

# Athens between East and West: Athenian Elite Self-Presentation and the Durability of Traditional Cult in Late Antiquity

*Edward Watts*

IT IS GENERALLY ACCEPTED that the urban centers of the Greek-speaking east more quickly dismantled traditional religious infrastructure and disrupted traditional religious customs than did cities in the west.<sup>1</sup> The city of Athens, however, has always fit awkwardly in this narrative. Alexandria, long Athens' rival for cultural supremacy in the Greek world, saw its urban infrastructure violently and effectively Christianized in the early 390s by the campaigns and construction projects of the bishop Theophilus.<sup>2</sup> Alexandria's civic and political life arguably followed suit after the violence that accompanied the consolidation of episcopal power by Theophilus' successor Cyril and the murder of the philosopher Hypatia in the early 410s.<sup>3</sup> Antioch and its hinterland saw its pagan institutions disrupted gradually, first through isolated incidents like the conversion (and ultimate destruction) of the

<sup>1</sup> See, among others, C. P. Jones, *Between Pagan and Christian* (Cambridge [Mass.] 2014) 107–143.

<sup>2</sup> J. Hahn, “The Conversion of Cult Statues: The Destruction of the Serapeum 392 A.D. and the Transformation of Alexandria into the ‘Christ-Loving’ City,” in J. Hahn et al. (eds.), *From Temple to Church: Destruction and Renewal of Local Cultic Topography in Late Antiquity* (Leiden 2008) 335–363. Cf. E. Watts, *Riot in Alexandria* (Berkeley 2010) 191–205.

<sup>3</sup> On Hypatia see C. Haas, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity* (Baltimore 1997) 295–316; M. Dzielska, *Hypatia of Alexandria* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1995) 88–93; E. Watts, *Hypatia: The Life and Legend of an Ancient Philosopher* (Oxford 2017).

Daphne shrine of Apollo in the 350s and 360s and later through the campaign against rural Syrian temples led by the prefect Cynegius in the late 380s.<sup>4</sup> John Malalas (13.39) describes how Constantinople saw the old pagan infrastructure it inherited from the city of Byzantium converted into gaming halls and taverns in the reign of Theodosius I. A law of 419 banning the burning of lime on the shore between the amphitheater and the Julian harbor suggests that what remained of the temples of old Byzantium may have been recycled by enterprising residents in the early fifth century.<sup>5</sup>

Athenian cults escaped these fates. Even when the city's temples were closed and its traditional religious festivals ceased in the middle decades of the fifth century, Athens did not see the destructions or desecrations that occurred earlier in some other eastern cities.<sup>6</sup> The Athenian temples, both large and small, seem to have sat shuttered but intact until their eventual conversion into churches sometime in, perhaps, the sixth

<sup>4</sup> For the Christianization of Antioch more generally see C. Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Spaces: Late Antique Antioch and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy* (Berkeley 2014). On Cynegius' campaigns see P. Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity* (Madison 1992) 107; J. Matthews, *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court AD 364–425* (Oxford 1975) 140–142; G. Fowden, "Bishops and Temples in the Eastern Roman Empire A.D. 320–435," *JThS* 29 (1979) 53–78.

<sup>5</sup> *Cod. Theod.* 14.6.5. The location mentioned would have been near the old city of Byzantium, probably in Region II. For a sense of the character of this district in the later fourth century see the *Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae*, now translated and analyzed in J. Matthews, "The *Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae*," in L. Grig and G. Kelly (eds.), *Two Romes* (Oxford 2012) 81–115 (103 on Region II).

<sup>6</sup> The most notable examples are Alexandria, described above, and Gaza, where the Marneion was destroyed and the site purified. On this process in Gaza see the highly problematic *Life of Porphyry, Bishop of Gaza*, and the discussion of M. Edwards, "Where Greeks and Christians Meet: Two Incidents in Panopolis and Gaza," in A. Smith (ed.), *The Philosopher and Society in Late Antiquity* (Swansea 2005) 189–202; C. Rapp, "Mark the Deacon, *Life of St. Porphyry of Gaza*," in T. F. Head (ed.), *Medieval Hagiography: An Anthology* (London/New York 2000) 53–75; R. Van Dam, "From Paganism to Christianity at Late Antique Gaza," *Viator* 16 (1985) 1–20.

century.<sup>7</sup> By the turn of the seventh century, a number of Acropolis buildings had become churches, as had a small temple dedicated to Demeter and Kore on the Ilissos.<sup>8</sup> None of these conversions, of course, fits the general pattern that we see in Constantinople, Antioch, or Alexandria.

What emerges instead is a pattern of Christianization not unlike that seen in the city of Rome. In both Athens and Rome, the local elite perpetuated a culture that privileged involvement in both traditional religion and civic life for longer than was the case in many eastern cities.<sup>9</sup> Roman temples, like those in Athens, remained closed but intact through the fifth century and were converted to churches later than similarly monumental structures in the major cities of the east.<sup>10</sup> Indeed, this 'Roman model' of Christian religious evolution fits Athens rather well. Like elites in Italy, late antique Athenian elites marked social status through participation in activities determined by the particular religious and cultural traditions of their city. In Athens, this meant elites in the fourth and fifth centuries continued to hold civic offices, lead pagan religious activities, and have strong connections to Athenian educational institutions. Even more intriguingly, western emperors and intellectually inclined pagan governors (many of whom had connections to Italy and the city of Rome) governed the

<sup>7</sup> For discussion of the transformation of Athenian temples see A. Kaldellis, *The Christian Parthenon* (Cambridge 2009) 23–31. For a detailed discussion of changes to the Parthenon in particular see B. Anderson, "The Defacement of the Parthenon Metopes," *GRBS* 57 (2017) 249–260.

<sup>8</sup> Kaldellis, *Christian Parthenon* 31–33. This structure was demolished in 1778.

<sup>9</sup> For the Christianization of the senatorial aristocracy in Rome see M. Salzman, *The Making of a Christian Aristocracy: Social and Religious Change in the Western Roman Empire* (Cambridge [Mass.] 2002).

<sup>10</sup> The temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus remained impressive and intact until at least 455 when Geiseric looted some of its gilded roof tiles (Procop. *Wars* 3.5.4). The Pantheon was converted into a church in 609 (John the Deacon 7.8.20).

province of Achaëa (to which Athens belonged) for much of the fourth and early fifth centuries. These western administrators protected this particular Athenian form of elite self-representation despite increasingly strict imperial restrictions on traditional religious activities.

