine*. Edited with a facing-page French translation by G.J.M. Bartelink. Sources chrétiennes, 400. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2004.

Augustine. *Augustine: Confessions*. Edited by James J. O'Donnell. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Aulus Gellius. *Attic Nights*, 3 vols. Edited with a facing-page English translation by John Carew Rolfe. London: Heinemann, 1927. Reprinted as Loeb Classical Library, 195, 200, 212. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961-1968.

Basil of Ancyra. *De Virginitate*. Edited by J.P. Migne. *Patrologiae cursus completus* (*series Graeca*) 30 (Paris, 1857-1866): 669-809.

Basil of Caesarea. *The Asketikon of St. Basil the Great.* Translated by Anna M. Silvas. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

———. *Basilio de Cesarea: Discorso ai giovani*. Edited by Mario Naldini. Florence: Nardini Editore, 1984.

———. *De jejunio*. Edited by J.P. Migne. *Patrologiae cursus completus* (*series Graeca*) 31 (Paris, 1857-1866): 1508-1509.

———. *De humilitate*. Edited by J.P. Migne. *Patrologiae cursus completus* (*series Graeca*) 31 (Paris, 1857-1866): 525-540.

———. *Regulae fusius tractatae et brevius tractatae*. Edited by J. Garnier and P. Maran. Paris, 1721-1730. Reprinted by J.P. Migne in *Patrologiae cursus completus* (*series Graeca*) 31 (Paris, 1857-1866): 901-1305.

———. *Saint Basil: the Letters,* 4 vols. Edited with a facing-page English translation by Roy J. Deferrari. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1926-1934. Reprinted as Loeb Classical Library, 190, 215, 243, 270. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970-1972.

———. *Saint Basile. Aux jeunes gens sur la manière de tirer profit des lettres helléniques*. Edited by Fernand Boulenger. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1935 and 1965.

Cicero. *M. Tulli Cicernois scripta quae manserunt omnia*. Edited by C. Atztert, R. Klotz, et al. Leipzig: Teubner, 1914-1995.

Clement of Alexandria. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Le Pédagogue*, 3 vols. Edited with a facing-page French translation by M. Harl, H.-I. Marrou, C. Mondésert, and C. Matray. Sources chrétiennes, 70, 108, 158. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1960-1970.

———. *Christ the Educator.* Translated by Simon P. Wood, C.P. Fathers of the Church, 23. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1954.

Codex Theodosianus cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis. Edited by Theodor Mommsen, Paul M. Meyer, and Paul Krueger. Berlin: Weidemann, 1905-1990.

Council of Gangra. Edited with a facing-page English translation by Anna M. Silvas. In *The Asketikon of St. Basil the Great*, edited and translated by Anna M. Silvas, 486-494. New York and Oxford: Oxford University of Press, 2005.

Dio Chrysostom. *Dionis Prusaensis quem vocant Chrysostomum quae exstant omnia*, 2 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1893-1896. Reprinted 1962.

Epictetus. *Epicteti dissertationes ab Arriano digestae*. Edited by Henricus Schenkl. Leipzig: Teubner, 1916.

Eunapius. *Lives of the Sophists and Philosophers*. Edited with a facing-page English translation by Wilmer Cave Wright. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921. Reprinted as Loeb Classical Library 134. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Eunomius. *Eunomius: the Extant Works*. Edited by Richard Paul Vaggione. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

Gregory of Nazianzus. *Apologetica* (*Oratio* 2). Edited by J.P. Migne. *Patrologiae cursus completus* (*series Graeca*) 35 (Paris, 1857-1866): 408-513.

———. *Carmina de se ipso* (*De rebus suis, De se et episcopis, De sua vita*). Edited by J.P. Migne. *Patrologiae cursus completus* (*series Graeca*) 37 (Paris, 1857-1866): 969-1029, 1166-1452.

———. *Funebris oratio in patrem* (*Oratio* 18). Edited by J.P. Migne. *Patrologiae cursus completus* (*series Graeca*) 35 (Paris, 1857-1866): 985-1044.

———. *Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours 4-5: contre Julien* (*Orationes* 4-5). Edited with a facing-page French translation by Jean Bernardi. Source chrétiennes, 309. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1984.

———. *Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours funèbres en l'honneur de son frère Césaire et de Basile de Césarée* (*Orationes* 7, 43). Edited by F. Boulenger. Paris: Picard, 1908.

———. *In laudem Heronis philosophi* (*Oratio* 25). Edited by J.P. Migne. *Patrologiae cursus completus* (*series Graeca*) 35 (Paris, 1857-1866): 1197-1225.

———. *In laudem sororis Gorgoniae* (*Oratio* 8). Edited by J.P. Migne. *Patrologiae cursus completus* (*series Graeca*) 35 (Paris, 1857-1866): 789-817.

———. *In sanctum Pascha et in tarditatem* (*Oratio* 1). Edited by J.P. Migne. *Patrologiae cursus completus* (*series Graeca*) 35 (Paris, 1857-1866): 396-401.

———. *In seipsum, cum rure rediisset, post ea quae a Maximo perpetrata fuerant* (*Oratio* 26). Edited by J.P. Migne. *Patrologiae cursus completus* (*series Graeca*) 35 (Paris, 1857-1866): 1228-1252.

———. "St. Gregory Nazianzen: Four Funeral Orations." Translated by Leo P. McCauley, S.J. In *Funeral Orations*, edited and translated by Leo P. McCauley, S.J, 1-156. Fathers of the Church, 22. Washington. DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1953 and 2004.

———. *Three Poems: Concerning His Own Affairs, Concerning Himself and the Bishops, Concerning His Own Life*. Translated by Denis Molaise Meehan, O.S.B. Fathers of the Church, 75. Washington. DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1987.

