

Teaching Philosophy in the 4th Century: Julian and the So-Called ‘School of Pergamon’

Riccardo Chiaradonna

Oxford, 07/06/2017

In this paper I will focus on the philosophical teaching in Neoplatonic schools in the 4th century, after Iamblichus’ death (ca. AD 325). This is certainly the least known phase in Ancient Neoplatonism: almost no works survive and scholars are often inclined to regard it dismissively. Some crucial details escape us: for example we would like to know more about how and when Iamblichus’ teaching entered the philosophical school in Athens. As a matter of fact, from Karl Praechter onwards scholars have regarded this phase in Neoplatonism (that of the so-called ‘School of Pergamon’) as characterised by a markedly religious and theurgical trend that relegated rational philosophical teaching in the background. Here I would like to suggest that such conclusions are partial to say the least. The surviving evidence (e.g. Eunapius’ *Vitae sophistarum*; Julian’s and Themistius’ orations, etc.) offers a different picture. Theurgical practices did not supplant traditional teaching based on arguments and the exegesis of texts: theurgy was actually seen as part of the traditional *paideia*. Furthermore, Iamblichus’ immediate posterity was characterised by different positions that coexisted even within the same intellectual circles. We should be aware, then, that pagan philosophy during the 4th century is remarkably more sophisticated and multi-faced than scholars sometimes suggest.

As noted earlier, scholars are inclined to regard post-Iamblichean philosophers (among them Julian’s teachers) as religious and charismatic figures, whose main (or rather sole) interest resided in performing rituals and engaging in theurgical practices: G. Fowden’s expression ‘pagan holy men’ is often used to describe their status. This general view can be traced back to Karl Praechter’s classical outline of Neoplatonist schools. Praechter famously regarded Iamblichus’ disciples who settled in Pergamon around Aedesius as forming a unique school (the ‘school of Pergamon’), which was actually a religious and theurgical circle (**T1**). This, according to Praechter, was ‘die religiös-theurgische Richtung’ in Greek Neoplatonism. This view is sometimes connected to that which regards these philosophers as forming an ideologically engaged pagan group threatened by Christian persecution after Constantine (**T2**). At least some episodes seem to confirm such conclusions. For example, Sopater of Apamea, Iamblichus’ student and possibly Iamblichus’ Maecenas in Apamea, came to acquire an influential position under Constantine, so much so that he took part in the foundation rituals of Constantinople (328-339) as *τελεστής* (**T5**). This and other

facts suggest that pagan philosophers did not suffer from any kind of repression under Constantine. Yet, despite his prestigious position, Sopater eventually fell into disgrace and Constantine put him to death under the incitement of his Christian praetorian prefect Ablabius. Sopater was actually convicted of impeding the provision of wheat in Constantinople through magical rituals (see EUNAP. *v. soph.* VI, 13-18, pp. 21, 6-22, 10 Goulet). This is a well-known episode and is not unparalleled in 4th-century history (cf. Maximus of Ephesus' conviction to death under the Emperor Valens). Yet, as we shall see in a moment, nothing really suggests that a widespread movement of repression against pagan philosophers took place after Constantine. Their Neoplatonic and pagan allegiance is not a sufficient explanation for Sopater's and Maximus' dramatic vicissitudes, which rather point to their involvement in political court affairs. Apparently, Aedesius' school in Pergamon did not look like a quasi-clandestine circle: nothing really suggests that Neoplatonist pagan philosophers had to go underground. Another common view demands further scrutiny. Scholars sometimes argue that Iamblichus' teaching represented a genuine turn in Neoplatonism and that immediately after him all pagan philosophers became committed theurgists, thus abandoning rational methods. Again, this looks like an oversimplification: as we shall see, 4th-century pagan philosophy included different trends and Iamblichus' teaching did not supplant other tendencies. Furthermore, we can detect the presence of different views even among Iamblichus' followers.

Our main source for reconstructing this phase of Neoplatonism are Eunapius' *Lives of Philosophers and Sophists*. Fortunately, this work is preserved and has been the focus of several recent and important studies, first and foremost Richard Goulet's masterly critical edition, with a French translation and rich commentary, in the Collection Budé (Paris, 2014; **T3**). Unfortunately, however, Eunapius is a notoriously tendentious source, with his own ideological anti-Christian and hagiographical agenda and with little interest in philosophical technicalities (see e.g. M. Becker, 'Depicting the Character of Philosophers: Traces of the Neoplatonic Scale of Virtues in Eunapius' Collective Biography', in *Bios Philosophos. Philosophy in Ancient Greek Biography*, ed. M. Bonazzi and S. Schorn, Turnhout 2016, pp. 221-258). That said, it is worth focusing on some passages in Eunapius that seem to offer a rather consistent picture of pagan philosophical teaching during the 4th century. Eunapius provides some well-known remarks against Constantine, whom he presents as the Emperor who demolished the most illustrious pagan sanctuaries and replaced them with Christian buildings (*v. soph.* VI, 10, p. 19, 11-13 Goulet: see **T6**). Yet Eunapius does not record any crisis of philosophical teaching under or after Constantine. He says that Iamblichus' students formed a large crowd and that those who were eager to learn flocked to him from all parts (see EUNAP. *v. soph.* VI, 4, p. 12-14 Goulet). This is only one of several passages that suggest that

philosophical teaching definitely did not go underground after 312 (see e.g. EUNAP. *v. soph.* VI, 38, p. 26, 9-13 on Aedesius reputation in Pergamon). Scholars often regard Eunapius with scepticism. It is indeed more than likely that his remarks contain some exaggeration, but his list of students suffices to confirm the echo of Iamblichus' teaching (T4):

Sopater the Syrian was of their number, a man who was most eloquent both in his speeches and writings; and Aedesius and Eustathius from Cappadocia; while from Greece came Theodorus and Euphrasius, men of superlative virtue, and a crowd of other men not inferior in their powers of oratory, so that it seemed marvellous that he could satisfy them all; and indeed in his devotion to them all he never spared himself (*v. soph.* V, 5, p. 12, 14-20 Goulet; here and below I quote Eunapius from W.C. Wright's translation, with some slight changes) .

We actually do not know anything about Euphrasius, but the other three students mentioned by Eunapius are well known figures. In his recent edition, R. Goulet offers an excellent presentation of each of them and I can only refer to him for details. Here I will recall that Sopater of Syria is the counsellor of Constantine mentioned above. His importance as a philosopher emerges from several sources and not only from Eunapius. So Sozomenus says that Sopater was the head of 'Plotinus' succession' and this information is confirmed in Suda, which mentions Sopater as one of the members of Plotinus' *diadochê*. In his letter 1389.13-14 Libanius calls Apamea the city 'beloved by Iamblichus and mother of Sopater'. Scholars suppose that Sopater received Iamblichus in Apamea and that he was then head of a school in that city. His teaching is interestingly set in connection to that of Plotinus. It is actually difficult to regard Sopater as the head of a school of philosophers originating from Plotinus: Plotinus, Porphyry and Iamblichus can hardly be seen as forming a single school, given their different views and the different geographical locations of their circles. Probably the remarks in Sozomenus and Suda are meant to describe Sopater as the heir to a certain philosophical tradition and this is not an isolated situation: the Neoplatonic taste for establishing successions is well known.

