



Julian and Justinian and the Unity of Faith and Culture

Glanville Downey

Church History, Vol. 28, No. 4. (Dec., 1959), pp. 339-349.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-6407%28195912%2928%3A4%3C339%3AJAJATU%3E2.0.CO%3B2-K>

Church History is currently published by American Society of Church History.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/asch.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

JULIAN AND JUSTINIAN AND THE UNITY OF FAITH AND CULTURE*

GLANVILLE DOWNEY, *Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D. C.*

The relationship—or lack of it—between religious belief and so-called secular culture is a topic which has been of perennial interest both to ancient students of religion and history and to modern historians. Students today use the phrase Unity of Faith and Culture because it has become current and because it bears some relationship to our own situation and problems, but we must also consider the subject, at least as we see it in antiquity, in terms of the interdependence or the interaction of faith and culture.

That the interdependence of religious belief and secular cultural activity in all its forms was something that was taken for granted in the Hellenised Roman world calls for no specific demonstration here. It is sufficient for the present purpose to refer to the recent summary of this subject by F. Temple Kingston in the *Anglican Theological Review*.¹ In the classical world religious faith might include both philosophy and cult, private and public, while culture involved the social order, and the political order, as well as literary and artistic activity. The individual, as a natural consequence of being a member of a state and a society built up by the Graeco-Roman achievement and tradition, could only be the heir of a system in which certain beliefs had come to be established and accepted—though not necessarily accepted to the same degree by each person—namely belief in the benevolent activity of the gods, or the divine power or powers, as protectors of the state and its members, along with confidence in the ability of the human intellect to work out metaphysical and philosophical problems, though there could be, of course, difference of opinion, and individual choice, in the matter of the solutions. Freedom and diversity in such matters were themselves an essential part of the heritage, and the possibility of choice did not obscure or call into question the fact that life was to be lived within a known framework in which the ordinary member of society, no matter which intellectual or religious path he elected to follow, still took his departure from a common inheritance and still was a member of a state in which, for the Romans, the public cult, representing the formal acknowledgement of the emperor as a figure with divine attributes, was a unifying and essential element.

*This study is a revised form of a paper read at the joint session of the American Historical Association and American Society of Church History in Washington, D.C., December 30, 1958. I am indebted to my colleague, Professor Milton V. Anastos, for his friendly comments which have contributed much to the improvement of the paper.

In the Eastern, Greek-speaking part of the Roman Empire, with which the present study is concerned, there was a special situation, in that the Greek tradition maintained itself in an unbroken line, in its original home and in its original language. When the relationships of Christianity and classical culture had to be worked out, the reactions of pagan thinkers to the new problem give us an instructive opportunity to see how the unity of faith and culture was understood at that time. This is a topic that has been studied by a number of scholars, such as Edwin Hatch, W. R. Halliday, Charles Norris Cochrane and Frederick C. Grant, to name only a few.² The eventual acceptance of what was considered the best part of the classical heritage was the beginning of a tradition of Christian scholarship which has lasted down to our own times. The present study will deal with two aspects of this development.

The first concerns the Emperor Julian the Philosopher. The success of Christianity in the fourth century evoked, as one might expect, quite different reactions from pagan leaders of different temperaments. Libanius ignored Christianity, Themistius tried to compete with it, and Julian set out to fight it. From the writings of Libanius, the great pagan teacher and orator of Antioch, one would hardly know that Christianity existed; at least, to him, it was not something that people such as himself and his peers had to take into account.³ His contemporary Themistius devoted himself to showing that Hellenism, as a way of life and a system of education, was at least as good as Christianity if not better. The ethical teachings of Christianity, he believed, could all be found in Hellenism, and the intelligent man ought to prefer the older and hence genuine system.⁴ Libanius and Themistius were private individuals, but Julian, as Emperor, was in a different position, and his remarkable temperament and personality led him to other measures.

The picture of Julian with which we have all grown up, the noble defender of the lost cause, is a touching and romantic spectacle. However, our picture of Julian has changed radically in the last half century, thanks to the researches of such scholars as Johannes Geffcken, Wilhelm Ensslin, Joseph Bidez, Roberto Andreotti, and Professor Dvornik,⁵ and our new knowledge both does greater justice to Julian, and throws a clearer light on the history of the Roman state and the real factors behind the success of Christianity in what Professor Dow⁶ has so aptly called the new-old fourth century.