Gregory of Nyssa. *Encomium of Saint Gregory Bishop of Nyssa on His Brother Saint Basil: A Commentary, with a Revised Text, Introduction, and Translation*. Edited with a facing-page English translation by Sister James Aloysius Stein, A.M. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1928.

———. *Gregorii Nysseni opera*. Edited by Werner Jaeger, Hermann Langerbeck, Heinrich Dörrie, Hadwig Hörner, and Giorgio Pasquali. Berlin: Weidemann, and Boston and Leiden: Brill, 1921-2009.

———. *Gregory of Nyssa: the Letters*. Translated by Anna M. Silvas. Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 83. Boston and Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. "Life of Gregory the Wonderworker." Translated by Michael Slusser. In *Saint Gregory Thaumaturgus: Life and Works*, edited and translated by Michael Slusser, 41-87. Fathers of the Church, 98. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1998.

———. *Traité de la virginité*. Edited with a facing-page French translation by Michel Aubineau. Source Chrétiennes, 119. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966.

———. *Vie de sainte Macrine*. Edited with a facing-page French translation by Pierre Maraval. Source Chrétiennes, 178. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1971.

———. *Vita Gregorii Thaumaturgi*. Edited by J.P. Migne. *Patrologiae cursus completus* (*series Graeca*) 46 (Paris, 1857-1866): 893-957.

Jerome. *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*. Edited by Rudolf Helm. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Jahrhunderte, 47. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956.

———. *Epistulae*. Edited by I. Hilberg and J. Divjak. Corpus Christianorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 54-56, 88. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1910-1981.

John Chrysostom. *Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae*. Edited by J.P. Migne. *Patrologiae cursus completus* (*series Graeca*) 47 (Paris, 1857-1866): 319-386.

———. *A Comparison Between a King and a Monk; Against the Opponents of the Monastic Life: Two Treatises*. Translated by David Hunter. Lewiston, NY. E. Mellen Press, 1988.

———. *Contra ludos et theatra*. Edited by J.P. Migne. *Patrologiae cursus completus* (*series Graeca*) 56 (Paris, 1857-1866): 263-370.

———. *Jean Chrysostome: Sur la vaine gloire et l'éducation des enfants*, edited with a facing-page French translation by A.M. Malingrey. Source Chrétiennes, 188. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1972.

Julian. *The Works of the Emperor Julian*, 3 vols. Edited with a facing-page English translation by Wilmer Cave Wright. London: W. Heinemann, 1913-1923. Reprinted as Loeb Classical Library, 13, 29, 157. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962-1969.

Justin Martyr. *Die ältesten Apologeten*. Edited by E.J. Goodspeed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1915.

Libanius. *Libanii opera*, 12 vols. Edited by R. Foerster. Lepizig: Teubner, 1903-1927.

Lucian. *Lucian*, 8 vols. Edited with a facing-page English translation by A.M. Harmon et al. London: W. Heinemann, 1913-1967. Reprinted as Loeb Classical Library, 14, 54, 130, 162, 302, 430-432. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969-1992.

Philostratus the Elder. *Philostrati maioris imagines*. Edited by O. Benndorf and K. Schenkl. Leipzig: Teubner, 1893.

Philostratus the Younger. *Flavii Philostrati opera*, 2 vols. Edited by C.L. Kayser. Leipzig: Teubner, 1870-1871.

Polemo. "A New Edition and Translation of the Leiden Polemon." Edited and translated by Robert Hoyland. In *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul: Polemon's* Physiognomy *from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam*, edited by Simon Swain, 329-464. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Plato. *Platonis opera*, 5 vols. Edited by John Burnet. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901-1907 and 1967.

Plutarch. *Plutarchi vitae parallelae*, vol. 1.1, 4th edition. Edited by K. Ziegler. Leipzig: Teubner, 1969.

———. *Plutarch's Moralia*, 15 vols. Edited with a facing-page English translation by F.C. Babbitt and others. Loeb Classical Library, 197, 222, 245, 305, 306, 321, 337, 405, 406, 424-429, 470. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936-2005.

Quintilian. *Institutio oratoria*. Edited by L. Radermacher and V. Buchheit. Leipzig: Teubner, 1971.

The Roman Imperial Coinage, Volume 8: the Family of Constantine. Edited by John Philip Cozens Kent et al. London: Spink, 1981.

Seneca the Younger. *Epistulae morales ad Lucilium*. Edited by O. Hense. Leipzig: Teubner, 1938.

Sextus Empiricus. *Against Logicians*. Edited with a facing-page English translation by R.G. Bury. Loeb Classical Library, 291. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935 and 1983.

Socrates Scholasticus. *Socrate de Constantinople: Histoire ecclésiastique*, 3 vols. Edited with a facing-page French translation by P. Maraval and P. Périchon. Sources chrétiennes 477, 493, 505. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2004-2007.

Sozomen. *Sozomenus. Kirchengeschichte*. Edited by J. Bidez and G. C. Hansen. *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 50. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1960.

Tertullian. *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani opera*, 2 vols. Edited by A. Gerlo et al. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 1-2. Turnhout: Brepols, 1954.

———. *Traité de la prescription contre les hérétiques*. Edited with a facing-page French translation by Raymond François Refoulé. Sources chrétiennes, 46. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1957.

Valerius Maximus. *Facta et dicta memorabilia*. Edited by C. Kempf. Leipzig: Teubner, 1888.

Varro. *De lingua Latina*. Edited by G. Goetz and F. Schoell. Leipzig: Teubner, 1910.

Secondary Sources

Andrade, Nathanael J. *Syrian Identity in the Greco-Roman World*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Annas, Julia. "Plato's 'Republic' and Feminism." *Philosophy* 51:197 (1976): 307-321.