This article explains how the western administrators of Achaëa and the particular ways in which Athenian elites expressed their social status combined to protect traditional Athenian civic and religious life. It first reconstructs the administrative history of Athens in the fourth and early fifth centuries. It then considers how Achaëa's governors fostered conditions that encouraged late antique Athenian elites to continue to utilize a form of self-representation that bound social status to service to Athens, devotion to its traditional gods, and intellectual achievement until deep into the fifth century. This elite rhetoric also created a deeply traditional and self-reinforcing standard of conduct that incentivized elites to continue to pursue the religious and cultural activities that had long defined them.

1. *Athens and the western imperial courts*

It is often assumed that eastern emperors and administrators governed Athens in late antiquity. This was, of course, true of Athens from the early fifth century until the thirteenth century. It was also true that Athens was controlled from the east in the tetrarchic divisions of 286 and 293. The fourth century, however, was different. From Constantine's acquisition of the province in 314 until the death of Theodosius I in 395, Athens was under the same administrative authority as the city of Rome for seventy-two of these eighty-one years.<sup>11</sup> It is no

<sup>11</sup> The exceptions were: (1) the period between March 350 (when the place-holder emperor Vetranio separated Achaëa from the territory controlled by Magnentius) and Constantius' expulsion of Magnentius from Italy between July and September of 352. De Rossi (*ICUR* I no. 88 [= *ICUR*<sup>2</sup> II 4798] and p.70) indicates that the last record of Magnentius' authority over Rome is an inscription of late July 352. The *Chronicle of 354* indicates that the new urban prefect Naeratius Ceralis (appointed by Constantius) was in

exaggeration to say that Athens was, politically speaking, very much a part of the western not the eastern empire in the fourth century. Indeed, even when the city did come under the control of the eastern court in 395, some westerners still saw this as a temporary administrative measure that was likely to be reversed. Perhaps because of this, governors with Italian connections continued to be appointed until the reign of Theodosius II.<sup>12</sup>

Not only was Athens governed from the west in the fourth century, but its governors were often ambitious pagan elites with strong ties to Italy and the city of Rome. The origins of nineteen men who governed Achaëa between 286 and 405 can be determined with reasonable certainty and twelve of them either came from Italy or later held prefectures in Italy.<sup>13</sup> This

---

office by September 26. (2) The period between 379 and 382 when Gratian turned the dioceses of Macedonia and Dacia over to Theodosius I for his campaign against the Goths. Theodosius ultimately returned the territory to Gratian by 1 September 382. For discussion of this process of Gratian ceding and taking back control of these dioceses see P. Heather and D. Moncur, *Politics, Philosophy and Empire: Select Orations of Themistius* (Liverpool 2001) 207, on the basis of Themistius *Or.* 15, and N. McLynn, “Moments of Truth: Gregory of Nazianzus and Theodosius I,” in S. McGill et al. (eds.), *From the Tetrarchs to the Theodosians* (Cambridge 2010) 215–240, at 226–228. (3) The period between 387 and August of 388 when Italy was held by Magnus Maximus and Achaëa by Valentinian II (under the protection of Theodosius I). Valentinian’s flight to Thessaloniki cannot be precisely dated, but it occurred at some point in 387 (Socr. *HE* 5.11). Magnus Maximus’s execution was on 28 August 388 (*Pan.Lat.* 12.44.2, Socr. *HE* 5.14). (4) The period between 22 August 392 and 6 September 394 when Italy was held by Eugenius and Achaëa by Theodosius. For these dates see, among others, *Cons.Const.* s.a. 392 (for Eugenius’ elevation) and *Chron.Pasch.* s.a. 394 (for Eugenius’ defeat at the Frigidus).

<sup>12</sup> This is reflected both in Stilicho’s claims on Illyricum and, more specifically, in Pope Innocent I’s claim that the churches in Illyricum and Greece remained subject to Rome in 402 (*Ep.* 1 [*PL* 20.463–465]).

<sup>13</sup> *PLRE* I 1076–1077 gives a list of all governors of Achaëa between 261 and 395. The following are clearly or probably Italian: L. Turranius Grati-anus 3; Anonymus 45 (a governor described as a well-educated Roman by Eunapius, *VS* 483); C. Vettius Cossinius Rufinus 15; Anonymus 37; Pubilius

is, in some ways, not at all surprising. Constantine had given the province of Achaëa a special status that allowed its proconsul to bypass the praetorian prefect and report directly to the emperor.<sup>14</sup> This made a proconsulship of Achaëa one of the most desirable provincial governorships, especially for ambitious figures. Indeed, six of the twelve governors of the province with Italian connections went on to become urban prefect of Rome.<sup>15</sup> Another Achaëan proconsul known only from a fragmentary inscription dated to the reign of Constantine<sup>16</sup> must be one of four aristocrats. Of those four possibilities, one held the urban prefecture of Rome, two held consulships, and the fourth was the father of one urban prefect of Rome

---

Optatianus 3; Anonymus 46; Basilius 2 (a figure of western origin [Himer. *Or.* 46.8] who was the son of a consul and probable relative of an urban prefect of Rome); Publius Ampelius 3; Vettius Agorius Praetextatus 1; Postumius Rufius Festus 12; and, in *PLRE* II, Gennadius Torquatus (proconsul between 396 and 404). Those likely not Italian include Scylacius (whose previous post was vicar of Asia); Fl. Hermogenes 9 (who seems to have been appointed by Constantius during the revolt of Magnentius); Plutarchus 3; Strategius Musonianus (who was appointed during the revolt of Magnentius and later became proconsul of Constantinople); Olympius (whose proconsulship is suggested but not proven by Liban. *Epp.* 1258 and 1264); Antiochus 10 (who was from Asia); and Proclianus 4 (a native of Argos). Musonius I retired to Thessaloniki after his proconsulship, which may suggest an origin outside of Italy. Anatolius 8 may have Italian ties if, as suggested tentatively, he is to be identified with the *consularis* named in *Cod. Theod.* 11.1.9.

<sup>14</sup> Constantine's upgrading of this office (which previously had been defined as a *corrector*) can be seen almost immediately in his selection of Vettius Cossinius Rufinus, a former *corrector*, as the first proconsul. The staff of the proconsul also came to look more like that of a prefect than that of a *corrector*. For discussion see A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* I (Norman 1964) 106–107, 129.