We now understand that Julian's plan was not simply a campaign against Christianity as an inferior and erratic new kind of religion, but was a part of a larger political, social and economic program designed to save the state from what Julian and his supporters viewed as the gravest dangers. Here I believe Julian was thinking primarily in

terms of the unity or the interdependence of faith and culture, if we use the term culture in the widest sense.

The economic system which developed under Diocletian and Constantine the Great, at the end of the third century and the beginning of the fourth, was proving to bring hardships to the working classes, and Constantine's ambitious building program, coupled with increasing military expenses, inevitably produced an inflation which as always bore hardest on the poor and the middle classes. This is an aspect of the Constantinian system, as Julian and his friends would have viewed it, which has only recently been sufficiently understood, and in fact we must wait, for a full appreciation of it, until there is adequate publication of the coins issued by Julian, of which we do not yet possess a satisfactory catalogue. But the overall economic situation when Julian became emperor in 361—the inflation, the difficulties with the currency, and the characteristic local famine and price spiral at Antioch, Julian's headquarters—are all perfectly clear.⁷ Taken in conjunction with other aspects of his program which have been better known—the effort to reform justice, to strengthen the local municipal governments, to reduce the expenses of the imperial court—the economic problems are a first indication that Julian's program as a whole was not entirely a crusade against the Christian religion as such.

On the political side, we likewise have new knowledge. Here the basic problem, to Julian, was the danger to the state produced by the way in which Constantine and his sons had been slighting the old Roman gods in favor of the Christian deity. Every pagan knew that the Roman Empire and the Roman people had grown great through the favor of the old gods whose worship they had maintained with reverence and care, and it was obvious that if the imperial house adhered to Christianity, the traditional gods would be angered and would withdraw their favor. From Julian's point of view, the policy of Constantine and his dynasty had created a situation of the most alarming kind, which brought the gravest kind of threat to the stability and prosperity of the state.

In its political aspect, Julian's reaction was not merely a restoration of the status quo, but a radical return to older principles of Roman government, upon which the original greatness of the state had been based. It is only recently that Professor Dvornik has shown, in the course of his comprehensive study of the origins of Christian political philosophy, how Julian intended to abandon many of the features of the Roman imperial office as it had developed in his own time, returning instead to the political forms of the early Roman principate and the traditional Republican ceremonial. Julian refused the title of *Dominus* and condemned the formalized ruler cult and everything associated with

absolute and theocratic monarchy, and he set himself to obey and support the laws, instead of putting himself forward as Law Animate.⁸

In the matter of religion, likewise, Julian was not content to try simply to revive the pagan cults as they had existed before the time of Constantine, and to preserve pagan philosophy and literature in the forms they had then reached. Instead, Julian set out to found what has been called a "pagan church," with a professionally trained and disciplined priesthood organized in a hierarchy headed by a chief priest in each province. He likewise undertook to put together, himself, a new philosophical system, based on the principal traditional schools of philosophy, which would both preserve and vitalize the best features of classical philosophical thought. Julian was himself a keen and learned student of the history of religion and the history of philosophy, and was well qualified to undertake this task.

Modern scholars have pointed out that Julian's plan for a pagan church shows that he appreciated the importance, in the success of Christianity, of its professional clergy, trained and governed within a hierarchical structure, which made a notable contrast with the casual nature of the pagan priesthood. It is certainly true that by Julian's day the pagan cults had lost ground and tended to become unattractive and uninteresting, in comparison with the position they had once held. But we can also see, in this aspect of Julian's program, a part of a much more comprehensive effort to restore pagan thought and worship to the central place in human life they had formerly occupied. Classical philosophy, by Julian's time, had developed along so many different lines, and had become so academic and esoteric, that it had lost touch with ordinary life and could no longer be taken to represent the best elements of pagan thought. Julian's effort to organize a system of classical philosophy has been looked upon by some modern students as a bookish and impractical pastime, reflecting what has been thought of as the unworldly, rather dreamy side of his complex nature. It seems rather that Julian was here seeking to produce a strengthened synthesis of philosophical thought which would take its place alongside the new pagan church in a comprehensive revival of the classical way of life which, he thought, would be able to displace Christianity. Julian's program of reform, we have been coming to realize, reached into every department of life—government, justice, society, the economic order, cult and philosophy. In all these he tried to reintroduce the ancient virtues and to renew his people's connection with the ancient achievement, and it seems plain that he was convinced that all these departments of human thought and action must hang together. What counted most, to Julian and his friends, was that it was classical Greece that had first taken up the task of equipping man with all that fitted him for civil life and promoted his secular wellbeing.⁹