Athanassiadi-Fowden, Polymnia. *Julian: an Intellectual Biography*. New York and London: Routledge, 1981.

Aubineau, Michel. *Traité de la virginité*. Source Chrétiennes, 119. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966.

Auvray-Assayas, Clara. "Images mentales et représentations figurées: penser les dieux au Ier siècle av. n. è." In *Images Romaines : actes de la table ronde organisée à l'Ecole normale supérieure, 24-26 octobre 1996*, edited by Clara Auvray-Assayas, 299-310. Études de littérature ancienne, 9. Paris: Presses de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure, 1998.

Ayres, Lewis. *Nicaea and its Legacy: an Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Baker-Brian, Nicholas. “The Politics of Virtue in Julian’s *Misopōgōn*.” In *Emperor and Author: the Writings of Julian the Apostate*, 263-280. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2012.

Baker-Brian, Nicholas, and Tougher, Shaun, eds. *Emperor and Author: the Writings of Julian the Apostate*. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2012.

Barnes, Michel René. *Power of God: Δύναμις in Gregory of Nyssa’s Trinitarian Theology*. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2001.

Barnes, Timothy David. “The Collapse of the Homoeans in the East.” *Studia Patristica* 29 (1997): 3-16.

———. *Eusebius and Constantine*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.

———. *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Bartsch, Shadi. *The Mirror of the Self: Sexuality, Self-Knowledge, and the Gaze in the Early Roman Empire*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Barton, Carlin. “Being in the Eyes: Shame and Sight in Ancient Rome.” In *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*, edited by David Fredrick, 216-235. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

Barton, Tamsyn S. *Power and Knowledge: Astrology, Physiognomics, and Medicine under the Roman Empire*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1992.

Bassi, Karen. *Acting Like Men: Gender, Drama, and Nostalgia in Ancient Greece*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1999.

Baudry, Etienne. “Apports de la tradition manuscrite syriaque du Petit Ascéticon: pour une meillure connaissance de l’histoire du texte de l’Ascéticon de s. Basile le Grand.” *Studia Monastica* 50:1 (2008): 41-68.

Bell, Catherine. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992 and 2009.

Bernardi, Jean. *La prédication des Péres Cappadociens, le prédicateur et son auditoire*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1968.

Bidez, Joseph. *La vie de l’empereur Julien*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1940.

Bloomer, W. Martin. *The School of Rome: Latin Studies and the Origins of Liberal Education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011.

Børtnes, Jostein. "Rhetoric and Mental Images in Gregory." In *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*, edited by Jostein Børtnes and Thomas Hägg, 37-57. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006.

———. "Eros Transformed: Same-Sex Love and Divine Desire. Reflections on the Erotic Vocabulary in St. Gregory of Nazianzus's Speech on St. Basil the Great." In *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, edited by Thomas Hägg and Philip Rousseau, 180-193. Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 31. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000.

Bouffartigue, Jean. *L'empereur Julien et la culture de son temps*. Collection des Études Augustiniennes Série Antiquité, 133. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1992.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge Studies in Social and Cultural Anthropology 16. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Passeron, Jean-Claude. *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture*. Translated by Richard Nice. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1990.

Bowersock, Glen. "The Emperor Julian on His Predecessors." *Yale Classical Studies 27: Greek and Latin Literature* (1982): 159-172.

———. *Julian the Apostate*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978 and 1997.

———. *Hellenism in Late Antiquity*. Jerome Lectures, 18th Series. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1990.

Boys-Stones, George. "Physiognomy and Ancient Physchological Theory." In *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul: Polemon's* Physiognomy *from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam*, edited by Simon Swain, 19-125. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Bradley, Keith. "Appearing for the Defence: Apuleius on Display." In *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture*, edited by Jonathan Edmonson and Allison Keith, 238-256. Buffalo, NY and Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

Brakke, David. *Athanasius and Asceticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

———. "The Lady Appears: the Materializations of 'Woman' in Early Monastic Literature." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33:3 (2003): 387-402.

Brakke, David, Satlow, Michael L., and Weitzmann, Steven, eds. *Religion and the Self in Antiquity*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2005.

Brown, Peter. *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988 and 2008.

———. *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992.

———. "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity." *Journal of Roman Studies* 61 (1971): 80-101.

Browning, Robert. *The Emperor Julian*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1976.

Burrus, Virginia. *Begotten not Made: Conceiving Manhood in Late Antiquity*. Stanford, CA: University of California Press, 2000.

———. "Life after Death: The Martyrdom of Gorgonia and the Birth of Female Hagiography." In *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*, edited by Jostein Børtnes and Thomas Hägg, 153-170. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006.

———. "Macrina's Tattoo." In *The Cultural Turn in Late Ancient Studies*, edited by Dale B. Martin and Patricia Cox Miller, 103-116. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.

———. *The Sex Lives of Saints: an Erotics of Ancient Hagiography*. Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Burton-Christie, Douglas. *The Word in the Desert: Scripture and the Quest for Holiness in Early Christian Monasticism*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* New York and London: Routledge, 1999.

———. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory." *Theatre Journal* 40:4 (1988): 519-31.

Cadenhead, Raphael. "Corporeality and *Askesis*: Ethics and Bodily Practice in Gregory of Nyssa's Theological Anthropology." *Studies in Christian Ethics* 26:3 (2013): 281-299.

Cameron, Alan. *The Last Pagans of Rome*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Cameron, Averil. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire*. Sather Classical Lectures, 55. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1991.

Caner, Daniel. *Wandering, Begging Monks: Spiritual Authority and the Promotion of Monasticism in Late Antiquity*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 33. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002.

Carruthers, Mary J. *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric, and the Making of Images, 400-1200*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature, 34. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Castelli, Elizabeth A. *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making*. Gender, Theory, and Religion. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.