<sup>15</sup> L. Turranius Gratianus 3, PUR in 290–291; C. Vettius Cossinius Rufinus 15, PUR in 315–316; Publilius Optatianus 3, PUR in 329 and 333; Anonymus 12, PUR at an unknown date; Vettius Agorius Praetextatus 1, PUR in 367–368; and Publius Ampelius 3, PUR in 371–372.

<sup>16</sup> This is *PLRE* I 1012 (Anonymus 37), known only from *ILAFr* 456 = *AE* 1917/8 99.

and the son of another.<sup>17</sup> Indeed, the proconsulship of Achaëa features in the *cursus honorum* of a number of prominent Italian senators, above low-level governorships like the *corrector Tusciae et Umbriae* and just below some of the prefect positions to which its holders often next moved.<sup>18</sup> This was, like the proconsulship of Africa, a sort of training ground for elites aiming to hold the highest civilian administrative offices in the western empire in the fourth century.<sup>19</sup>

Although both proconsulships were prestigious offices, Achaëa differed from Africa in the religious identities of the men who held its proconsulship. Whereas many of the other senators who became prefects after serving as proconsul of Africa were Christian, nearly all the proconsuls of Achaëa whose confessional inclinations can be determined were pagan.<sup>20</sup> Intriguingly, many of these officials were also accomplished men of letters. Publilius Optatianus Porphyrius, for example, published a volume of poems that praised Constan-

<sup>17</sup> The four men are M. Ceionius Iulianus Cametius 26 (who became PUR in 333), Domitius Zenophilus (cos. 333), Antonius Marcellinus 16 (cos. 341), and Tertullus I (the son and father of urban prefects).

<sup>18</sup> E.g. *CIL* VI 1779 [*ILS* 1259], discussed below.

<sup>19</sup> M. Kahlos, *Vettius Agorius Praetextatus: A Senatorial Life in Between* (Rome 2002) 32, suggests that the Achaean prefecture had no great significance, but I am persuaded by H. Bloch, "A New Document of the Last Pagan Revival in the West, 393–394 A.D.," *HTHR* 38 (1945) 199–244, at 204, who sees real significance in holding the Achaean proconsulship.

<sup>20</sup> *PLRE* I identifies the following proconsuls as probably pagan: Publilius Optatianus 3 (this identification can perhaps be questioned on the basis of, for example, the design of his *Carm.* 4; note however Bede *De arte metrica* 24); Plutarchus 3; Publius Ampelius 3; Vettius Agorius Praetextatus 1; Olympius 9; Antiochus 10; Postumius Rufius Festus 12. The only (probably) Christian governor of Achaëa known to have held office before 435 was Strategius Musonianus, who Ammianus (15.13.1–2) says used his eloquence to help Constantine in ecclesiastical affairs. It is worth noting, however, that Johannes Hahn (unpublished paper) counts four proconsuls who were certainly pagan, another who may have been, and finds no clear evidence for a fourth-century Christian proconsul of Achaëa.

tine and contained designs celebrating aspects of his reign.<sup>21</sup> Publius Ampelius was a poet celebrated enough to be remembered by Sidonius Apollinaris more than a century after his death (*Carm.* 9.304). Postumius Rufius Festus translated the *Phaenomena* of Aratus and authored two works of his own.<sup>22</sup> And Gennadius Torquatus seems to have copied and circulated an edition of the poet Martial.

While not exactly a typical figure, Vettius Agorius Praetextatus (proconsul of Achaëa 362–364) embodies many of the characteristics of this group of proconsuls. The scion of a well-established senatorial family, his official career began when, as a ten-year old, he took part in the ceremonies inaugurating the city of Constantinople in 330.<sup>23</sup> This ceremonial role previewed a string of offices that he held from roughly the time of Constantine's death until the late 350s. These included a quaestorship, a praetorship, *corrector* of Tuscany and Umbria, and *consularis Lusitaniae*.<sup>24</sup> In this period he also served as an

<sup>21</sup> For his literary production see T. D. Barnes, "Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius," *AJP* 96 (1975) 173–186.

<sup>22</sup> His translation was known to Jerome, *Comm. Ep. ad Tit.* 1 (*PL* 26.572B). His other works included a *Descriptio Orbis Terrae* and an *Ora Maritima*.

<sup>23</sup> For his career see the excellent study of Kahlos, *Vettius Agorius Praetextatus*. He was probably related to either Gaius Vettius Cossinius Rufinus 15 (a former proconsul of Achaëa who was also urban prefect of Rome in 315–316) or Vettius Rufinus (a consul in 323) or both (a suggestion based on *PLRE* I, Vettius Rufinus 24). The date of Praetextatus' birth is uncertain, but the range suggested by Kahlos (17,) somewhere between 314 and 319, is plausible. This means that Praetextatus' visit to Constantinople, described by John Lydus (*Mens.* 4.2), would have taken place when he was about ten years old. For this interpretation of Lydus' passage see J. Rüpke, *Fasti Sacerdotum* (Oxford 2008) 948 n.1.

<sup>24</sup> A number of inscriptions preserve all or part of the *cursus honorum* of Praetextatus (*CIL* VI 1777 and 1778 [*ILS* 1258] omit his earliest offices; *CIL* VI 1779 [*ILS* 1259] gives a full *cursus honorum*). Unlike many other career inscriptions of Roman notables, that of Praetextatus lists his sacred offices separately from those *in re publica vero*. For the dating of the priesthoods see Rüpke, *Fasti* no. 3468. For a possible explanation of the separation of priesthoods and other offices see Alan Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome* (Oxford 2012) 139–141. The best survey of his larger career remains that of Kahlos.

augur and may have assumed some of the ten other priest-hoods he would eventually occupy.<sup>25</sup>

Praetextatus took office as proconsul of Achaëa in 362 when he was forty-two years old. To that point, he had served in a series of customary senatorial offices and low-level governorships. After he left office in 364, he would advance to the highest offices in the western empire. As was the case with a number of other Italian proconsuls, the Achaëan proconsulship then represented a sort of hinge in Praetextatus' career that transformed a rather generic senatorial path into an exceptional one. His *cursus honorum* shows this.<sup>26</sup> Before the proconsulship, we see an unexceptional sequence of offices. After it, Praetextatus was selected as urban prefect of Rome, as praetorian prefect of Italy and Illyricum, as *consul ordinarius*, and as a member of five embassies sent on behalf of the Roman senate. He also seems to have been appointed to most of his priest-hoods either during his time in Achaëa or after it ended.<sup>27</sup> The Achaëan proconsulship then truly represented the beginning of a new phase in his public career, but its appeal for Praetextatus likely went beyond the higher offices it opened for him. He was well-educated man who had such an interest in philosophy that he translated into Latin an Aristotelian paraphrase written by Themistius.<sup>28</sup> He also had great interest in the traditional and mystery cults that the Achaëan proconsulship would allow him

<sup>25</sup> For a full list of his priesthoods see *CIL* VI 1779 and Rüpke, *Fasti* 948–949.