Julian's intense belief in the essential unity of faith and culture is illustrated by his famous edict on Christian teachers, in which he forbade Christians to teach classical literature, because, he pointed out, it could only be morally dishonest for a teacher to give instruction in material in which he himself did not sincerely believe.¹⁰ A man like Julian could only distrust any attempt at assimilation. Truth, to him, was established and single and it made a single culture and a single faith. In the belief in which Julian had been schooled, both classical civilization and the political ideal of the Roman Empire and its eternity were in themselves matters of faith, and Julian could not comprehend the new Christian idea of man, society and learning as another single and unified idea of faith.

Whether Julian's program as a whole was practical, and whether it could have been successful, is another question. Julian—and he was not alone in this—could not understand that there was something within Christianity which made it impossible to eliminate this new religion. It is, moreover, by no means certain that Christianity was responsible for all the evils which Julian found in the state; but Julian's attacking the Christian system on a comprehensive basis and attempting to replace it with a comprehensive classical system shows how important, to his mind, was the wholeness of faith and culture, whether the faith be pagan or Christian. For Julian, as for the classical Greek philosophers, ethics, as they concerned the individual, and politics, as they concerned the state, were not to be distinguished.¹¹

* * * * *

A little more than a century and a half later, when Justinian became emperor, paganism and Christianity had come to occupy quite different positions. Yet the problems that Justinian found were, in their implications, comparable to those Julian had faced. Justinian's ambitions, as we know, were two, the restoration of the political power of the ancient Roman Empire, and the definitive establishment of orthodox Christianity in the sense that orthodoxy was to be achieved within the Church, and heresy and paganism were to be once for all suppressed. To Justinian, heresy and paganism presented a threat to the welfare of the Roman State as a whole, just as Julian had believed that Christianity and its consequences had brought the Empire into mortal peril.

Like Julian, Justinian took a personal part in preparing the intellectual and spiritual foundations of the Christian state which he hoped to shape. As head of the state, responsible for both the spiritual and the political welfare of his subjects, he himself pursued theological studies which produced important results,¹²—studies which were the counterpart, *mutatis mutandis*, of Julian's philosophical and religious writings.

There is no need here to describe in detail Justinian's conception of the Christian state and of the Emperor's responsibility, as the head of it, for both the spiritual and the political welfare of his subjects. What I hope to do is to offer some new considerations on Justinian's views on Christianity and the Greek tradition which I think may help us to understand a little better certain aspects of his policy.

Justinian's deep respect for classical antiquity is well known.¹³ He saw that the Empire of his own day, as the direct heir of classical Greece and Rome, could draw renewed strength from a revival of those elements, political, legal and cultural, which had made the ancient Empire great. In view of the emperor's well known enthusiasm for antiquity, it has seemed a paradox that he should have closed, in 529, the ancient and celebrated schools of Athens, in which classical Greek philosophy was still being taught in establishments which were the direct descendants of the schools of Plato, Aristotle and their successors. This has seemed almost a blot on Justinian's character, but in reality his action was perfectly normal and consistent.

The real background of Justinian's action may be perceived in the academic activities of the major centers of learning in the Empire in his day. One of the most characteristic illustrations of the academic program of this period is found in the history of the School of Gaza in Palestine, one of the most famous and influential literary centers of that epoch. This School has not been well known among modern scholars because only a limited number of its productions have been preserved and these do not have a strong appeal to modern taste. Yet this School played a highly significant role in the literary history of the sixth century of our era. This peaceful little town on the coast of Palestine, admired for its attractive climate and its handsome buildings, was famous throughout the Empire for the special excellence of its teaching of the classical Greek language and literature. Gaza was of course not the only place in which the tradition of Hellenism was maintained; but by reason of its secluded location, the distinguished faculty which was built up, and its tranquil antiquarian atmosphere, this quiet university town carried on the Greek tradition in a manner which drew students from all over the Empire.