Chin, Catherine. *Grammar and Christianity in the Late Roman World*. Divinations. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.

Clark, Elizabeth A. *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999.

———. "Ideology, History, and the Construction of 'Woman' in Late Ancient Christianity." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 2:2 (1994): 155-184.

———. "The Lady Vanishes: Dilemmas of a Feminist Historian after the 'Linguistic Turn'." *Church History* 67:1 (1998): 1-31.

———. *The Origenist Controversy: the Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Clark, Gillian. *Women in Late Antiquity: Pagan and Christian Life-styles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Cleland, Liza, Harlow, Mary, and Llewellyn-Jones, Lloyd, eds. *The Clothed Body in the Ancient World*. Oakville, CT and Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2005.

Coburn, Cynthia S. and Heyn, Maura K., eds. *Reading a Dynamic Canvas: Adornment in the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008.

Coon, Lynda L. *Dark Age Bodies: Gender and Monastic Practice in the Early Medieval West*. Middle Ages Series. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

Cooper, Kate. *Band of Angels: the Forgotten World of Early Christian Women*. New York: the Overlook Press, 2013.

———. *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Corbeill, Anthony. *Nature Embodied: Gesture in Ancient Rome*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Corcoran, Simon. *Empire of the Tetrarchs: Imperial Pronouncements and Government, AD 284-324*. Oxford Classical Monographs. New York and Oxford: Oxford Universitty Press, 1996.

Corrigan, Kevin. *Evagrius and Gregory: Mind, Soul, and Body in the 4th Century*. Burlington, VT and Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.

Cox, Patricia. *Biography in Late Antiquity: a Quest for the Holy Man.* Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 5. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983.

Cribiore, Raffaella. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.

———. *Libanius the Sophist: Rhetoric, Reality, and Religion in the Fourth Century*. Cornell Studies in Classical Philology. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013.

———. *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Daley, Brian E., S.J. *Gregory of Nazianzus*. Early Church Fathers. New York and London: Routledge, 2006.

Daniélou, Jean. "Chronologie des sermons de Grégoire de Nysse." *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 29:4 (1955): 346-372.

———. *Nouvelle histoire de l'Église 1, des origines à Saint Grégoire le Grand*. Paris: Seuil, 1963.

Davies, Glenys. "What Made the Roman Toga *virilis*?" In *The Clothed Body in the Ancient World*, edited by Liza Cleland, Mary Harlow, and Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones, 121-130. Oakville, CT and Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2005.

Deferrari, Roy J. "Address to Young Men on Reading Greek Literature." In *Saint. Basil: the Letters*, vol. 4, edited and translated by Roy J. Deferrari and Martin R.P. McGuire, 365-435. Loeb Classical Library 270. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970.

DelCogliano, Mark. *Basil of Caesarea's anti-Eunomian Theory of Names: Christian Theology and Late-Antique Philosophy in the Fourth Century Trinitarian Controversy*. Boston and Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Digeser, Elizabeth DePalma. *A Threat to Public Piety: Christians, Platonists, and the Great Persecution*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: an Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. New York: Praeger, 1966.

Drake, H.A. *Constantine and the Bishops: the Politics of Intolerance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.

———. "Lambs into Lions: Explaining Early Christian Intolerance." *Past and Present* 153 (1996): 3-36.

Duff, P.B. "Vision and Violence: Theories of Vision and Matthew 5:27-30." In *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy Presented to Hans Dieter Betz on his 70th Birthday*, edited by Adela Yarbro Collins and Margaret M. Mitchell, 63-75. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

Edmonson, Jonathan and Keith, Allison, eds. *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture*. Buffalo, NY and Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

———. "Introduction: From Costume History to Dress Studies." In *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture*, edited by Jonathan Edmonson and Allison Keith, 1-19. Buffalo, NY and Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

Edwards, Catharine. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Elm, Susanna. *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 49. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2012.

———. "Julian the Writer and His Audience." In *Emperor and Author: the Writings of Julian the Apostate*, edited by Nicholas Baker-Brian and Shaun Tougher, 1-18. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2012.

———. "'Pierced by Bronze Needles': Anti-Montanist Charges of Ritual Stigmatization in Their Fourth-Century Context." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4:4 (1996): 409-439.

———. *'Virgins of God': the Making of Asceticism in Late Antiqutiy*. Oxford Classical Monographs. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Elsner, Jaś. *Roman Eyes: Visuality and Subjectivity in Art and Text*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Fedwick, Jonathan Paul, ed. *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-Hundredth Anniversary Symposium*, 2 vols. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981.

———. "A Chronology of the Life and Works of Basil of Caesarea." In *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-Hundredth Anniversary Symposium*, vol. 1, edited by Jonathan Paul Fedwick, 3-20. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981.

Flower, Harriet I. *The Art of Forgetting: Disgrace and Oblivion in Roman Political Culture*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.

———. *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth, the Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*. Edited by Paul Rabinow, translated by Robert Hurley and others. New York: New Press, 1997.

———. *The History of Sexuality*, 3 volumes. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Random House, 1978-1986.

———. "The Battle for Chastity." In *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth, the Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*. Edited by Paul Rabinow, translated by Robert Hurley and others, 185-197. New York: New Press, 1997.

———. "Self-Writing." In *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth, the Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*. Edited by Paul Rabinow, translated by Robert Hurley and others, 207-222. New York: New Press, 1997.

———. "Technologies of the Self." In *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth, the Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*. Edited by Paul Rabinow, translated by Robert Hurley and others, 223-251. New York: New Press, 1997.

Francis, James A. *Subversive Virtue: Asceticism and Authority in the Second-Century Pagan World*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995.

Frank, Georgia. *The Memory of the Eyes: Pilgrims to Living Saints in Christian Late Antiquity*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 30. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000.