<sup>26</sup> *CIL* VI 1779: *D(is) M(anibus) / Vettius Agorius Praetextatus / augur p[ro]ntifex Vestae / pontifex Sol[is] quindecimvir / curialis Herc[ul]is sacratus / Libero et Eleusi[ni]s hierophanta / neocorus tauroboliatus / pater patrum, in [re] publica vero / quaestor candidatus / pretor urbanus / corrector Tusciae et Umbriae / consularis Lusitaniae / proconsule Achaiae / praefectus urbi / legatus a senatu missus V / praefectus praetorio II Italiae / et Illyrici / consul ordinarius / designatus.*

<sup>27</sup> His selection as hierophant of Eleusis must date to his proconsulship: see Kahlos, *Vettius Agorius Praetextatus* 83–84.

<sup>28</sup> Praetextatus' interests extended to translations of Greek poetry (*CIL* VI 1779) and Themistius' commentary on Arist. *Int.* (mentioned by Boethius *In Arist. De interpret.*, ed. sec. 1 [p.4 Meiser]).

to explore from a position of great honor.<sup>29</sup>

It should be clear why an Achaean proconsulship would seem a particularly appealing office for Praetextatus. At the same time, this was not simply an honorific position. Praetextatus had real responsibilities while in office and he also enjoyed the privileged access to the emperor that Achaean governors expected. He took advantage of this direct access in 364 when he intervened with Valentinian I to prevent the implementation of a law banning nocturnal sacrifices.<sup>30</sup> Praetextatus forcefully made the point that this law would interfere with the Eleusinian Mysteries. This disruption would could cause significant anger in his province and would eliminate a festival that generated significant economic activity in the area.<sup>31</sup> Praetextatus had recently become an Eleusinian hierophant himself and he understood both the particular interests of his province and the religious implications of such a law. He was then well positioned to speak on behalf of elite, pagan Athenians. Just as importantly, the emperor apparently thought it important to heed Praetextatus' counsel. Not only did Valentinian suspend the law after Praetextatus' complaint, but he later tapped Praetextatus to serve as urban prefect because of his effective service as proconsul.<sup>32</sup>

While no other Achaean proconsul is known to have acted so memorably to defend traditional religious practices in and around Athens, many others worked to protect, participate in, and support the unique cultural and religious traditions of the

<sup>29</sup> So the verse epitaph written for Praetextatus by his wife (part of *CIL VI* 1779, cf. 31929).

<sup>30</sup> The law is *Cod.Theod.* 9.16.7, a probable reiteration of the law of Constantius excerpted at *Cod.Theod.* 16.10.5. For Praetextatus' intervention that prevented it being implemented in Achaea see Zosmius 4.3.3. For the context of this law see E. Watts, *The Final Pagan Generation* (Oakland 2015) 140–142.

<sup>31</sup> I thank an anonymous reader for pointing out the economic impact of banning the Mysteries.

<sup>32</sup> On his urban prefecture see Kahlos, *Vettius Agorius Praetextatus* 35–38; Watts, *Final Pagan Generation* 143–144.

city. Both Eunapius and Libanius mention unnamed proconsuls of Achaëa who displayed considerable erudition and actively involved themselves in the Athenian schools. A family member of another proconsul celebrated one of the last taurobolia performed in the city.<sup>33</sup> These activities demonstrate why the Achaean proconsulship's unique cultural symbolism particularly appealed to pagans and intellectually-inclined senators who shared an affinity for the city's impressive cultural and religious patrimony. Their background enabled them to safely represent a Christian emperor to a largely pagan province and effectively communicate to the emperor the Achaean reaction to his policies. This unique arrangement also meant that Achaëans in general and Athenian elites in particular had a unique ability to convey concerns to the emperor through a high-status senatorial intermediary who often shared both their attachment to traditional religion and their affinity for Classical learning.

## 2. *Athenian elites and the preservation of tradition*

The particular tendencies of Achaëa's western governors combined with the interests of Athenian elites to ensure that the Christianization of Athens more closely resembled that of Rome than it did other eastern intellectual centers like Alexandria or Antioch. While there is certainly no one regional pattern for Christianization, the major cities of the eastern and western halves of the Roman Empire experienced this process differently in the fourth century. In the east, Christianization sometimes involved both imperial legislation and local violence.<sup>34</sup> Except for North Africa, which Brent Shaw has

<sup>33</sup> The proconsuls involved in the schools were *PLRE* 1 Anonymus 45 (Eunap. *VS* 483) and Anonymus 46 (Liban. *Or.* 1.25). The taurobolium, celebrated by Musonius, the brother of Antiochus 10, is commemorated in E. Sironen, *The Late Roman and Early Byzantine Inscriptions of Athens and Attica* (Helsinki 1997) no. 29 (all translations from this volume will follow Sironen unless otherwise noted) = *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 13253.

<sup>34</sup> See in particular the nuanced discussion of J. Hahn, *Gewalt und religiöser Konflikt: Studien zu den Auseinandersetzungen zwischen Christen, Heiden, und Juden im*

shown endured persistent local pagan-Christian violence, in the western half the empire Christianization moved more slowly and peacefully than in the east. In some places it likely resembled the world which Michele Salzman has reconstructed from Italian senatorial materials.<sup>35</sup> This was a world in which elite prestige was attached to a certain set of activities and offices, often both senatorial and sacred. Not only were there offices and priesthoods to hold, but elites had long used these positions to advertise their status.<sup>36</sup> Christianity made deep inroads among Italian senatorial elites only when the church and the imperial officials who supported it created sufficiently attractive incentives to entice the aristocracy to trade traditional civic and sacred positions of honor for prominent roles in the Christian community.