Gaza, however, was only one of several classical schools. A comparable center of learning, better known to scholars today, was Alexandria, where studies of Greek classical literature and philosophy had flourished since the Hellenistic period. Almost equally famous was Athens. Athens in fact might be thought to be somewhat similar to Gaza. This was a center of Greek literature and philosophy which was much older than Gaza and Alexandria, and as late as the fourth century

of our era the University of Athens, as we should now call it, was more famous than the school in Palestine, which began to reach its full development in the fifth century.¹⁴ To Athens some of the most famous Christian thinkers of the fourth century had gone, as young men, for their classical training. It would seem, on the face of it, at least puzzling that Justinian, the outspoken admirer of classical antiquity, should have closed the University of Athens two years after he became sole emperor. The teachers, and their instruction, were avowedly pagan, but even so the Emperor's action might appear to contradict his expressed admiration for what he himself spoke of in his legal writings as "the venerable authority of antiquity" and "faultless antiquity."¹⁵ Justinian encouraged the work of the historian Procopius of Caesarea and of the poet Paul the Silentiary, both of whom wrote in classical Greek style, and the poems of the *Greek Anthology* attest the serious study of classical poetry in court circles in Constantinople.

The seeming inconsistency of Justinian's termination of the activities of the University of Athens¹⁶ can be explained quite naturally in the light of the development of the contemporary academic world. Very soon after he became sole emperor, Justinian issued edicts which forbade heretics, pagans and Samaritans to teach any subject whatever.¹⁷ He did this, of course, as a part of his campaign to achieve religious unity, for he realized clearly that proper education was basic to his purpose, and that—as he himself wrote¹⁸—pagan or heretical teachers might corrupt the minds of their students. The parallel with Julian's edict on teachers is very striking, and these edicts indicate¹⁹ that the closing of the University of Athens was a consequence of the teachers there being pagans.

Yet this does not alone explain what happened. It is at Gaza and Alexandria that we can see an even more important reason for the disappearance of pagan philosophical instruction at Athens. At both places there had developed the new type of Christian professor, a type which has lasted down to the present. In the School of Gaza, instruction was centered on the Greek classics, and the students devoted themselves to Homer and Thucydides and the other great pagan writers. But at the same time—and this is what is significant—the teachers were actively engaged in research and writing on Christian subjects. One of the best known figures is Procopius of Gaza whose career lay in the reign of Anastasius (A.D. 491-518).²⁰ In the classical style he wrote such pieces as a panegyric of the Emperor Anastasius, a monody on an earthquake at Antioch, a description in rhythmic prose of two pictures at Gaza which portrayed scenes from the story of Phaedra and Hippolytus, and a highly literary description of a mechanical clock at Gaza.²¹ Such writings are typical of the *belles-lettres* of the day. At the

same time, Procopius was well known as a theological writer. He composed a commentary on the Octateuch which the learned Patriarch Photius of Constantinople later described as somewhat fulsome because Procopius was careful to record all the opinions of all the authorities.²² He also wrote commentaries on Kings, Chronicles, Proverbs and the Song of Songs, and polemics which included an attack on Theodoret of Cyrrihus and a refutation of the Neoplatonist Proclus.

Further examples could be cited of similar scholarship in the Christian classical tradition at Gaza and elsewhere in Palestine at this period.²³ The school at Alexandria produced the same kind of scholarship, for example in the work of John Philoponus, who wrote on both Christian theology and Greek philosophy.²⁴ Careers such as those of Procopius of Gaza and John Philoponus will make much more intelligible the closing of the pagan schools at Athens. Obviously Christian truth could be taught only by teachers who were themselves Christians. It had long been recognized that there was a place in the education of the Christian for the best elements of classical literature, but it was plain that the classics could be taught properly only by teachers who were Christians and could present the classical tradition within the Christian framework. It could only be on these terms that Justinian could achieve the synthesis of the revived *Imperium Romanum* and the Church. As Professor Florovsky has recently put it, in a Christian society nothing can be simply secular.²⁵ In this sense the schools at Athens had become an anachronism and their closing was even overdue. These pagan schools had simply put themselves outside the academic program of the rest of the Empire. It was not the teaching of classical philosophy at Athens that Justinian found dangerous, but the fact that it was being taught by pagans who had no interest in helping build up the kind of Christian culture that Justinian saw was needed as an essential basis for the Christian State. As we know, the Athenian professors found themselves unable to become Christians to save their jobs, and went as refugees to the court of the King of Persia.