———. "Macrina's Scar: Homeric Allusion and Heroic Identity in Gregory of Nyssa's *Life of Macrina*." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 8:4 (2000): 511-530.

———. "The Sensory Self in the Hymns of Romanos the Melodist." In *Religion and the Self in Antiquity*, edited by David Brakke, Michael L. Satlow, and Steven Weitzmann, 164-179. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 2005.

Fredrick, David, ed. *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

———. "Introduction: Invisible Rome." In *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*, edited by David Fredrick, 1-30. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

———. "Mapping Penetrability in Late Republican and Early Imperial Rome." In *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*, edited by David Fredrick, 236-264. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

Gemeinhardt, Peter. "Dürfen die Christen Lehrer Sein? Anspruch und Wirklichkeit im christlichen Bildungsdiskurs der Spätantike." *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 51 (2008): 25-43.

Gemeinhardt, Peter, Van Hoof, Lieve, and Van Nuffelen, Peter, eds. *Education and Religion in Late Antiquity: Reflections, Social Contexts, and Genres*. New York and London: Routledge, 2016.

Germino, Emilio. *Scuola e cultura nella legislazione di Giuliano l'Apostata*. Naples: Eugenio Jovene, 2004.

Gill, Christopher. "Psychophysical Holism in Stoicism an Epicureanism." In *Common to Body and Soul: Philosophical Approaches to Explaining Living Behaviour in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, 209-231. New York and Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.

Gleason, Maud W. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Goehring, James E. *Ascetics, Society, and the Desert: Studies in Early Egyptian Monasticism*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999.

Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday, 1959.

Guerri, Maria Elena Conde. “El elogio fúnebre de Gorgonia, modelo de filosofia cristiana.” *Helmantica: revista de filología clásica y hebrea* 45 (1994): 381-392.

Gustafson, W. Mark. “*Inscripta in Fronte*: Penal Tattooing in Late Antiquity.” *Classical Antiquity* 16:1 (1997): 79-105.

Hadot, Pierre. *Philosophy as a Way of Life: Spiritual Exercises from Socrates to Foucault*, edited by Arnolid I. Davidson, translated by Michael Chase. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1995.

———. *What is Ancient Philosophy?* translated by Michael Chase. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2002.

Hägg, Thomas. “Playing with Expectations: Gregory’s Funeral Orations on his Brother, Sister, and Father.” In *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*, edited by Jostein Børtnes and Thomas Hägg, 133-151. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006.

Hägg, Thomas, and Rousseau, Philip, eds. *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 31. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000.

———. “Introduction: Biography and Panegyric.” In *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, edited by Thomas Hägg and Philip Rousseau, 1-28. Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 31. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000.

Hanson, R.P.C. *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: the Arian Controversy*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.

Harmless, William, S.J. “Monasticism.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, edited by Susan Ashbrook Harvey and David Hunter, 493-517. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Harpham, Geoffrey Galt. “Asceticism and the Compensations of Art.” In In *Asceticism*, edited by Vincent L. Wimbush and Richard Valantasis, 357-368. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Harrill, J. Albert. *Slaves in the New Testament: Literary, Social, and Moral Dimensions*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006.

Harrison, Carol. *The Art of Listening in the Early Church*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Hart, Mark D. “Gregory of Nyssa’s Ironic Praise of the Celibate Life.” *Heythrop Journal* 33 (1992): 1-19.

Harvey, Susan Ashbrook. *Scenting Salvation: Ancient Christianity and the Olfactory Imagination*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 42. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2006.

———. "Locating the Sensing Body." In *Religion and the Self in Antiquity*, edited by David Brakke, Michael L. Satlow, and Steven Weitzmann, 140-163. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 2005.

Hedrick, Charles W., Jr. *History and Silence: Purge and Rehabilitation of Memory in Late Antiquity*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2000.

Hemelrijk, E.A. *Matrona Docta: Educated Women in the Roman Élite from Cornelia to Julia Domna*. New York and London: Routledge, 1999.

Hildebrand, Stephen M. *Basil of Caesarea*. Foundations of Theological Exegesis and Christian Spirituality. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014.

Hunt, David. "Julian and Marcus Aurelius." In *Ethics and Rhetoric: classical essays for Donald Russell on his seventy-fifth birthday*, edited by Doreen Innes, Harry M. Hine, and C.B.R. Pelling, 287-98. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Hunter, David. *A Comparison Between a King and a Monk; Against the Opponents of the Monastic Life: Two Treatises*. Lewiston, NY: E. Mellen Press, 1988.

Ivánka, E. von. "*ΚΕΦΑΛΑΙΑ*. Eine Byzantinische Literaturform und ihre Antiken Wurzeln." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 47 (1954): 285-291.

Jaeger, Werner. *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1961.

Jones, C.P. "Stigma and Tattoo." In *Written on the Body: the Tattoo in European and American History*, edited by Jane Caplan, 1-17. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Karras, Valerie A. "A Re-Evaluation of Marriage, Celibacy, and Irony in Gregory of Nyssa's *On Virginity*." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 13:1 (2005): 111-121.

Kennedy, George A. *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors*. A History of Rhetoric, 3. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Kolbet, Paul. *Augustine and the Cure of Souls: Revising a Classical Ideal*. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 17. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010.

Konstan, David. “How to Praise a Friend: St. Gregory of Nazianzus’s Funeral Oration for St. Basil the Great.” In In *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, edited by Thomas Hägg and Philip Rousseau, 160-179. Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 31. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000.

Koschorke, Klaus. *Spuren der Alten Liebe: Studien zum Kirchebegriff des Basilius von Caesarea*. Paradosis, 32. Freibourg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1991.