Like the senatorial aristocracy in Rome, late antique Athenian elites demonstrated their achievements and social status in a locally distinct idiom shaped by the religious, political, and cultural traditions of their city. So, for example, a fourth-century herm found near Mt. Hymettus traces nine generations of priests and priestesses from one Athenian family, with their offices prominently advertised.<sup>37</sup> Another fourth-century mon-

---

*Osten des Römischen Reiches* (Berlin 2004) 81–105.

<sup>35</sup> Salzman, *The Making of a Christian Aristocracy*. For North Africa see B. Shaw, *Sacred Violence and Sectarian Hatred in the Age of Augustine* (Cambridge 2011).

<sup>36</sup> Salzman, *The Making of a Christian Aristocracy* 29–68, 110–137.

<sup>37</sup> Sironen, *Inscriptions* no. 3 = *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 13620: “[...Themistocles was born to her and Themistoc]es, [son of Leonidas] the daduch [son of Themistocles], Praxa[gora]s the daduch was born to Themistocles a[nd –], daughter of Praxagoras. [Phil]iste was born to [hi]m and Bassa, d[daughter] of [Nig]rinus the sacred herald. [P]raxagore was born to her and Demonstratus, son of Sospis the daduch. Xenagoras was born to Praxagore [an]d Xenagoras. Dionysia was born to him and He[r]mippis. Xenagoras was born to Dionysia [and Hegias], son of Hegias. Hierophantes was born to Xenagoras and Aristophania, daughter of Victorinus. (column B) [– –S]op[is the exdadu]ch. [Demonstratus was born to him and Phil]ippe, daughter of D[– – the e]xegete. Praxagore was born to him and [Philiste, d]aughter of [Pra]xagoras the daduch. Xenagoras the Pythian priest was born to her and

ument, a statue set up to honor the senator, eponymous archon, and panegyriarch Hegias,<sup>38</sup> defines him as an ideal Athenian benefactor by listing together his sacred and civic offices (a division that would, of course, not have been recognized as meaningful in antiquity).<sup>39</sup> A fourth-century inscription set up in the temple of Demeter and Kore by Cleadas, the son of Erotius, simultaneously honors his father's service to the gods and advertises Cleadas' own position as priest.<sup>40</sup>

Elite inscriptions that celebrate a family's commitment to public service and pagan priesthoods are not unique to Athens. Inscriptions honoring Praetextatus and other fourth-century Roman senators similarly combine priesthoods and civic magistracies.<sup>41</sup> In Athens, however, these texts often have an added local flavor. These commemorations highlight not just divine and civic service, but also the intellectual leadership that was as much a distinguishing feature of Athenian elite life as senatorial service was in the city of Rome. Perhaps the best-known such inscription honors the historian Dexippus. This was carved into the base of a statue set up by his children sometime after 270.<sup>42</sup>

---

Xenagoras. Dionysia, later on the priestess of Demeter, was born to Xenagoras and Hermippis, who once was priestess of Athena. Xenagoras, father of Hierophantes was born to her and Hegias.”

<sup>38</sup> Sironen, *Inscriptions* no. 11 = *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 13273: “With veneration the entire city has dedicated (this statue of) her own benefactor, Hegias *lamprotatos*, son of Timocrates, who very generously held the office of eponymous archon and very conspicuously held the office of panegyriarch.”

<sup>39</sup> The panegyriarch seems mainly to have been responsible for feeding the visitors to the Eleusinian Mysteries: F. Millar, “P. Herennius Dexippus: The Greek World and the Third Century Invasions,” *JRS* 58 (1969) 12–29, at 21.

<sup>40</sup> Sironen, *Inscriptions* no. 16 = *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 13278; Cleadas was a priest of Demeter in Lerna.

<sup>41</sup> E.g. *CIL* VI 1779, 31929. For discussion of Praetextatus see above.

<sup>42</sup> Sironen, *Inscriptions* no. 4 (translation slightly adapted) = *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 13262: “Upon the approval granted by the Council of the Areopagus and by the Council of the 750 members and by the people of Athens, the children (erected the statue for their father) Publius Herennius Dexippus, son of Ptol-

It celebrates Dexippus for his civic service as, among other things, eponymous archon, panegyriarch, and agonothete of the Panathenaia. These activities, however, define him less than his literary achievements. He is described as a rhetor and historian whose “repute is widespread in Greece” because of his *History*. While Dexippus’ monument is remarkable for the specific praise it gives to his history, the linking of intellectual achievement, sacred service, and civic officeholding is not unprecedented—even in Dexippus’ own family. He came from a family of sophists, many of whom had proudly advertised the local offices they held, the strong connection to the Eleusinian cult they cultivated, and the intellectual prominence they earned. His father, for example, was a sophist, *kerux* of the Areopagus, and *hierokerux* at Eleusis.<sup>43</sup>

Other Athenian elite families present themselves similarly. In 326, Nicagoras, a rhetorician descended from a long line of teachers, wrote a graffito in the Valley of the Kings identifying himself as “the torch bearer of the holy mysteries at Eleusis” and “an Athenian” before calling the reader’s attention to the supposed Egyptian visit of “the divine Plato from Athens.”<sup>44</sup>

---

emaus, from the deme of Hermos, the rhetor and historian, and the sacrosanct priest, because of his merits in having held the office of *basileus* among the *thesmothetai* and having held the office of the eponymous archon and having served as panegyriarch and having been the agonothete of the Great Panathenaic festival at his own expense. The land of Cecrops has brought forth men excelling in courage, in speech and in counsel; one of them is Dexippus, who observed age-long history and wrote it exactly. Some of the events he witnessed himself, some he gathered from books, and thus made his way to the manifold path of history. O most famous man, who, spreading out his boundless insight, closely examined the doings of times long gone by! His reputation is well known all around Greece, a reputation which the newly bloomed praise for his history granted to Dexippus. And this is the reason why (his) children have repaid their famous father by erecting a statue formed of stone.” Cf. Millar, *JRS* 58 (1969) 12–29.

<sup>43</sup> Millar, *JRS* 58 (1969) 19–20. Two of his ancestors held the office of *hierokerux* at Eleusis and his father served as president of the Areopagus, polemarch, and agonothete.