We know Eustathius of Cappadocia from Eunapius' *Lives*. His biography gives further evidence of the high reputation gained by Iamblichus' students. Constance II entrusted him with an embassy to the King of Persia during an unplanned siege at Antioch. In reporting this episode Eunapius expresses surprise at this decision, since Constance 'was wrapped up in the books of the Christians' (*v. soph.* VI, 40, p. 26, 25 Goulet). And indeed Eunapius describes the gloomy situation that affected people under Christian emperors (*v. soph.* XXIII, 54, p. 105, 20-22 Goulet). Yet Eustathius' embassy can be taken to reveal that pagan intellectuals did not lose power and influence under Christian emperors: after all, there was no competing Christian *élite* capable of

replacing them at that time. Eustathius was a relative of Aedesius, the other student of Iamblichus. He married Sosipatras and had three children, one of them being the philosopher Antoninus.

Aedesius studied in Greece (*v. soph.* VI, 1, p. 18, 17 Goulet) and then in Syria under Iamblichus (*v. soph.* VI, 4, p. 19, 3-7 Goulet). He settled in a small estate and took up the life of a goat-herd or cow-herd (*v. soph.* VI, 36, p. 25, 21-22 Goulet) before establishing a school in Pergamon, probably at his house (*v. soph.* VI, 38, p. 26, 13 Goulet; VI, 81, p. 34, 20-21 Goulet: **T7**). There came Julian to study under him, around 350, when Aedesius was an old man (*v. soph.* VII, 15, p. 43, 18-19 Goulet = **T8**). The list of Aedesius' students includes Chrysanthius of Sardis, Eusebius of Mindus, Priscus of Thesprotia and Maximus of Ephesus. As is well known, Priscus and Maximus were teachers and counsellors of Julian and remained with him until his death during the Persian campaign (AMM MARC. XXV, 3, 23). Sosipatras, Eustathius' widow, came to teach in Pergamon too (*v. soph.* VI, 80-81, p. 34, 14-35, 2 Goulet). Finally, Iamblichus' student Theodorus, who is mentioned by Eunapius, is probably to be identified with Theodorus of Asine (in Messenia), a most interesting and revealing figure in the intellectual panorama of that time. While Eunapius lists Theodorus among Iamblichus' disciples, Damascius describes him as a student of Porphyry's (see DAM. *V. Isidori, Epitoma Photiana* 166, p. 230, 1-2 Zintzen). As a matter of fact, Proclus confirms that Theodorus followed Porphyry on an exegetical issue regarding the *Timaeus* (PROCL. *in Tim.*, vol. II, p. 154, 7-9 Diehl). Furthermore, we know that Theodorus parted company with Iamblichus' views on the soul and endorsed an intellectualist kind of Platonism close to that of Plotinus (PROCL. *in Tim.*, vol. III, p. 333, 28-30 Diehl). As we shall see later, however, this fact does not rule out that he had been a disciple of Iamblichus: Eusebius of Mindus further shows that members of Iamblichean circles could hold intellectualist and anti-theurgical views.

Eunapius' *Lives* contain several anecdotes about the supernatural capacities of these figures, about their ritual practices and so on. All this fits perfectly with the traditional outline of 4th-century Neoplatonists as pagan holy men. Yet the situation is more complicated, as shows a famous page about Sosipatras' prodigious abilities. Here Eunapius describes Sosipatras' teaching practice in some detail (**T11**):

Once, for example, when they were all met at her house – Philometor however was not present but was staying in the country – the theme under discussion and their inquiry was concerning the soul. Several theories were propounded, and then Sosipatra began to speak, and gradually by her proofs disposed of their arguments; then she fell to discoursing on the descent of the soul, and what part of it is subject to punishment, what part immortal, when in the midst of her bacchic and frenzied flow of speech she became silent, as though her voice had been cut off, and after letting a short interval pass she cried aloud in their midst: "What is this?" (*v. soph.* VI, 90-91 pp. 36, 19-37, 1 Goulet) .

This is a most interesting passage. Eunapius says that Sosipatras taught where she lived (παρ' αὐτῆς, *v. soph.* VI, 90, p. 36, 19), at her house (κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτῆς οἰκίαν, *v. soph.* VI, 80, p. 34, 20) in Pergamon, next to Aedesius. In all likelihood those Neoplatonist schools were private circles and this situation is clearly different from that in Athens in the late 2nd and early 3rd centuries, where philosophers were appointed to 'public' Imperial chairs (the same holds for Alexandria in the late 5th and the early 6th centuries where, as scholars generally suppose, philosophy teachers were appointed to public chairs). The private Iamblichean circles usually attracted disciples of a high social status and with an excellent school background, who sought to receive superior philosophical training, culminating in the prodigious unification with the divine, as the final part of the anecdote just quoted confirms. Here Sosipatras, after some kind of corybantic ecstasy, becomes aware of an accident involving Philometor (*v. soph.* VI, 91-93, p. 37, 1-10). This is the most famous part of the episode but we should definitely not overlook the steps which lead to this final and prodigious outcome. Such steps are much less sensational than we would expect, for Eunapius presents the prodigious ecstasy as the crowning result of a very traditional teaching method. Theurgy is, so to speak, the final step and the complement of a process that includes traditional philosophical *paideia* and is certainly not opposed to it. It is worth noting that Sosipatras' lecture is about a famously debated issue in Neoplatonic schools, that is the soul's descent into bodies and its vicissitude after death (εἶτα εἰς τὸν περὶ καθόδου ψυχῆς καὶ τί τὸ κολαζόμενον καὶ τί τὸ ἀθάνατον αὐτῆς ἐμπύπτουσα λόγον). From Plotinus onwards this topic had been the main focus of philosophical discussions. Plotinus held that a part of us (that is, something of our soul or its intellectual counterpart) remains in the intelligible realm and does not descend into the body: so our superior self is alien to the extensional and temporal level of being (PLOT. *enn.* IV, 8 [6], 8; V, 3 [49], 4; VI, 4 [22], 14). The superior self is characterised by a thought activity that is homogeneous to that of the divine Intellect (V, 3 [49], 4, 29-30). Furthermore Plotinus claims that human beings are in principle capable of 'awakening to themselves' (IV, 8 [6], 1). This entails that through intellectual activity (and without supra-rational practices such as those of theurgy) each of us can join to the highest (and ordinarily unconscious) part of his/her soul, so as to share its thought activity and intelligible mode of life. Despite some slight changes, Porphyry apparently did not abandon Plotinus' intellectualist position. The situation changed with Iamblichus, who criticized Plotinus' view and held that the soul descends completely into the body so that it cannot ascend to divine being without the help of demonic and divine powers. Iamblichus' conclusions are, in this precise sense, anti-intellectualist and anti-Plotinian: on his view, the ascent to principles cannot be achieved through philosophy alone and requires the accomplishment of precise ritual practices. Yet, if we carefully read Iamblichus' theurgical *magnum opus* (that is his *Response to Porphyry*, generally

known under the title of *De mysteriis Ægyptiorum* assigned to it by Ficino), we can immediately detect that it is an extremely sophisticated treatise full of philosophical technicalities about, e.g., genera, categories and predication. As a matter of fact, Iamblichus' anti-intellectualist position is based on a precise account of knowledge and the hierarchy of being, which Iamblichus opposes to the views developed by Plotinus and Porphyry. Interestingly, the controversy about these issues continued after Iamblichus and involved some of his disciples. As noted earlier, Theodorus – whom Eunapius lists among Iamblichus' disciples – followed Plotinus' views of the superior soul and Eusebius of Mindus – one of Aedesius' students – held a clearly intellectualist position. According to Eunapius, Eusebius (T9)