Kraemer, Ross Shepard. *Unreliable Witnesses: Religion, Gender, and History in the Greco-Roman Mediterranean*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Krawiec, Rebecca. “‘Garments of Salvation’: Representations of Monastic Clothing in Late Antiquty.” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 17:1 (2009): 125-150.

———. “‘The Holy Habit and the Teachings of the Elders’: Clothing and Social Memory in Late Antique Monasticism.” In *Dressing Judeans and Christians in Antiquity*, edited by Kristi Upson-Saia, Carly Daniel-Hughes, and Alicia J. Batten, 55-73. Burlington, VT and Farnham: Ashgate, 2014.

———. *Shenoute and the Women of the White Monastery: Egyptian Monasticism in Late Antiquity*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Krueger, Derek. *Liturgical Subjects: Christian Ritual, Biblical Narrative, and the Formation of the Self in Byzantium*. Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.

———. *Writing and Holiness: the Practice of Authorship in the Early Christian East*. Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

———. “Writing and the Liturgy of Memory in Gregory of Nyssa’s *Life of Macrina*.” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 8:4 (2000): 483-510.

Larsen, Lillian I. “The *Apophthegmata Patrum*: Rustic Rumination or Rhetorical Recitation.” *Meddelanden från Collegium Patristicum Lundense* 23 (2008): 21-30.

Lenski, Noel Emmanuel. *Failure of Empire: Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century A.D.* Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 34. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002.

Leyerle, Blake. *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives: John Chrysostom’s Attack on Spiritual Marriage*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2001.

Limberis, Vasiliki. *Architects of Piety: the Cappadocian Fathers and the Cult of the Martyrs*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Llewellyn-Jones, Lloyd. *Aphrodite's Tortoise: the Veiled Woman of Ancient Greece*. Swansea: the Classical Press of Wales, 2003.

Louth, Andrew. *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition from Plato to Denys*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Ludlow, Morwenna. *Gregory of Nyssa; Ancient and (Post)modern*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Maier, Harry O. "Dressing for Church: Tailoring the Christian Self Through Clement of Alexandria's Clothing Ideals." In *Religious Dimensions of the Self in the Second Century CE*, edited by Jörg Rüpke and Gregory D. Woolf, 66-89. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Malingrey, Anne Marie. *'Philosophia': étude d'un groupe des mots dans la litteráture grecque, des présocratiques au IVe siècle aprés J.C.* Études et commentaires, 40. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1961.

Maraval, Pierre. "Chronology of Works." Translated by Seth Cheney. In *The Brill Dictionary of Gregory of Nyssa*, Lucas Francisco Mateo-Seco and Giulio Maspero, eds, 153-169. Boston and Leiden: Brill, 2010.

———. "Retour sur quelques dates concernant Basil de Césarée et Grégoire de Nysse." *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 99 (2004): 153-157.

———. *Vie de sainte Macrine*. Source Chrétiennes, 178. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1971.

Marcone, Arnaldo. "The forging of an Hellenic orthodoxy: Julian's speeches against the Cynics." In *Emperor and Author: the Writings of Julian the Apostate*, 239-251. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2012.

Martin, Dale B. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.

———. "Introduction." In *The Cultural Turn in Late Ancient Studies*, edited by Dale B. Martin and Patricia Cox Miller, 1-21. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.

Martin, Dale B. and Miller, Patricia Cox, eds. *The Cultural Turn in Late Ancient Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.

Matthews, John. *Laying Down the Law: a Study of the Theodosian Code*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.

Maxwell, Jaclyn LaRae. *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and his Congregation in Antioch*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

———. "The Attitudes of Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus toward Uneducated Christians." *Studia Patristica* 47 (2010): 117-22.

McGuckin, John A. *St. Gregory of Nazianzus: an Intellectual Biography*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminar Press, 2001.

McLynn, Neil. "Gregory Nazianzen's Basil: the Literary Construction of a Christian Friendship." *Studia Patristica* 37 (2001): 178-193.

———. "Julian and the Christian Professors." In *Being Christian in Late Antiquity: a Festschrift for Gillian Clark*, edited by Carol Harrison, Caroline Humfress, and Isabella Sandwell, 120-136. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Meiser, Martin. "Johannes der Täufer als Asket." In *Asceticism and Exegesis in Early Christianity: the Reception of New Testament Texts in Ancient Ascetic Discourses*, edited by Hans-Ulrich Weidemann, 78-91. Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus: Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, 101. Bristol, CT and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

Meredith, Anthony. *The Cappadocians*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1995.

Miller, Patricia Cox. *The Corporeal Imagination: Signifying the Holy in Late Ancient Christianity*. Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.

———. "The Blazing Body: Ascetic Desire in Jerome's Letter to Eustochium." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 1:1 (1993): 21-45.

———. "Desert Asceticism and 'The Body from Nowhere'." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 2:2 (1994): 137-153.

———. "Shifting Selves in Late Antiquity." In *Religion and the Self in Antiquity*, edited by David Brakke, Michael L. Satlow, and Steven Weitzmann, 15-39. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 2005.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. "The Life of St. Macrina by Gregory of Nyssa." *Contributo all storia degli studi classici* 8 (1987): 333-347.

Moreschini, Claudio. *I Padri Cappadoci: storia, letteratura, teologia*. Rome: Città Nuova, 2008.

Morgan, Teresa. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Muehlberger, Ellen. "Salvage: Macrina and the Christian Project of Cultural Reclamation." *Church History* 81:2 (2012): 273-297.

———. "Simeon and Other Women in Theodoret's *Religious History*: Gender in the Representation of Late Ancient Christian Asceticism." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 23:4 (2015): 583-606.

Naldini, Mario, ed. *Basilio di Cesarea: Discorso ai giovani*. Florence: Nardini Editore, 1984.