<sup>44</sup> *OGIS* 720: “I, the torch bearer of the most holy mysteries at Eleusis, the

Nicagoras too came from a well-established Athenian family that had long served the gods and contributed to the intellectual life of the city. Indeed, the two orations in which Nicagoras' son-in-law Himerius described Nicagoras' grandson Rufinus emphasize the family's connection to Demeter through the Eleusinian Mysteries (*Or.* 8.7, 18), its public role in Athens (7.4), and Rufinus' promise to match the spectacular rhetorical achievements of his Athenian ancestors (7.4; 8.4, 21).<sup>45</sup>

Given the position of cultural leadership that Athens had long enjoyed, there is nothing remarkable about seeing the Athenian elite of the late third and early fourth centuries use these three types of achievements to collectively define their positive contributions to their city. More remarkable, however, is the degree to which this sort of elite, Athenian self-representation continued through the fourth century into the fifth. In the early 390s, for example, a philosopher named Iamblichus was honored for "adorning Athens with his wisdom" by arranging for the construction of defensive fortifications.<sup>46</sup> While the Iamblichus text does not speak about priesthoods, three inscriptions erected around the turn of the fifth century show that the triad of intellectual achievement, civic service, and cultic support remained an important part of Athenian elite self-definition. These inscriptions are connected to a teacher named Plutarch, most probably the scholarch who established

---

son of Minucianus, and an Athenian, examined the burial vaults many years after the divine Plato from Athens, and admired them, and gave thanks to the gods and to the most pious emperor Constantine, who has granted me this." For discussion see G. Fowden, "Nicagoras and the Lateran Obelisk," *JHS* 107 (1987) 51–57.

<sup>45</sup> On the larger context of *Or.* 8 see E. Watts, "Himerius and the Personalization of the Monody," in G. Greatrex and H. Elton (eds.), *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity* (Aldershot 2015) 319–324. For Himerius' career more generally see R. Penella, *Man and the Word: The Orations of Himerius* (Berkeley 2007), and T. D. Barnes, "Himerius and the Fourth Century," *CP* 82 (1987) 206–225.

<sup>46</sup> Sironen, *Inscriptions* no. 15 = *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 13277. See Alan Cameron, "Iamblichus at Athens," *Athenaeum* 45 (1967) 143–153.

the Athenian Neoplatonic school.<sup>47</sup> One of these, a badly damaged inscription found near the site of the Lyceum, uses philosophical language to recognize gifts that Plutarch gave to a temple.<sup>48</sup> A second inscription links his teaching activities and his support for prominent pagan festivals.<sup>49</sup> The third, dedicating a statue of the praetorian prefect Herculius ca. 410, does not mention a specific political office that Plutarch held, but it identifies him as an intellectual and suggests that he played a leading role in Athenian civic affairs.<sup>50</sup>

Collectively, these inscriptions reveal that intellectual achievement, civic leadership, and pagan cultic service remained both important markers of elite Athenian social status and possible avenues for public activity in the early fifth century. As the fifth century progressed, however, the standards set by past Athenians became less practically achievable. This can be seen in two inscriptions that honor later-fifth century Athenian intellectuals. The first of these honors Lachares, the sophist and student of Neoplatonic philosophy profited by Marinus and Damascius.<sup>51</sup> The fragmentary inscription reads:<sup>52</sup>

<sup>47</sup> The connection between the honorand and the scholar remains the subject of some debate. Alan Cameron (“Hypatia: Life, Death, and Works,” in *Wandering Poets and Other Essays* [Oxford 2016] 185–203, at 190) has revived the suggestion that these inscriptions refer to two different Plutarchs, largely on the basis of a reading of Synesius *Ep.* 136 and *IG II*<sup>3</sup> 13281 that calls Plutarch “the king of words.” On these points see however Watts, *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria* (Berkeley 2006) 92–96.

<sup>48</sup> The three fragments are Epigraphic Museum 4878, 4713, and 8572. See now Sironen, *Inscriptions* no. 25 = *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 13286.

<sup>49</sup> Sironen, *Inscriptions* no. 20 = *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 13281: “The people of the Erechtheus put this up for Plutarch, the king of words, the mainstay of firm prudence, who drew the Sacred Ship to the temple of Athena three times, spending all his wealth.”

<sup>50</sup> Sironen, *Inscriptions* no. 22 = *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 13283: “Plutarch the sophist, steward of words, erected this for Herculius the holy prefect, steward of laws.”

<sup>51</sup> Marinus *V.Proc.* 11; Damascius *V.Isid.* 62A Athanassiadi.

<sup>52</sup> Sironen, *Inscriptions* no. 163 = *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 13454.

[—] with soul [—] lives among the immortals [—] was to the much-loved man [—] which the [—] of Zeus the aegis-bearer [—] begot a better man. [—] of all, piety and of the moral virtue [—] to preserve unbroken [ch]ains indissoluble [—] (he) says that he uses the rule of the[se] both [—] the much admired Lachares left me, Eustathius, as a most [—] but I [—]ly as they would take when alive, [but] I was not a little inferior [both to my grandfather] and to (my) father.

The stone is unfortunately quite damaged, but it highlights Lachares' connection to Zeus and may perhaps have once listed a priesthood or other sacred office in its second line. There is, however, no indication of the specific service to the city or its gods that we see in earlier Athenian texts.

The second inscription, which honors Proclus, reads: "I am Proclus born of the Lycian race, whom Syrianus raised here to succeed him in his teaching. A common tomb has received both our bodies. May a single place receive our souls."<sup>53</sup> Penned by Proclus himself, this epitaph focuses upon his philosophical genealogy and refers to neither a specific civic role nor a cultic office. But Proclus elsewhere staked a claim to elements of the old, elite triad of intellectual achievement, civic leadership, and cultic service. Marinus, his biographer, asserts that Proclus spoke publicly in the Athenian assembly, advocated for Athenian interests with imperial officials, and even declared himself the custodian of the cult of Athena when imperial officials removed her cult statue from the Acropolis. The Athenian context then shaped the ways in which Marinus emphasized Proclus' very modest successes in civic and cultic affairs in his *Life of Proclus*.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>53</sup> The inscription is lost but the text is preserved by Marinus *V.Proc.* 36. On the social context that produced this sort of relationship between the two teachers see E. Watts, "Doctrine, Anecdote, and Action: Reconsidering the Social History of the Last Platonists (c. 430–c. 550 CE)," *CP* 106 (2011) 226–244.