At the close of his exposition [...] would add that these are the only true realities, whereas the impostures of witchcraft and magic that cheat the senses are the works of conjurors who are insane men led astray into the exercise of earthly and material powers. (*v. soph.* VII, 17, p. 45, 3-7 Goulet)

Eusebius represented an intellectualist trend within Aedesius' school and his attitude was opposed to that of another disciple of Aedesius, that is Maximus of Ephesus. With his speech Eusebius was actually admonishing the young Julian against Maximus' theurgical practices. Eusebius recalled the prodigious acts that Maximus accomplished in the sanctuary of Hecates, described Maximus as a kind of charlatan, and finally said that true purification is achieved through reason (*cfr. v. soph.* VII, 24, p. 46, 12-13 Goulet). Julian's reply is famous 'Nay, farewell and devote yourself to your books. You have shown me the man I was in search of' (*v. soph.* VII, 26, p. 46, 14-15 Goulet)

We will come back later to the different attitudes of Aedesius' students. For the time being, it is worth setting Sosipatras' episode against its philosophical background. Before reaching the final corybantic trance, the philosopher tackles one of the principal issues in post-Plotinian doctrinal debates, that is the status of the soul. Sosipatras possibly refuted views similar to those of Plotinus, Theodorus and Eusebius. This is suggested by the words *κατὰ μικρὸν ταῖς ἀποδείξεσι διαλύουσα τὰ προβαλλόμενα* (*v. soph.* VI, 91 pp. 36, 23-24 Goulet). By doing so, Sosipatras probably held that intellectual capacities alone are insufficient to achieve unification with the divine. It is only after this discussion based on arguments that Sosipatras came to the final trance with her prodigious clairvoyance.

Sosipatras' philosophical methods in the first part of her lecture were probably the same methods used by those who had different views. We know that Eusebius blamed Maximus who, because of his lofty genius and his superiority as a speaker, scorned all demonstrations based on arguments (*διὰ μέγεθος φύσεως καὶ λόγων ὑπεροχὴν καταφρονήσας τῶν ἐν τούτοις ἀποδείξεων*, *v. soph.* VII, 21, p. 45, 22-24 Goulet). Yet as we shall see in a moment Maximus was

certainly not alien to the study of logic and of argumentative methods. Be that as it may, it is interesting that ‘demonstrations’ (ἀποδείξεις) are mentioned both in Sosipatras’ anecdote and in Eusebius’ discourse. Eunapius describes Eusebius’ course as an ἐξήγησις (to be understood as ‘exposition’ rather than ‘commentary’) ending with an ἐπίλογος τῆς ἐξηγήσεως or an ἐπιφώνημα, that is a ‘conclusion’ (v. *soph.* VII, 17, p. 45, 4 Goulet; VII, 18, p. 45, 11 Goulet; VII, 18, p. 45, 8 Goulet). Some information about the canon of texts used in these lectures is given in Eunapius’ remarks about Chrysanthius. Eunapius explains that Chrysanthius first adequately learned the doctrines of Plato and Aristotle (τῶν τε Πλάτωνος καὶ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους λόγων μετασχὼν ἰκανῶς, v. *soph.* XXIII, 8, p. 97, 12-13 Goulet = **T10**); next he applied himself to grasping the nature of the gods and the wisdom to which Pythagoras had devoted his mind, as had his disciples Archytas and Apollonius of Tyana, men who only seemed to possess a body and to be mortal (see v. *soph.* XXIII, 8, p. 97, 19-23 Goulet). Chrysanthius aims then to acquire a divinely inspired wisdom, but this does not rule out the study of Plato’s and Aristotle’s works. We find the same programme in a passage from Julian, who replaces Pythagoras with the *Chaldean Oracles*. Julian here criticizes the position of the Peripatetic philosopher Xenarchus and, in connection to this criticism, describes his own attitude to the philosophical tradition (**T16**):

Now whether what he [Xenarchus] says is correct or not, let us leave to the extreme Peripatetics to refine upon. But that his view is not agreeable to me is, I think, clear to everyone. For I hold that the theories of Aristotle himself are incomplete unless they are brought into harmony with those of Plato, or rather we must make these also agree with the oracles that have been vouchsafed to us by the gods (*Ad Matrem deorum* 162 cd, tr.. Wright).

In a few words, this is Iamblichus’ philosophical programme as represented by the theurgical trend of his school. This programme does not dismiss the study of Aristotle at all: quite the contrary. For example, we know that Julian was familiar with Aristotle and acted as arbiter in a dispute that opposed Themistius and Maximus of Ephesus concerning Aristotle’s syllogistic (more on this below). These aspects of Julian’s philosophical method should in no way be underestimated. Still, according to Julian Aristotle is clearly subordinated to Plato and both of them are subordinated to the supernatural teaching of the *Chaldaean Oracles*. We find a similar situation in Julian’s *Letter 12* to Priscus: again, Julian’s enthusiasm for theurgy and for the *Chaldaic Oracles*, and his hostility towards the ‘Theodorean’ trend of philosophy, do not prevent him from admiring Priscus’ works on Aristotle.

From the texts discussed thus far a slightly different picture emerges from the one that is often drawn by scholars. Interestingly, no Neoplatonist philosopher rejected argumentative methods and the exegesis of Plato’s and Aristotle’s normative texts (see Goulet’s judicious assessment in

T3). So we can safely assume that different attitudes rested on a common basis. For people such as Maximus of Ephesus, Sosipatras and Chrysanthius, philosophy culminated in a supra-rational wisdom connected to ritual practices and prodigious capacities. People such as Theodorus and Eusebius, instead, had an attitude closer to that of Plotinus and – as far as we can tell – were inclined to reject theurgical and magical practices. That said, we should not forget that Eusebius was a member of Aedesius’ school as much as Maximus. So it is wrong to regard Aedesius’ school as some kind of religious circle with no internal debate, based on orthodoxy and ritual practices. This would be a mere caricature of historical reality. Our extant sources suggest instead that members of the same school could hold different views about the same issues, while all sharing a common background of normative texts and argumentative methods. We can also infer that even members of Iamblichean circles did not accept Iamblichus’ theurgical teaching unanimously.