Nasrallah, Laura Salah. *Christian Responses to Roman Art and Architecture*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Newby, Zahra. "Reading Programs in Greco-Roman Art: Reflections on the Spada Reliefs." In *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*, edited by David Fredrick, 110-148. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

Norris, Frederick W. "Your Honor, My Reputation: St. Gregory of Nazianzus's Funeral Oration on St. Basil the Great." In *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, edited by Thomas Hägg and Philip Rousseau, 140-159. Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 31. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000.

Nussbaum, Martha C. *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*. New Series, 2. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Okin, Susan Moller. "Philosopher Queens and Private Wives: Plato on Women and the Family." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 6:4 (1977): 345-369.

Olson, Kelly. *Dress and the Roman Woman: Self-Presentation and Society*. New York and London: Routledge, 2008.

———. "Masculinity, Appearance, and Sexuality: Dandies in Roman Antiquity." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 23:2 (2014): 182-205.

O'Sullivan, Timothy M. *Walking in Roman Culture*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Parkes, M.B. *Pause and Effect: an Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Christianity and Classical Culture: the Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism*. Gifford Lectures 1992-1993. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.

Penniman, John David. "Fed to Perfection: Mother's Milk, Roman Family Values, and the Transformation if the Soul in Gregory of Nyssa." *Church History* 84:3 (2015): 495-530.

Radde-Gallwitz, Andrew. *Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and the Transformation of Divine Simplicity*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Rapp, Claudia. "Comparison, Paradigm, and the Case of Moses in Panegyric and Hagiography." In *The Propaganda of Power: the Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, edited by Mary Whitby, 277-298. Boston and Leiden: Brill, 1998.

———. *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: the Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 37. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005.

Rist, John M. "Basil's 'Neoplatonism: Its Background and Nature." In *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-Hundredth Anniversary Symposium*, vol. 1, edited by Jonathan Paul Fedwick, 137-220. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981.

Rosen, Klaus. *Julian: Kaiser, Gott, und Christenhaßer*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2006.

Rousseau, Philip. *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church in the Age of Jerome and Cassian*. Notre Dame, ID: University of Notre Dame Press, 1978 and 2010.

———. *Basil of Caesarea*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 20. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1994.

———. "Basil of Caesarea: Choosing a Past." In *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity*, edited by G.W. Clarke, 37-58. Rushcutters Bay, NSW, Australia: Australian National University Press, 1990.

———. "The Identity of the Ascetic Master in the *Historia Religiosa* of Theodoret of Cyrrhus: a New *Paideia*?" *Mediterranean Archaeology* 11 (1998): 229-244.

———. "'Learned Women' and the Development of a Christian Culture in Late Antiquity." *Symbolae Osloenses* 70 (1995): 116-147.

Rousselle, Aline. *Porneia: on Desire and the Body in Antiquity*. Translated by Felicia Pheasant. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1988 and 1993.

Rubenson, Samuel. *The Letters of St. Antony: Monasticism and the Making of a Saint*. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

———. "Philosophy and Simplicity: The Problem of Classical Education in Early Christian Biography." In *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, edited by Thomas Hägg and Philip Rousseau, 110-139. Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 31. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000.

Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *Gregory of Nazianzus: Rhetor and Philosopher*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

Saenger, Paul Henry. *The Space Between Words: the Origins of Silent Reading*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Sanchez, Juan Antonio Jiménez. "La crítica intelectual pagana al monacato primitivo." *sacris erudiri* 49 (2010): 5-35.

Sandwell, Isabella. *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews, and Christians in Antioch*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Schäfer, Christian, ed. *Kaiser Julian "Apostata" und die philosophische Reaktion gegen das Christentum*. Millennium-Studien, 21. New York and Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.

Schmitz, Thomas. *Bildung und Macht: zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*. Zetemata: Monographien zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, 97. Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1997.

Schott, Jeremy. *Christianity, Empire, and the Making of Religion in Late Antiquity*. Divinations. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.

Schroeder, Caroline T. *Monastic Bodies: Discipline and Salvation in Shenoute of Atirpe.* Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

Schwab, Andreas. "From a Way of Reading to a Way of Life: Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nazianzus about Poetry in Christian Education." In *Religious Education in Pre-Modern Europe*, edited by Ilinca Tanaseanu-Döbler and Marvin Döbler, 147-162. Studies in the History of Religions. Boston and Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Shaw, Teresa M. "*Askesis* and the Appearance of Holiness." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 6:3 (1998): 485-499.

———. *The Burden of the Flesh: Fasting and Sexuality in Early Chirstianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.

———. "Wolves in Sheep's Clothing: The Appearance of True and False Piety." *Studia Patristica* 29 (1996): 127-132.

Shepardson, Christine C. *Controlling Contested Places: Late Antique Antioch and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2014.

Silvas, Anna M. *The Asketikon of St. Basil the Great*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

———. "Basil and Gregory of Nyssa on the Ascetic Life: Introductory Comparisons." *Studia Patristica* 67 (2013): 53-62.

———. "Edessa to Cassino: The Passage of Basil's *Asketikon* to the West." *Vigiliae Christianae* 56 (2002): 247-259.

———. *Gregory of Nyssa: the Letters*. Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 83. Boston and Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. "The Latin *Regula Basilii* and the Syriac *Questions of the Brothers*: A Preliminary Inquiry," *Parole de l'Orient* 36 (2011): 445-452.

———. *Macrina the Younger, Philosopher of God*. Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts, 22. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008.

Small, Jocelyn Penny. *Wax Tablets of the Mind: Cognitive Studies of Memory and Literacy in Antiquity*. New York and London: Routledge, 1997.

Smith, Rowland. *Julian's Gods: Religion and Philosophy in the Thought and Action of Julian the Apostate*. New York and London: Routledge, 1995.

Špidlik, Thomas. "L'idéal du monachisme basilien." In *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-Hundredth Anniversary Symposium*, vol. 1, edited by Paul Jonathan Fedwick, 361-374. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981.