Julian and Justinian, each in his own way, saw, as Professor Tsirintanes of Athens has recently emphasized, that the past is a condition for the existence of a civilization, and that belief in a civilization is belief in the historical cohesion of values.²⁶ The sense of the "presentness of the past," as Justinian and others of his day conceived it, proved of course to be one of the vital bases of Byzantine civilization and of the role of the Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire.²⁷ When we recall that Julian, from his own point of view, had had the same sense of the continuity of the present with its roots, we realize what it was that the unity of faith and culture meant to both rulers. Both these learned and conscientious emperors were sure that unity

existed and that it could be realized in practice; and as Roman sovereigns they conceived it to be their duty to use all the power of the state to put this unity into effect. The contrasts and at the same time the similarities that we have seen in these two epochs are a commentary on the ancient view of the necessity and the naturalness of the unity of faith and culture.

1. F. Temple Kingston, "Classical Culture and the Wholeness of Faith," *Anglican Theological Review*, XL (1958), pp. 26-36.
2. Edwin Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church* (Hibbert Lectures, 1888; London, 1890), reprinted in 1957 in the Harper Torchbook series under the title *The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity*, with valuable foreword, notes and bibliography by Frederick C. Grant; W. R. Halliday, *The Pagan Background of Early Christianity* (Liverpool and London, 1925); C. N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* (Oxford, 1940), reprinted 1944, and reissued in 1957 by the Oxford University Press, New York, in the Galaxy series.
3. On Libanius' attitude toward Christianity, see J. Misson, "Libanius et le christianisme," *Musée belge*, XXIV (1920), pp. 72-89; P. Petit, *Libanius et la vie municipale à Antioche au IV^e siècle après J.-C.* (Paris, 1955), p. 196.
4. See the studies by the present writer, "Education and Public Problems as Seen by Themistius," *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, LXXXVI (1955), pp. 291-307, and "Themistius and the Defense of Hellenism in the Fourth Century" (one of the Bedell Lectures for 1956), *Harvard Theological Review*, L (1957), pp. 259-274.
5. J. Geffcken, *Kaiser Julianus* (Leipzig 1914); W. Ensslin, "Kaiser Julians Gesetzgebungswerk und Reichsverwaltung," *Klio*, XVIII (1923), pp. 104-199; J. Bidez, *La vie de l'empereur Julien* (Paris, 1930), translated into German, with additional material, under the title (in which the change of the description of Julian may be noted) *Julian der Abtrünnige* (Munich, 1940); R. Andreotti, "L'opera legislative ed amministrativa dell'Imperatore Giuliano," *Nuova Rivista Storica*, XIV (1930), pp. 342-383, together with the same scholar's *Il Regno dell'Imperatore Giuliano* (Bologna, 1936). Professor Dvornik's study is cited below, note 8.
6. In a forthcoming paper in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*.
7. On the economic situation in Julian's time see S. Mazzarino, *Aspetti sociali del quarto secolo* (Rome, 1951). On Julian's sojourn at Antioch see the studies by the present writer, "Julian the Apostate at Antioch," *Church History*, VIII (1939), pp. 303-315, and "The Economic Crisis at Antioch under Julian the Apostate," *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of A. C. Johnson* (Princeton, 1951), pp. 312-321.
8. F. Dvornik, "The Emperor Julian's 'Reactionary' Ideas on Kingship," *Late Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of A. M. Friend, Jr.* (Princeton, 1955), pp. 71-81, especially pp. 75-76.
9. See S. H. Butcher, *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius* (ed. 2, London, 1893), pp. 4-42.
10. This edict is so important, and so characteristic of Julian's views, that it is quoted here in full, in the translation by Mrs. W. C. Wright in her edition of Julian's works in the Loeb Classical Library, II, pp. 117-123 (*Epistle 36 = Epistle 61* in the edition of J. Bidez and F. Cumont): "I hold that a proper education results, not in laboriously acquired symmetry of phrases and language, but in a healthy condition of mind, I mean a mind that has understanding and true opinions about things good and evil, honorable and base. Therefore, when a man thinks one thing and teaches his pupils another, in my opinion he fails to educate exactly in proportion as he fails to be an honest man. And if the divergence between a man's convictions and his utterances is merely in trivial matters, that can be tolerated somehow, though it is wrong. But if in matters of the greatest importance a man has certain opinions and teaches the contrary, what is that but the conduct of hucksters, and not honest but thoroughly dissolute men in that they praise most highly the things they believe to be most worthless, thus cheating and enticing by their phrases those to whom they desire to transfer their worthless wares. Now all who profess to teach anything whatever ought to be men of upright character,