This general outline can help explain some interesting *testimonia* about Julian’s master Maximus of Ephesus. We are very well informed about Maximus’ charismatic figure, about his prodigious capacities, about the influence he exerted on Julian and, finally, on his conviction to death under the Emperor Valens in the winter of 371/372 (Maximus was involved in the so-called ‘Theodorus affair’). These pieces of information, however, do not exhaust Maximus’ multi-faced personality. In some recent contributions N. Zito has offered a complete analysis of the astrological poem *Περὶ καταρχῶν* (*On initiatives*), which Suda ascribe to Maximus with the additional information that Maximus had dedicated this work to Julian. Zito persuasively shows that the attribution to Maximus is plausible (see N. Zito, *Maxime: Des Initiatives*, ed. and comm., Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2016). Furthermore we know that Maximus was familiar with Aristotelian logic. Simplicius informs us that he wrote a commentary on Aristotle’s *Categories* closely dependent on Alexander of Aphrodisias. In his commentary on Aristotle’s *Prior Analytics*, Ammonius says that Maximus held a view on the perfection of syllogistic figures close to that of the Peripatetic commentator Boethus of Sidon (and of Porphyry and Iamblichus after Boethus): so he regarded as perfect not only syllogisms of the first figure, but also those of the second and the third (**T12**). Themistius maintained the contrasting view that only first figure syllogisms are perfect and Julian acted as an arbiter in their controversy, approving Maximus’ position. This interesting information is further confirmed by Themistius’ treatise *Reply to Maximus and Boethus about the Reduction of the Second and Third Figure to the First* preserved in an Arabic translation (recently edited in M. Rashed, *L’Héritage aristotélicien: Textes inédits de l’Antiquité*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2016), which makes it possible to reconstruct this debate and the logical views held by Maximus. Maximus’ interest in the technical aspects of Aristotelian logic might seem to contrast with the theurgical and charismatic aspects of his intellectual figure that emerge from Eunapius; therefore,

some specialists are cautious in assessing these *testimonia*. Yet it is very unlikely (to say the least) that Ammonius, Themistius and Simplicius are all unreliable on these issues. We would have no doubts at all about Porphyry's and Iamblichus' philosophical views and arguments, if we merely had Eunapius' biographies of these authors. So Eunapius' portrait of Maximus should be regarded with caution: it certainly captures part of Maximus' intellectual figure, but not the whole of it. Because of our intellectual attitude, we tend to regard theurgy and magic as incompatible with logic and argumentation: but this radical separation reflects our own outlook and not that of 4th-century philosophers. Being surprised at Maximus' logical knowledge reveals a naïve and a-historical approach, similar to that of someone who is surprised at Julian's military skills, given his interest in theurgy and mystic.

Themistius' work fits well with this outline. Certainly, he was different from Eunapius' heroes and this fact is sufficiently confirmed by Eunapius' very telling silence about him (we can detect here a sort of 'strategy of exclusion'). That said, we should note again that Themistius and his opponents shared common methods and normative texts, and this even though this common basis led to totally different approaches and conclusions. What separates Julian's teachers and Themistius is not their canon of authorities, but rather the way in which they rely on the same normative texts (see on this S. Elm, *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome*. Los Angeles; Oxford: University of California Press, 2012). It is extremely interesting to focus on Themistius' speech 20, the *epitaphium* for his father Eugenius. Here Themistius describes his father's attitude to philosophy in a way that actually adumbrates Themistius' own attitude to philosophy (this *epitaphium* has aptly been described as a kind of self-advertisement) (T13):

To be sure, the visage and shape impressed upon these sacred mysteries were almost entirely those of Aristotle. Nevertheless, my father helped to open up all the shrines of the sages. He was one of those who were fully initiated in the sacred knowledge that Pythagoras of Samos brought back to Greece from Egypt and in what Zeno of Citium later taught in the Painted Stoa. He always displayed the works of the great Plato right at the door and in the very temple precinct. When passing to the Academy from the Lyceum, he did not change his clothes; he would often first make a sacrifice to Aristotle and then end by worshipping Plato (*Or.* 20, 235 c, trad. Penella with some alterations).

The traditional interpretation of Themistius as an Aristotelian and anti-Platonic philosopher has not much to commend itself and this passage aptly shows that Themistius actually shares a crucial idea held by Neoplatonic philosophers, that is that of the harmony between Plato and Aristotle, whereby Plato's philosophy is seen as crowning the philosophical curriculum. Pythagoras is also included in the canon of normative authors and so are the Stoics. Finally, Themistius makes use of vocabulary

pertaining to the celebration of ‘Mysteries’ in order to express the agreement of Plato and Aristotle: celebrating the Aristotelian Mysteries is seen as propaedeutic to the celebration of the Platonic mysteries. All this is well-known to scholars familiar with Neoplatonic exegesis. From this perspective, Themistius’ canon of authorities could well be shared by a follower of Iamblichus such as Julian. And, indeed, scholars have aptly remarked that Themistius’ canon of philosophical authorities is more or less that same as Julian’s canon of authorities, as this emerges, e.g., from his letter 89b to Theodorus. That said, Themistius’ Platonism is profoundly different from that of Maximus and Julian. Themistius’ use of vocabulary related to the mysteries does not point to any special religious reading of the philosophical tradition; ultimately, it is nothing but a well-known Platonic reminiscence (*Symp.* 210 a-211 b). Secondly, while Pythagoras is included in Themistius’ canon of normative philosophers, he has certainly no eminent position and Themistius does not argue in favour of a Pythagorising reading of the Greek philosophical tradition. I will come back to this issue in a moment. Finally, Themistius does not mention the *Chaldaean Oracles* and theurgy at all. In sum: his harmonising reading of Greek philosophy leaves aside two crucial features of Iamblichus’ distinctive exegetical method, that is the Pythagorean reading of Plato and Aristotle and the role played by theurgy and *Chaldaean Oracles*. If we set Themistius’ approach in parallel to that of Chrysanthius, we can easily note that both rely on a common basis formed by Plato and Aristotle. Yet Chrysanthius’ philosophical knowledge culminated in some kind of superior and divinely inspired wisdom represented by super-human figures such as Pythagoras, Apollonius and Archytas: herein lies the difference from Themistius. As Boethius reports (see *In Cat.*, P.L. 64, 162 a = **T15**), Themistius regarded Archytas’ treatise on the categories as spurious and argued that the author was not a Pythagorean at all. This is a crucial piece of evidence and I think we should be well aware of its anti-Iamblichean implications. By regarding Archytas’ work as spurious Themistius actually removes the main support to Iamblichus’ Pythagorean and metaphysical reading of Aristotle’s *Categories*. After all, Iamblichus held that Aristotle had derived his theory from Archytas (see SIMP. *In Cat.*, p. 2, 15-25 Kalbfleisch). Therefore, Themistius’ remark seems to be inspired not by any philological scruple, but rather by philosophical polemics.