Stein, James Aloysius, A.M. *Encomium of Saint Gregory Bishop of Nyssa on His Brother Saint Basil: A Commentary, with a Revised Text, Introduction, and Translation*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1928.

Sterk, Andrea. "On Basil, Moses and the Model Bishop: the Cappadocian Legacy of Leadership." *Church History* 67:2 (1998): 227-253.

———. *Renouncing the World yet Leading the Church: the Monk-Bishop in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Stewart, Andrew. *Art, Desire, and the Body in Ancient Greece*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Stewart, Columba, OSB. "Evagrius Ponticus on Monastic Pedagogy." In *Abba: the Tradition of Orthodoxy in the West*, edited by John Behr, Andrew Louth, and Dimitri E. Conomos, 241-271. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Press, 2003.

———. "Monasticism." In *The Early Christian World*, vol. 1, edited by Philip F. Esler, 344-364. New York and London: Routledge, 2000.

Storin, Bradley K. "In a Silent Way: Asceticism and Literature in the Rehabilitation of Gregory of Nazianzus." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 19:2 (2011): 225-257.

Swain, Simon. "Biography and Biographic in the Literature of the Roman Empire." In *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*, edited by Mark J. Edwards and Simon Swain, 1-37. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

———. "Polemon's *Physiognomy*." In *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul: Polemon's* Physiognomy *from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam*, edited by Simon Swain, 125-201. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Taft, Robert E. "Women at Church in Byzantium: Where, When—and Why?" *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 52 (1998): 27-87.

Too, Yun Lee, ed. *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Boston and Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Upson-Saia, Kristi. *Early Christian Dress: Gender, Virtue and Authority*. New York and London: Routledge, 2011.

———. "Hairiness and Holiness in the Early Christian Desert." In *Dressing Judeans and Christians in Antiquity*, edited by Kristi Upson-Saia, Carly Daniel-Hughes, and Alicia J. Batten, 155-174. Burlington, VT and Farnham: Ashgate, 2014.

Urbano, Arthur P. "'Dressing a Christian': The Philosopher's Mantle as Signifier of Pedagogical and Moral Authority." *Studia Patristica* 62 (2013): 213-229.

———. "Sizing up the Philosopher's Cloak: Christian Verbal and Visual Representations of the *Tribōn*." In *Dressing Judeans and Christians in Antiquity*, edited by Kristi Upson-Saia, Carly Daniel-Hughes, and Alicia J. Batten, 175-194. Burlington, VT and Farnham: Ashgate, 2014.

Vaggione, Richard Paul. *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———. "Of Monks and Lounge Lizards: 'Arians,' Polemics, and Asceticism in the Roman East." In *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts*, edited by Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams, 181-214. Edinburgh: T &T Clark, 1993.

Valantasis, Richard. "Is the Gospel of Thomas Ascetical?" *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 7:1 (1999): 55-81.

Van Dam, Raymond. *Becoming Christian: the Conversion of Roman Cappadocia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.

———. "Hagiography and History: the Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus." In *Portraits of Spiritual Authority: Religious Power in Early Christianity, Byzantium, and the Christian Orient*, edited by Jan Willem Drijvers and J.W. Watt, 99-138. Religions in the Greco-Roman World, 137. Boston and Leiden: Brill, 1999.

———. *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.

———. *Kingdom of Snow: Roman Rule and Greek Culture in Cappadocia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.

Varner, Eric R. "Roman Authority, Imperial Authoriality, and Julian's Artistic Program." In *Emperor and Author: the Writings of Julian the Apostate*, 183-211. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2012.

Vernant, J.-P. "From the 'Presentification' of the Invisible to the Imitation of Appearance." In *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays*, edited by Froma I. Zeitlin, 151-163. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Watts, Edward Jay. *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 41. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2006.

———. *The Final Pagan Generation*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 53. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2015.

———. *Riot in Alexandria: Tradition and Group Dynamics in Late Antique Pagan and Christian Communities*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 46. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2010.

———. "The Student Self in Late Antiquity." In *Religion and the Self in Antiquity*, edited by David Brakke, Michael L. Satlow, and Steven Weitzmann, 234-251. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 2005.

Webb, Ruth. *Demons and Dancers: Performance in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008.

———. *Ekphrasis, Imagination, and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*. Burlington, VT and Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.

Wiemer, Hans-Ulrich. *Libanios und Julian: Studien zum Verhältnis von Rhetorik und Politik im vierten Jahrhundert n. Chr.* Munich: C.H. Beck, 1995.

Wilkinson, Kate. *Women and Modesty in Late Antiquity*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Williams, Megan Hale. *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Williams, Rowan. *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 2002.

Wimbush, Vincent L. and Valantasis, Richard. "Introduction." In *Asceticism*, edited by Vincent L. Wimbush and Richard Valantasis, xix-xxxiii. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Winn, Robert E. "Revising the Date of Authorship of Basil of Caesarea's *Ad Adolescentes*." *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 44:1-4 (1999): 291-307.

Wipszycka, Ewa. *Moines et communautés monastiques in Égypte (IVe-VIIIe siècles)*. Warsaw: Warsaw University, 2009.

Zanker, Paul. *The Mask of Socrates: the Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity*. Translated by Alan Shapiro. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995.

VITA

Stefan Hodges-Kluck was born on September 16, 1986 in Boulder, Colorado, to parents John Hodges and Patricia Kluck. He attended the University of Colorado at Boulder, where he received his B.A. *magna cum laude* in Classics in 2008. He then went on to receive an M.A. in Classics and History in 2011 from the Pennsylvania State University, and did his Ph.D. work at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. He currently lives in Knoxville with his wife Katie and his cat Flavia.