and ought not to harbor in their souls opinions irreconcilable with what they publicly profess; and, above all, I believe it is necessary that those who associate with the young and teach them rhetoric should be of that upright character; for they expound the writings of the ancients, whether they be rhetoricians or grammarians, and still more if they are sophists. For these claim to teach, in addition to other things, not only the use of words, but morals also, and they assert that political philosophy is their peculiar field. Let us leave aside, for the moment, the question whether this is true or not. But while I applaud them for aspiring to such high pretensions, I should applaud them still more if they did not utter falsehoods and convict themselves of thinking one thing and teaching their pupils another. What! Was it not the gods who revealed all their learning to Homer, Hesiod, Demosthenes, Herodotus, Thucydides, Isocrates and Lysias? Did not these men think that they were consecrated, some to Hermes, others to the Muses? I think it is absurd that men who expound the works of these writers should dishonor the gods whom they used to honor. Yet, though I think this absurd, I do not say that they ought to change their opinions and then instruct the young. But I give them this choice; either not to teach what they do not think admirable, or, if they wish to teach, let them first really persuade their pupils that neither Homer nor Hesiod nor any of these writers whom they expound and have declared to be guilty of impiety, folly and error in regard to the gods, is such as they declare. For since they make a livelihood and receive pay from the works of those writers, they thereby confess that they are most shamefully greedy of gain, and that, for the sake of a few drachmae, they would put up with anything. It is true that, until now, there were many excuses for not attending the temples, and the terror that threatened on all sides [i.e. under the Christian régime] absolved men for concealing the truest beliefs about the gods. But since the gods have granted us liberty, it seems to me absurd that men should teach what they do not believe to be sound. But if they believe that those whose interpreters they are and for whom they sit, so to speak, in the seat of the prophets, were wise men, let them be the first to emulate their piety towards the gods. If, however, they think that those writers were in error with respect to the most honored gods, then let them betake themselves to the churches of the Galileans to expound Matthew and Luke,

since you Galileans are obeying them when you ordain that men shall refrain from temple-worship. For my part, I wish that your ears and your tongues might be 'born anew,' as you would say, as regards these things in which may I ever have part, and all who think and act as is pleasing to me. For religious and secular teachers let there be a general ordinance to this effect: Any youth who wishes to attend the schools is not excluded; nor indeed would it be reasonable to shut out from the best way boys who are still too ignorant to know which way to turn, and to overawe them into being led against their will to the beliefs of their ancestors. Though indeed it might be proper to cure these, even against their will, as one cures the insane, except that we concede indulgence to all for this sort of disease. For we ought, I think, to teach, but not punish, the demented." On this edict and its significance, see the present writer's article, "The Emperor Julian and the Schools," *Classical Journal*, LIII (1957), pp. 97-103.

11. See p. xi of the Foreword by Kenneth M. Setton in Henry Osborne Taylor, *The Emergence of Christian Culture in the West* (New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1958; originally published in 1901 under the title *The Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages*).
12. See the study of M. V. Anastos, "The Immutability of Christ and Justinian's Condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, VI (1951), pp. 123-160. Professor Anastos is preparing a monograph on the intellectual history of the reign of Justinian.
13. The paragraphs which follow have grown in part out of previous studies by the present writer, "Justinian as Achilles," *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, LXXI (1940), pp. 68-77; "Justinian's View of Christianity and the Greek Classics," *Anglican Theological Review*, XL (1958), pp. 13-22; "The Christian Schools of Palestine: A Chapter in Literary History," *Harvard Library Bulletin*, XII (1958), pp. 297-319.
14. The best account of the work of the schools at Athens at this period is J. W. H. Walden, *The Universities of Ancient Greece* (New York, 1909).
15. *veneranda vetustatis auctoritas* (Nov. 23, 3, p. 188, line 9 ed. Schoell-Kroll, *Corpus iuris civilis*); *inculpabilis antiquitas* (Nov. 8, *iusiurandum*, *ibid.* p. 89, line 36).
16. Justinian's action is thought paradoxical by Ernst Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, II (Paris, 1949), p. 276, cf. p. 372. J. B. Bury comes closer to a correct understanding of the mea-