<sup>54</sup> E.g. *V.Proc.* 15 (Proclus addressing the city council); 30 (Athena coming to Proclus' house). Of course, Marinus emphasizes these things for thematic reasons connected to the scale of philosophical virtues around which Pla-

Proclus and Lachares were perhaps disadvantaged by being born outside of Athens, but even native Athenians in the fifth century found it challenging to live up to this old standard for elite achievement. And yet it still remained an elite ideal. The philosopher Plutarch's grandson Archiades aspired to match the contributions of his ancestors but was prevented by circumstances from doing so. He trained in Neoplatonic philosophy alongside and under the direction of Proclus (*V.Proc.* 12). We know nothing about the specific civic offices he held, but he reportedly "led all of his own city in assembly and did kindness to each (citizen) on his own in accordance with every appearance of virtue and, above all, justice" (14). While Archiades clearly aspired to the traditional well-rounded Athenian elite ideal, Damascius' *Life of Isidore* suggests that circumstances prevented him from holding the sacred offices that his grandfather once did: Damascius describes his loss of property in a barbarian invasion and explains that, in pious elite fashion, Archiades complained not about his sudden poverty but about the fact that he was not permitted instead to exhaust his resources by paying for the Panathenaic procession.<sup>55</sup> Archiades instead devoted what remained of his wealth to the support of the Platonic school of Proclus, the institution that had appointed itself the private custodian of Athena's old public cult.

Although they are often rather sparse, the literary commemorations of other later fifth-century Athenian elites suggest that many still valued this traditional ideal of pagan elite

---

tonic philosophical training was organized. See H. J. Blumenthal, "Marinus' *Life of Proclus*: Neoplatonist Biography," *Byzantion* 54 (1984) 471–493.

<sup>55</sup> Archiadas "displayed the nature of his soul: at a time when most of his property had been looted, realising that Theagenes—then a child—was sad at what had been lost and plundered, he said: 'Come Theagenes, cheer up and give thanks to the gods for having saved our lives, and do not be depressed about the money; if Athena, the patron of our city, had ordered us to spend this money on the Panathenaic festival we would have paid any price to acquire the honour of incurring this expenditure. We should consider the present cause to be more glorious and more holy than the Panathenaea or any other contest'" (*V.Isid.* 105A, transl. Athanassiadi).

achievement, albeit one in which support for the Athenian Platonic school replaced support for public cults. Both Marinus' *Life of Proclus* and Damascius' *Life of Isidore* mention Nicagoras, a pagan with intellectual interests and the eponymous archon in 485. Some have speculated (though this cannot be proven) that he was a descendant of Himerius' father-in-law, the sophist and hierophant Nicagoras who visited the Valley of the Kings in 326 (see n.44 above). More is known about Theagenes, a pagan Athenian aristocrat during the reigns of Zeno and Anastasius. Theagenes fancied himself a philosopher and was a financial and political supporter of the Athenian Neoplatonic school (*V.Proc.* 29) as well as an Athenian archon and Constantinopolitan senator.<sup>56</sup> A panegyric composed in his honor by Pamprepus makes his attachment to traditional cults clear and speaks about him "having Zeus in safe keeping, in the sight of all."<sup>57</sup> And yet there is again no specific evidence of priestly or other public cultic service. Finally, his son Hegias, a scholar of the Neoplatonic school, seems to have used his material resources to try to revive pagan cultic activity, an attempt that he apparently abandoned after it brought him into conflict with the people governing the city in the early sixth century.<sup>58</sup>

### 3. *Athenian distinctiveness*

The careers of these later Athenian elites show that the traditional goal of combining intellectual achievement, civic leadership, and pagan divine service remained an ideal long after the disappearance of supportive governors made it impossible to achieve. It is important to consider the degree to which this distinguished the Athenian elite from their peers elsewhere. In places like Aphrodisias, some locally-defined version of this pagan elite self-representation may have survived into the later

<sup>56</sup> The date of his archonship is uncertain; see Damasc. *V.Isid.* 100A–B.

<sup>57</sup> Page, *Sel.Pap.* III 140.b.12. For the career of Pamprepus in Athens see Cameron, "Wandering Poets: A Literary Movement in Byzantine Egypt," in *Wandering Poets* 1–35, at 16–17; Watts, *Riot in Alexandria* 72–78.

<sup>58</sup> Damasc. *V.Isid.* 145B; Watts, *City and School* 123–127.

fifth century.<sup>59</sup> But this was not true in other intellectual centers of the east. In Alexandria, for example, the destruction of pagan religious infrastructure and pagan elite disempowerment at the turn of the fifth century made this particular combination of achievements impossible. Like Athens, Alexandria produced pagan intellectuals who attained senatorial rank in the later fifth and early sixth centuries. Horapollon, the latest known example of such a man (he lived into the reign of Anastasius), advertised his Mouseion membership, senatorial rank, and professorial standing in an extant court document, but he says nothing about priestly offices.<sup>60</sup> Admittedly, a court document would probably not advertise these offices overtly in the later fifth century, but Horapollon does not hide his father's paganism in it (1.18). Damascius' indication that Horapollon later willingly converted to Christianity (*V.Isid.* 120B) suggests that, although he clearly valued his positions of intellectual and political honor, traditional religious service was not a particularly high priority for him. Horapollon's father and uncle showed more devotion to the traditional cults but, unlike their Athenian contemporaries, they seem to have had no opportunity to visit monumental temples nor any hope of ever participating in a public festival like the Panathenaea.<sup>61</sup> Indeed, the only temples they are known to have frequented are a house-temple in the suburb of Menouthis and a mysterious old shrine partially hidden by sand (if they are not in fact the same building).<sup>62</sup> The actions of Theophilus in the early 390s had

<sup>59</sup> The career of Asclepiodotus of Aphrodisias provides a possible analogue. For discussion of his service and its commemoration see C. Roueché, *Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity: The Late Roman and Byzantine Inscriptions*<sup>2</sup> (<http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/ala2004>), nos. 52–54 and section V.8.

<sup>60</sup> J. Maspero, "Horapollon et la fin du paganisme égyptien." *BIFAO* 11 (1914) 163–195; *P.Cair.Masp.* III 67295. He is marked as a *lamprotatos* at 1.1; the Mouseion membership is mentioned in 1.19.

<sup>61</sup> Damascius (*V.Isid.* 72A–E, 76A–E) describes the religious activities of Horapollon's father Asclepiades and his uncle Heraiscus.