A very interesting passage from Themistius’ speech n. 23 (= **T14**) confirms this outline. Here Themistius recalls his early writings, where he had followed the teaching of his ‘elders’ (his grandfather and father had been philosophers) and had attempted to explain Aristotle’s doctrines for his own personal use (some of his paraphrases have been transmitted to us). Against Themistius’ will, some of these writings began to circulate and some copies reached Sycion. There, Simplicius informs us, lived a man who had originally been ‘a disciple of the man of Chalcis [i.e., Iamblichus] when the latter was elderly’. He was, however, ‘not a devotee of the new song [i.e. of the new kind

of theurgical philosophy established by Iamblichus], but of the ancestral and ancient song of the Academy and the Lyceum represented by Themistius (*or.* 23, 295 B tr. Penella). With his typical taste for self-advertisement, Simplicius says that this philosopher from Sycion became enthusiastic about Themistius' works and behaved just like three famous figures of the past: Axiothea, who came to Athens after reading Plato's *Republic* in order to attend the Academy – she had to conceal her feminine identity in order to be admitted to Plato's school; the Corinthian farmer who after reading Plato's *Gorgias* left his vines and 'submitted his soul to Plato'; and, finally, Zeno of Citium who after reading the *Apology of Socrates* left Phoenicia and came to Athens where he founded the Stoà. In the same way the philosopher from Sycion came with his students to the Bosphorus (that is to Constantinople, where Themistius taught philosophy). And since his students were reluctant at first, he sent them to the temple of Apollo to ask if the god knew of a better master. Themistius adds that the god delivered the same judgement that he had delivered long before about Socrates, meaning: no one was a better philosopher than Themistius. This passage is irritatingly self-celebratory and might indeed reveal Themistius' lack of good taste. Yet, in addition to this, it also reveals his philosophical models: Aristotle, Plato, and Socrates.

We should recall that Themistius, Maximus, Sosipatras and Eusebius were all pagan philosophers. All of them shared a common philosophical education based on school discussions, argumentative methods, and Plato's and Aristotle's normative texts. Yet their views were not unanimous; debates and controversies were vibrant. Their opinions about philosophy and their own 'Hellenic' intellectual identity were profoundly different. It would be a mistake, then, to regard Neoplatonic pagan philosophers in the 4th century as forming a common anti-Christian front. Their approach to political issues confirms this multi-faced situation. After all, Julian's project was not unanimously regarded with enthusiasm by pagan intellectuals. Themistius was frosty and even Chrysanthius did not accept Julian's invitation to Constantinople (*v. soph.* VII, 38, p. 49, 20-23; XXIII, p. 15, p. 99, 1-3 Goulet). Finally, we should recall that Iamblichus' theurgical teaching was not approved by everybody and that even some members of Iamblichean circles were cautious on these issues. Theurgy was definitely not the common background of 4th-century philosophers. Their common background was instead formed by doctrinal discussion, normative texts, and exegetical and argumentative methods (see **T3**).

Texts and references

T1: Dieser Sachverhalt verbietet, Iamblich als Theologen aus der philosophischen Entwicklung des Neuplatonismus herausfallen zu lassen. [...] In Iamblichs Bahnen bewegt sich Theodoros von Asine. Anders freilich scheint es mit dem Teile der geistigen Nachkommenschaft Iamblichs zu

stehen, der sich um Pergamon gruppiert. Der Charakter, den Zeller zu Unrecht Iamblich und der Gesamtheit seiner Anhänger zuschreibt, eignet, wenn nicht alles täuscht, diesem Zweige in der Tat. K. Praechter, *Richtungen und Schulen im Neuplatonismus*, in *Genethliakon für Carl Robert*, Berlin 1910, pp. 105-156 (rist. in K. Praechter, *Kleine Schriften*, Olms, Hildesheim-New York 1973, pp. 165-216: 176-177)

T2: Sopater met a violent death by getting mixed up in Imperial politics, and it was left to Aedesius to carry on the School after the master's death, in a period of repression, during which the School had to go underground. He moved the school to Pergamon, and was succeeded on his death by Eustathius.

J. Dillon, *Iamblichus of Chalcis*, ANRW, II.36.2, de Gruyter, Berlin-New York 1987, pp. 862-909: 871

T3: Bien qu'il soit toujours avare de détails historiques précis, Eunape nous confirme en tout cas que la philosophie restait bien vivante dans plusieurs régions de l'Empire. L'image générale qu'il donne du philosophe est d'ailleurs tout à fait traditionnelle. Être philosophe, c'est comme être médecin ou sophiste. Ce n'est pas uniquement avoir reçu une formation philosophique et partager des convictions : il y a apparemment une activité (ἐπιτήδευμα, 2, 12) propre au philosophe, un statut identifiable dans la société, peut-être un vêtement caractéristique : le philosophe porte un petit manteau grossier (τριβώνιον), du moins lorsqu'il ne fait pas étalage de luxe à la cour comme Maxime qui revêt « un habit plus élégant qu'il ne sied à un philosophe », il possède des écrits des anciens philosophes, il lit les Anciens, notamment Platon et Aristote, apprend par cœur les classiques, il écrit ou n'écrit pas des traités ou des commentaires, discute avec d'autres philosophes dans des débats publics¹ ou des échanges privés, tient école, enseigne à des disciples, se promène avec eux en ville tout en discutant, prend même des vacances avec eux. Il lui arrive de conseiller les princes, il fréquente volontiers les gouverneurs, participe à des ambassades, et se fait le porte-parole de ses concitoyens. A plusieurs reprises Eunape mentionne des discours d'apparat de philosophes en public. Manifestement, dans son esprit, philosophie et rhétorique sont difficilement dissociables. On a vu que lui-même enseignait la rhétorique le matin, tout en étudiant la philosophie auprès de Chrysanthe l'après-midi.

R. Goulet, *Eunape de Sardes: Vies de philosophes et de sophistes*, t. I: *Introduction et prosopographie*, Les Belles Lettres, Paris 2014, pp. 159-162.

T4: Eunapius, VS, V 4-5 = p. 12.11-20 Goulet:

Δικαιοσύνην δὲ ἀσκήσας, εὐηκοίας ἔτυχε θεῶν τοσαύτης ὥστε πλῆθος μὲν ἦσαν οἱ ὁμιλοῦντες, πανταχόθεν δὲ ἐφοίτων οἱ παιδείας ἐπιθυμοῦντες · ἦν δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸ κάλλιστον δύσκριτον. Σώπατρος γὰρ ἦν ὁ ἐκ Συρίας, ἀνήρ εἰπεῖν τε καὶ γράψαι δεινότατος, Αἰδέσιος τε καὶ Εὐστάθιος ἐκ Καππαδοκίας, ἐκ δὲ τῆς Ἑλλάδος Θεόδωρος τε καὶ Εὐφράσιος, οἱ κατ' ἀρετὴν ὑπερέχοντες, ἄλλοι τε πλῆθος, οὐ πολὺ λειπόμενοι κατὰ τὴν ἐν λόγοις δύναμιν, ὥστε θαυμαστὸν ἦν ὅτι πᾶσιν ἐπήρκει · καὶ γὰρ ἦν πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀφθονος.