- sure, though he does not take into account all the factors involved: *History of the Later Roman Empire* (London, 1923; reprinted, New York, Dover Publications, 1958), II, pp. 369-370.
17. *Cod. Just.* 1.5.18.4; 1.11.10.2.
 18. *Cod. Just.* 1.5.18.4. It is interesting to compare St. Augustine's statement (*De doctrina Christiana*, IV, 27 [59]): "The man whose life is in harmony with his teaching will teach with greater effect . . . Whatever may be the majesty of the style, the life of the speaker will count for more in securing the hearer's compliance."
 19. As Bury (*loc. cit.*, above, note 15) suggested.
 20. On his career, see K. Seitz, *Die Schule von Gaza* (Diss., Heidelberg, 1892), pp. 9-21, and W. von Christ, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*, ed. by W. Schmid and O. Stählin, ed. 6, II, pt. 2 (Munich, 1924), pp. 1029-1031.
 21. H. Diehls, "Ueber die von Prokop beschriebene Kunstuh von Gaza: mit einem Anhang enthaltend Text und Uebersetzung der Ekphrasis Horologiu des Prokopios von Gaza," *Abhandlungen der k. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 1917, No. 7.
 22. Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 206 (Migne, P.G., CIII, cols. 676-677).
 23. See the present writer's article in the *Harvard Library Bulletin*, cited above, note 13.
 24. On John Philoponus, see H. D. Saffrey, "Le chrétien Jean Philopon et la survivance de l'école d'Alexandrie au VI^e siècle," *Revue des études grecques*, LXVII (1954), pp. 396-410 (for this reference I am indebted to Professor Sirarpie der Nersessian). For other studies of the work of the school of Alexandria at this period, see M. V. Anastos, "The Alexandrian Origin of the Christian Topography of Cosmas Indicopleustes," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, III (1946), pp. 73-80; *idem*, "Aristotle and Cosmas Indicopleustes on the Void," *Prosphora eis Stilpona P. Kyriakiden* (Thessalonica, 1953), pp. 35-50 (*Hellenika, Parartema IV*).
 25. G. Florovsky, "Empire and Desert: Antinomies of Christian History," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, III (1957), p. 143. The reader should note what Professor Florovsky says (*ibid.*, pp. 141-142) on Justinian's conception of the Christian State.
 26. A. N. Tsirintanes, *Towards a Christian Civilization: A Draft Issued by the Christian Union of Professional Men of Greece* (Athens, "Damascus" Publications, 1950), pp. 156-157.
 27. See the present writer's article "The Byzantine Church and the Presentness of the Past," *Theology Today*, XV (1958), pp. 84-99, also the review article "Byzantium and the Classical Tradition," *The Phoenix*, XII (1958), pp. 125-129.

1960 Brewer Prize Contest

The American Society of Church History announces that its next Brewer Prize competition for a book-length manuscript in church history will conclude in 1960. The award will be announced at the annual meeting of the Society in December of that year. It will consist of a subsidy of one thousand dollars to assist the author in the publication of the winning manuscript, which shall be described on its title-page as the "Frank S. and Elizabeth D. Brewer Prize Essay of the American Society of Church History" and shall be published in a manner acceptable to the Society. If competing essays are otherwise of equal quality, preference will be given to those dealing with topics related to the history of Congregationalism. Complete manuscripts in final form, fully annotated, must be in the hands of the Secretary, Professor Winthrop S. Hudson, 1100 South Goodman St., Rochester 20, New York, by September 15, 1960. There must be two copies, a typescript and a first carbon, on standard weight paper, double-spaced, with a left-hand margin of at least an inch and one-half.