<sup>62</sup> For the Menouthis shrine see Zacharias *Vit.Sev.* 16–19, 32–33. For hidden shrines see Damasc. *V.Isid.* 53B, 53D, and the discussion of D.

made Athenian-style public paganism impossible by taking down or transforming many of Alexandria's monumental temples and placing monastic garrisons on their sites to prevent furtive pagan attempts to pay homage to the old gods.<sup>63</sup> Hypatia's murder in 415 then pushed Alexandrian pagan elites to the city's political margins.<sup>64</sup> These developments changed both elite behaviors and elite notions about divine service. In Alexandria, elite rhetoric followed reality.

The Athenian temples and festivals escaped the anti-pagan fervor of the late 380s and early 390s in part because they enjoyed a different political climate. Despite the fact that two anti-pagan laws of 391 often associated with temple destructions are addressed to prefects based in Italy, the dismantling of traditional cults in the cities of the west usually involved not the destruction of temples but the withdrawal of imperial financial support and the confiscation of other cult funds.<sup>65</sup> The cults of the city of Rome were affected greatly by this loss of public financial support. Although Athens faced these same legal restrictions, local citizens privately funded its cults and kept them operating without interruption for perhaps two generations after the defunding of Rome's public cults. Some of this is due to the fact that the implementation of these laws was left to local officials and friendly, intellectually-inclined pagan proconsuls. In Athens, economic and social conditions meant that many of these local leaders were also pagan intellectuals who had no incentive to put these laws into effect.<sup>66</sup> One must imagine, however, that the liminality of the province of Achaëa also had an effect. Not only did Athens belong to western em-

---

Frankfurter, *Religion in Roman Egypt* (Princeton 1998) 40–41.

<sup>63</sup> On the actions of Theophilus see Watts, *Riot in Alexandria* 190–213.

<sup>64</sup> For a discussion see Watts, *Hypatia* 107–120.

<sup>65</sup> The laws are *Cod. Theod.* 16.10.10–11. On the withdrawal of funds and its effect on the process of Christianization in Italy see now the concise summary of Cameron, *Last Pagans* 39–56.

<sup>66</sup> On the roots of these later economic conditions see Watts, *City and School* 24–47.

perors for most of the fourth century, but it also spent much of the reign of Arcadius as a contested space afflicted first by the invasion of Alaric and then the territorial claims of Stilicho. The 390s and 400s were not a time when difficult imperial laws could be firmly pressed upon the province of Achaia.

When the Athenian temples were finally shut (probably by imperial authorities) sometime in the second quarter of the fifth century, the city lacked two important features necessary to force a change in elite rhetoric and behavior. First, as demonstrated by events like Proclus' night-time visit to the shuttered shrine of Asclepius sometime in the 450s or 460s, the Athenian Christian community lacked the strength and leadership to prevent pagan intellectuals from entering temples to furtively engage in pagan rituals (*V.Proc.* 29). Unlike the Egypt of Theophilus and Shenoute, Attica had no monastic militias to use for intimidating and spying on suspected pagans.<sup>67</sup> Second, unlike the Christian communities in Rome, Gaul, and North Africa, the Athenian Christian community did not succeed in creating an alternative, more attractive idiom for expressing elite achievement. Although we know that Athens produced at least one Christian *lamprotatos* in the fifth century (a man named Victorinus),<sup>68</sup> Christian tombstones from the fourth and fifth century are generally modest and contain few advertisements of social status or ecclesiastical service. The exceptions are the scattered (and very brief) epitaphs of presbyters, readers, and subdeacons that began appearing in the later fifth and early sixth centuries.<sup>69</sup> Christian Athens seems to lack the defined markers of social status that one finds Plutarch and other elite

<sup>67</sup> For monastic garrisons see Watts, *Riot in Alexandria* 196–198. For actions like throwing urine on the doors of suspected pagans note the famous conflict between Shenoute and Gesius: S. Emmel, “From the Other Side of the Nile: Shenute and Panopolis,” in A. Egberts et al. (eds.), *Perspectives on Panopolis* (Leiden 2002) 95–113.

<sup>68</sup> Sironen, *Inscriptions* no. 198 = *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 13493.

<sup>69</sup> Sironen, *Inscriptions* nos. 83 (an *episkopos*) = *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 13453, 122 and 203 (*presbuteros*) = 13400 and 13498, 164 (*diakonos*) = 13429, and seven inscriptions mentioning persons called *anagnostes*.

pagan intellectuals confidently drawing upon in the same period—markers of the sort that began appearing even in Italy in the fifth century.<sup>70</sup> Ultimately it took the blunt efforts of Justinian’s legislation closing the Athenian philosophical school in 529 (and the equally clumsy response of Damascius and six of his colleagues) to fundamentally disrupt this elite ideal.<sup>71</sup>

Some of this Athenian peculiarity would have persisted regardless of the events of the fourth century. It is difficult, for example, to imagine any circumstances under which an Athenian Theophilus could emerge. Nevertheless, it is also true that Athens undoubtedly benefited from being under the control of western Roman emperors and friendly, often Italian pagan governors, for nearly all of the first century of Rome’s Christian Empire. This meant that the city moved towards Christianity at a different pace than many of its eastern peers. It also ensured that Athenian elites could continue to define themselves and their status using their own traditional markers for much of the fifth century.<sup>72</sup>

November, 2016

Department of History  
University of California, San Diego  
La Jolla, CA 92093-0104  
watts@ucsd.edu

<sup>70</sup> Salzman, *Christianizing the Aristocracy* 132–134. For the rise of elite bishops and the increasing social status that went along with Christian offices in the fifth century see now P. Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle* (Princeton 2012) 50–52.

<sup>71</sup> There is a substantial literature concerning the closing of the Athenian Neoplatonic school. See, among many others, H. J. Blumenthal, “529 and its Sequel: What Happened to the Academy,” *Byzantion* 48 (1978) 369–385; P. Chuvin, *A Chronicle of the Last Pagans* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1990) 135–139; U. Hartmann, “Geist im Exil: Römische Philosophen am Hof der Sasaniden,” in M. Schulz et al. (eds.), *Grenzüberschreitungen: Formen des Kontakts zwischen Orient und Okzident im Altertum* (Stuttgart 2002) 123–160; Cameron, “The Last Days of the Academy at Athens,” in *Wandering Poets* 205–246.

<sup>72</sup> I thank Johannes Hahn and Christian Wildberg for comments on an earlier version of this paper. I am also grateful to the editorial board of *GRBS*, the external reader, and, especially, to Kent Rigsby for suggesting helpful revisions.