But because he practised justice he gained an easy access to the ears of the gods; so much so that he had a multitude of disciples, and those who desired learning flocked to him from all parts. And it is hard to decide who among them was the most distinguished, for Sopater the Syrian was of their number, a man who was most eloquent both in his speeches and writings; and Aedesius and Eustathius from Cappadocia; while from Greece came Theodorus and Euphrasius, men of superlative virtue, and a crowd of other men not inferior in their powers of oratory, so that it seemed marvellous that he could satisfy them all; and indeed in his devotion to them all he never spared himself. (tr. Wright)

T5: Eunapius, *VS*, VI 7 = p. 19.21-27 Goulet:

Ἰαμβλίχου δὲ καταλιπόντος τὸ ἀνθρώπειον, ἄλλοι μὲν ἀλλαγὴν διεσπάρησαν, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἦν ἔξω φήμης καὶ ἄγνωστος. Σώπατρος δὲ ὁ πάντων δεινότερος, διὰ τε φύσεως ὕψος καὶ ψυχῆς μέγεθος οὐκ ἐνεγκὼν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις ὁμιλεῖν, ἐπὶ τὰς βασιλικὰς αὐτὰς ἔδραμεν ὀξύς, ὡς τὴν Κωνσταντίνου πρόφασιν τε καὶ φορὰν τυραννήσεων καὶ μεταστῆσεων τῷ λόγῳ.

When Iamblichus had departed from this world, his disciples were dispersed in different directions, and not one of them failed to win fame and reputation. Sopater more eloquent than the rest because of his lofty nature and greatness of soul, would not condescend to associate with ordinary men and went in haste to the imperial court, hoping to dominate and convert by his arguments the purpose and headlong policy of Constantine. (tr. Wright)

T6: Eunapius, *VS*, VI 5 = p. 19.7-16 Goulet

Τούτων γὰρ οὐδὲν εἶχομεν ἀναγράφειν, ὅτι τὸ μὲν ἐπέκρουπεν ἴσως Αἰδέσιος αὐτὸς διὰ τοὺς χρόνους – Κωνσταντίνος γὰρ ἐβασίλευε, τὰ τε τῶν ἱερῶν ἐπιφανέστατα καταστρέφων καὶ τὰ τῶν χριστιανῶν ἀνεγείρων οἰκήματα –, τὰ δὲ ἴσως καὶ τὸ τῶν ὁμιλητῶν ἄριστον πρὸς μυστηριώδη τινὰ σιωπὴν καὶ ἱεροφαντικὴν ἐχεμυθίαν ἐπιρροεπὲς ἦν καὶ συνεκέκλιτο.

On this head I had nothing to record, partly perhaps because Aedesius himself kept it secret owing to the times (for Constantine was emperor and was pulling down the most celebrated temples and building Christian churches); but perhaps it was partly because all his most distinguished disciples leaned towards and inclined to a silence appropriate to the mysteries, and a reserve worthy of a hierophant. (tr. Wright)

T7: Eunapius, *VS*, VI 38 = p. 26.9-13 Goulet:

Αὐτὸς δὲ εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν διαβάς, ὅλης Ἀσίας προτεινούσης αὐτῷ χειρᾶς, ἐν τῷ παλαιῷ Περγάμῳ καθιδρύθη, καὶ παρ' ἐκείνων μὲν Ἕλληνές τε ἐφοίτων καὶ οἱ πρόσχωροι, καὶ ἡ δόξα τῶν ἀστρῶν ἔψαυεν.

while he himself passed into the province of Asia; for all Asia was holding out her arms in welcome. He [Aedesius] settled in ancient Pergamon, and his school was attended by Greeks and by the neighbouring people, so that his fame touched the stars. (tr. Wright)

T8: Eunapius, *VS*, VII 8-11 = p. 43.9-44.2 Goulet:

Ὡς δὲ οὔτε ἐκείνοι παιδεύειν εἶχον, οὔτε Ἰουλιανὸς μανθάνειν, ἐξήτησεν τὸν ἀνεπιὸν ἐπιτραπήναι οἱ καὶ ῥητορικῶν ἀκροάσασθαι καὶ φιλοσόφων λόγων. Ὁ δὲ, θεοῦ νεύσαντος, ἐπέτρεψεν, περὶ τὰ βιβλία πλανᾶσθαι βουλόμενος αὐτὸν καὶ ἀργεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ γένους καὶ τῆς βασιλείας ὑπομνήσκασθαι. Τοῦτο δὲ ἐπιτραπὲν αὐτῷ, πανταχοῦ βαθέων καὶ βαρυτάτων ὑποκειμένων κτημάτων, μετὰ βασιλικῆς ὑπονοίας καὶ δορυφορίας περιεφοίτα, καὶ διέστειχεν ὅπῃ βούλοιτο. Καὶ δὴ καὶ εἰς τὸ Πέργαμον ἀφικνεῖται κατὰ κλέος τῆς Αἰδεσίου σοφίας. Ὁ δὲ ἤδη μὲν εἰς μακρὸν τι γῆρας ἀφίκτο, καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἔκαμνε · τῆς δὲ ὁμιλίας αὐτοῦ προεστήκασαν καὶ ἀνὰ τοὺς πρώτους ἐφέροντο Μάξιμος τε, ὑπὲρ οὗ τάδε γράφεται, καὶ Χρυσάνθιος ὁ ἐκ Σάρδεων, Πρίσκος τε ὁ Θεσπρωτὸς ἢ Μολοσσός, Εὐσέβιος τε ὁ ἐκ Καρίας Μύνδου πόλεως. Καὶ συνουσίας ἀξιοθεῖς τῆς Αἰδεσίου, ὁ καὶ ἐν μειρακίῳ πρεσβύτης Ἰουλιανός, τὴν μὲν ἀκμὴν καὶ τὸ θεοειδὲς τῆς ψυχῆς καταπλαγεῖς, οὐκ

ἐβούλετο χωρίζεσθαι, ἀλλ', ὥσπερ οἱ κατὰ τὸν μῦθον ὑπὸ τῆς διψάδος δηχθέντες, χανδὸν καὶ ἀμυστὶ τῶν μαθημάτων ἔλκειν ἐβούλετο, καὶ δῶρά γε ἐπὶ τούτοις βασιλικὰ διέπεμπεν.

Now since they had nothing to teach him and Julian had nothing to learn from them, he begged his cousin's permission to attend the schools of the sophists and lectures on philosophy. He [Constance], as the god so willed, permitted this, because he wished Julian to browse among books and to have leisure for them, rather than leave him to reflect on his own family and his claim to empire. After he had obtained this permission, since ample and abundant wealth from many sources was at his disposal,⁶³ he used to travel about accompanied by the emperor's suspicions and a bodyguard, and went where he pleased. Thus it was that he came to Pergamon, following on the report of the wisdom of Aedesius. But the latter was by this time far on in years, and his bodily strength was failing. First and foremost of all his students were Maximus, about whom I am now writing, Chrysanthius of Sardis, Priscus the Thesprotian or Molossian, and Eusebius who came from Myndus, a city of Caria. On being allowed to study under Aedesius, Julian, who was old for his boyish years, in amazement and admiration of his vigour and the divine qualities of his soul, refused to leave him, but like those who had been bitten by the snake in the story he longed to drink down learning open-mouthed and at a gulp, and to win his end used to send Aedesius gifts worthy of an emperor. (tr. Wright)

T9: Eunapius, *VS*, VII 17 = p. 45.3-7 Goulet:

Προσετίθει δὲ μετὰ τὴν ἐξήγησιν ὁ Εὐσέβιος ὡς ταῦτα εἶη τὰ ὄντως ὄντα, αἱ δὲ τὴν αἴσθησιν ἀπατώσαι μαγανείαι καὶ γοητεύουσαι θαυματοποιῶν ἔργα καὶ πρὸς ὑλικὰς τινας δυνάμεις παραπαιόντων καὶ μεμνητότων.

At the close of his exposition Eusebius would add that these are the only true realities, whereas the impostures of witchcraft and magic that cheat the senses are the works of conjurors who are insane men led astray into the exercise of earthly and material powers. (tr. Wright)

T10: Eunapius, *VS*, XXIII 8 = p. 97.11-24 Goulet

Ὁ δὲ τῶν τε Πλάτωνος καὶ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους λόγων μετασχὼν ἰκανῶς, καὶ πρὸς πᾶν εἶδος φιλοσοφίας τρέψας τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ πᾶν εἶδος ἀναλεγόμενος, ὡς περὶ τὴν γνῶσιν τῶν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ὑγίαιεν καὶ ἔρρωτο, καὶ τῇ συνεχεῖ χρήσει πρὸς τὴν χρῆσιν αὐτῶν ἔτοιμος ὑπήρχεν, καὶ πρὸς ἐπίδειξιν ἐθάρσει τοῦ κατωρθωμένου, τὰ μὲν εἰπεῖν, τὰ δὲ σιωπῆσαι δυνάμενος, καί, πρὸς τὸ δύνασθαι κρατεῖν, εἴ που βιασθεῖη, τυγχάνων πομπικώτερος, ἐντεῦθεν ἀφήκεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ θεῶν γνῶσιν καὶ σοφίαν ἧς Πυθαγόρας τε ἐφρόντιζεν καὶ ὅσοι Πυθαγόραν ἐζήλωσαν, Ἀρχύτας τε ὁ παλαιὸς καὶ ὁ ἐκ Τυάνων Ἀπολλώνιος καὶ οἱ προσκυνήσαντες Ἀπολλώνιον, οἵτινες σῶμά τε ἔδοξαν ἔχειν καὶ εἶναι ἄνθρωποι.

When he had been sufficiently imbued with the doctrines of Plato and Aristotle, he turned his attention to every other school of philosophy and read deeply in every branch. Then when he had a sure and firm hold on the science of oratory, and by constant practice was fully equipped to exercise instant judgement in this field, he confidently displayed in public his well-trained talents, since he knew what to say and what to leave unsaid, while he was endowed with splendid and impressive rhetoric which helped him to win when he was hard pressed. Next he applied himself wholly to comprehending the nature of the gods and that wisdom to which Pythagoras devoted his mind, as did the disciples of Pythagoras such as Archytas of old, and Apollonius of Tyana, and those who worshipped Apollonius as a god, all of them beings who only seemed to possess a body and to be mortal men. (tr. Wright)

T11: Eunapius, *VS*, VI, 90-91 = p. 36.19-37.1 Goulet

Ποτὲ γοῦν συνεληλυθότων ἀπάντων παρ' αὐτῆ – Φιλομήτωρ δὲ οὐ παρήν, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀγρῷ διέτριβεν –, ἢ μὲν πρόθεσις ἦν καὶ τὸ ζήτημα περὶ ψυχῆς · πολλῶν δὲ κινουμένων λόγων, ὡς ἤρξατο Σωσιπάτρα λέγειν, κατὰ μικρὸν ταῖς ποδείξεσι διαλύουσα τὰ προβαλλόμενα, εἶτα εἰς τὸν περὶ καθόδου ψυχῆς καὶ τί τὸ κολαζόμενον καὶ τί τὸ θάνατον αὐτῆς ἐμπίπτουσα λόγον, μεταξὺ τοῦ κορυβαντισμοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐκβακχεύσεως, ὡσπερ ἀποκοπέισα τὴν φωνήν, ἐσιώπησεν, καὶ βραχὺν ἐλλιπούσα χρόνον « τί τοῦτο ;» ἀνεβόησεν εἰς μέσους κτλ.

Once, for example, when they were all met at her house – Philometor however was not present but was staying in the country---the theme under discussion and their inquiry was concerning the soul. Several theories were propounded, and then Sosipatra began to speak, and gradually by her proofs disposed of their arguments; then she fell to discoursing on the descent of the soul, and what part of it is subject to punishment, what part immortal, when in the midst of her bacchic and frenzied flow of speech she became silent, as though her voice had been cut off, and after letting a short interval pass she cried aloud in their midst: "What is this?" (tr. Wright)

T12: Ammonius, *In An. Pr.*, p. 31, 11-23 Wallies

ιστέον δὲ ὅτι ὁ μὲν Ἀριστοτέλης ταύτης ἐγένετο τῆς δόξης, ὅτι οἱ ἐν δευτέρῳ καὶ τρίτῳ σχήματι συλλογισμοὶ πάντες ἀτελεῖς εἰσιν, ὁ δὲ Βοηθὸς ἐνδέκατος ἀπὸ Ἀριστοτέλους γενόμενος ἐναντίως τῷ Ἀριστοτέλει περὶ τούτου ἐδόξασεν, καὶ καλῶς ἐδόξασεν καὶ ἀπέδειξεν ὅτι πάντες οἱ ἐν δευτέρῳ καὶ τρίτῳ σχήματι τέλειοι εἰσιν. τούτῳ ἠκολούθησεν Πορφύριος καὶ Ἰαμβλίχος, ἔτι μέντοι καὶ ὁ Μάξιμος, <ὅς> ἀκροατῆς ἦν Ἰερίου τοῦ Ἰαμβλίχου ἀκροατοῦ. καὶ Θεμιστιος δὲ ὁ παραφραστής τῆς ἐναντίας ἐγένετο δόξης τῆς καὶ τῷ Ἀριστοτέλει δοκούσης. τούτοις οὖν τοῖς δύο, τῷ τε Μαξίμῳ καὶ τῷ Θεμιστίῳ, ἐναντία περὶ τούτου δοξάζουσιν καὶ κατασκευάζουσιν, ὡς ὤντο, τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς [καὶ] διήτησεν αὐτὰ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰουλιανός, καὶ δέδωκεν τὴν ψήφον Μαξίμῳ καὶ Ἰαμβλίχῳ καὶ Πορφυρίῳ καὶ Βοηθῷ.

T13: Themistius, *Or.* 20, 235c

Τὸ μὲν οὖν πρόσωπον καὶ τὸ σχῆμα ὅλον μονοῦ δῆθεν ἐπὶ Ἀριστοτέλους τοῖς μυστηρίοις. ἅπαντα δὲ ὁμῶς συναεφῆνυτο τῶν σοφῶν τὰ ἀνάκτορα, καὶ συνεπώπευσε τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ ὅσα Πυθαγόρας ὁ Σάμιος ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκόμισεν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ ὅσα ὕστερον ἐν τῇ ποικίλῃ στοᾷ Ζήνων ὁ Κιτιεύς. τὰ μὲν γὰρ Πλάτωνος τοῦ μεγάλου ἀγχίθυρά τε αἰεὶ ἐπεδείκνυε καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ περιβόλῳ, καὶ οὐδὲ μετημφιέννυτο τὴν στολὴν μεταβαίνων εἰς τὴν Ἀκαδημίαν ἐκ τοῦ Λυκείου, ἀλλὰ πολλάκις Ἀριστοτέλει προθύσας εἰς τὴν Πλάτωνος ἔληγεν ἱεουργίαν.

To be sure, the visage and shape impressed upon these sacred mysteries were almost entirely those of Aristotle. Nevertheless, my father helped to open up all the shrines of the sages. He was one of those who were fully initiated in the sacred knowledge that Pythagoras of Samos brought back to Greece from Egypt and in what Zeno of Citium later taught in the Painted Stoa. He always displayed the works of the great Plato right at the door and in the very temple precinct. When passing to the Academy from the Lyceum, he did not change his clothes; he would often first make a sacrifice to Aristotle and then end by worshipping Plato. (tr. Penella)

T14: Themistius, *Or.* 23, 295b

᾽Ωκει δὲ ἐν Σικυῶνι τηρικαῦτα ἀνὴρ, ὃν ἐγὼ φαίην ἂν ἀτρεκέστατά τε καὶ ἀδολώτατα τῶν γε ἐπ' ἐμοῦ Ἑλλήνων ἀντειλήφθαι φιλοσοφίας, ἀκουστής μὲν γεγονὼς τοῦ Χαλκιδέως πρεσβύτου, θεραπεύων δὲ οὐ τὴν νέαν ᾠδὴν, ἀλλὰ τὴν πάτριον καὶ ἀρχαίαν τῆς Ἀκαδημίας καὶ τοῦ Λυκείου [...]

At that time there lived in Sicyon a man who, of all the Greeks of my time, I would say was most truly and genuinely in possession of philosophy. He had been a disciple of the man of Chalcis [i.e., Iamblichus] when the latter was elderly. He was not, however, a devotee of the new song, but of the ancestral and ancient song of the Academy and the Lyceum. (tr. Penella)

T15: Boethius, *In Cat.*, PL 64, 162 A

Archites autem duos composuit libros quos *katholous logous* inscripsit, quorum in primo haec decem praedicamenta disposuit. Unde posteriores quidam Aristotelem non esse huius divisionis inventorem suspicati sunt eo quod Pythagoricus vir eadem conscripsisset, in qua sententia Iamblichus philosophus est non ignobilis, cui non consentit Themistius neque concedit eum fuisse Architem, qui Pythagoreus Tarentinusque esset, quique cum Platone aliquantulum uixisset, sed Peripateticum aliquem Architem, qui nouo operi auctoritatem uetustate nominis conderet.

T16: Iul., *Ad Matrem deorum*, 162 cd

Εἰ μὲν οὖν ὀρθῶς ἢ μὴ ταῦτα ἐκείνος ἔφη, τοῖς ἄγαν ἐφείσθω Περιπατητικοῖς ὀνυχίζειν, ὅτι δὲ οὐ προσηνῶς ἐμοὶ παντί που δῆλον, ὅπου γε καὶ τὰς ἀριστοτελικὰς ὑποθέσεις ἐνδεεστέρως ἔχειν ὑπολαμβάνω, εἰ μὴ τις αὐτὰς ἐς ταῦτ' οἱ Πλάτωνος ἄγοι, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ταῖς ἐκ θεῶν δεδομέναις προφητείαις.

Now whether what he [Xenarchus] says is correct or not, let us leave to the extreme Peripatetics to refine upon. But that his view is not agreeable to me is, I think, clear to everyone. For I hold that the theories of Aristotle himself are incomplete unless they are brought into harmony with those of Plato, or rather we must make these also agree with the oracles that have been vouchsafed to us by the gods (tr. Wright).

Bibliography

- Becker M. 'Depicting the Character of Philosophers: Traces of the Neoplatonic Scale of Virtues in Eunapius' Collective Biography', in *Bios Philosophos. Philosophy in Ancient Greek Biography*, ed. M. Bonazzi and S. Schorn, Turnhout 2016, pp. 221-258.
- Bouffartigue J., *L'Empereur Julien et la culture de son temps*, Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, Paris, 1992.
- Chiaradonna R., 'La Lettera a Temistio di Giuliano Imperatore e il dibattito filosofico nel IV secolo', in A. Marcone (ed.), *L'imperatore Giuliano. Realtà storica e rappresentazione*, Florence 2015, pp. 149-171.
- Cracco Ruggini L., 'Simboli di battaglia ideologica nel tardo ellenismo (Roma, Atene, Costantinopoli; Numa, Empedocle, Cristo)', in *Studi storici in onore di O. Bertolini*, I, Pacini, Pisa 1972, pp. 177-300.
- De Vita M.C., *Giuliano imperatore filosofo neoplatonico*, Milano 2011.
- Di Branco M., *La città dei filosofi. Storia di Atene da Marco Aurelio a Giustiniano*, Florence 2006.
- Dillon J., 'Iamblichus of Chalcis', *ANRW*, II.36.2, de Gruyter, Berlin-New York 1987, pp. 862-909.
- Elm S., *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church. Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome*, Berkeley 2012.

- Goulet R., *Eunape de Sardes: Vies de philosophes et de sophistes*, Introduction et prosopographie; texte établi, traduit et annoté, 2 voll., Paris 2014.
- Goulet R., 'Mais qui était donc le gendre de la soeur de Priscus? Enquête sur les philosophes d'Athènes au IV^e siècle après J.-Chr.', «*Studia Greco-Arabica*», 2 (2012) pp. 33-77.
- Goulet R., s.v. 'Priscus de Thesprotie', in R. Goulet (ed.), *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, Vb, Paris 2012, pp. 1528-1539.
- O'Meara D.J., *Platonopolis. Platonic Political Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2003.
- Penella R.J., 'Plato (and Others) in the Orations of Themistius', in R. Fowler (ed.), *Plato in the Third Sophistic*, Berlin-Boston 2014, pp. 145-161.
- Praechter K., 'Richtungen und Schulen im Neuplatonismus', in *Genethliakon für Carl Robert*, Berlin 1910, pp. 105-156 (repr. in K. Praechter, *Kleine Schriften*, Hildesheim-New York 1973, pp. 165-216).
- Saffrey H.D. and Segonds A.-Ph., *Jamblique. Réponse à Porphyre (De mysteriis)*, texte établi, traduit et annoté, avec la collaboration de A. Lecerf, Paris 2013.
- Schramm M., *Freundschaft im Neuplatonismus: Politisches Denken und Sozialphilosophie von Plotin bis Kaiser Julian*, Berlin-Boston 2013.
- Zito N., *NMaxime: Des Initiatives*, ed. and comm., Paris 2016.