

**THE APOSTATE IN ALBION:
EVOCATIONS OF THE EMPEROR JULIAN IN
ENGLISH DISPUTATION AND SATIRE, ca.1600 TO ca.1750***

— ROWLAND SMITH —

ABSTRACT

The survival of a body of writings by the Emperor Julian, and the intellectual allegiances and aspirations that underpinned his anti-Christian politics, set parameters of sorts for his posthumous reception as a renegade ‘Apostate’. This paper discusses a particular aspect of Julian’s post-Classical afterlife: it attends to a sequence of learned evocations of his career and person in English works of disputation and satire published over the period ca.1600–ca.1750. Within that time-frame, the focus is restricted to deal only with cases that had a significant political edge, and to privilege evocations that disclose direct engagement by the authors with Julian’s own writings. As a preliminary, a brief outline of the early editorial tradition of Julian’s own writings is offered, with an eye to the bearing of Continental scholarship on the reading and reception of Julian in England in the selected time-frame. The paper then passes to close discussion of Julian’s reception by six selected English authors, and explicates the lines of influence or reaction that connect the English texts and authors at issue. It emerges that certain items and passages in Julian’s literary repertoire were repeatedly deployed and ‘flipped’ as tools of argument, particularly in volatile political contexts.

KEYWORDS

Apostate, persecution, toleration, Roman Catholic, Nonconformist, satire, Whig

CONTENT SUMMARY

1. **Introductory Contexts:**
The antique depictions of Julian and the parameters of his *post-Classical* reception; the focus of the paper; summary of the early modern editorial tradition of Julian’s works
2. **The Evocations:**
 - 2.1 **Perfidious Apostate:** Julian in the disputation of Bellarmine and James I, 1607/8
 - 2.2 **‘The subtlest enemy’:** Julian’s Education edict in Milton’s *Areopagitica*, 1644

* For help and comments in connexion with this paper, I am grateful to Professor Rachel Hammersley, to Professor Federico Santangelo, and to the two anonymous readers who assessed it for *HCS*.

- 2.3 Republican regicide: a motto from Julian's *Misopogon* in *Eikon Basilike*, 1649
- 2.4 Tolerant tyrants: Julian and his *Caesars* in Marvell's *Rehearsal Transpros'd*, 1672/73
- 2.5 An Apostate's Exclusion Crisis: Julian as Whig in 'Philaretus Anthropopolita', 1681
- 3. Concluding Coda. From London to Elysium: 'Mr. Julian the Apostate' in Fielding's *Journey from this World to the Next*, 1743



On a osé flétrir Julien de l'infâme nom d'*intolérant* et de *persécuteur*, lui qui voulait extirper la persécution et l'intolérance. Relisez sa lettre cinquante-deuxième, et respectez sa mémoire.

Voltaire, *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* (1774) vol. 1, s.v. 'Apostat'

In his way, Voltaire was a bigot, an intolerant bigot.

Gibbon, *DF* ch. 67 n. 13 (ed. Womersley, 1994: vol. 3, 916)

1. Introductory Contexts

The abundance of the extant antique testimonies relating to the Emperor Julian (not least, the survival of a substantial body of writings from Julian's own hand) would by itself suffice to give his case a special historical interest. But in the nature of the case, there has always been a broader ground of appeal — as the familiar soubriquet 'the Apostate' immediately discloses. Perhaps any attempt by a mid-fourth century ruler to reverse the Christianizing policies initiated by Constantine half a century earlier would have held some wider interest; but in Julian's case the ruler was a renegade pagan convert from within the Constantinian family nexus — and a highly cultivated intellectual convert, to boot. He was the best-educated Roman emperor since Marcus Aurelius — and like Marcus he had a deep personal interest in philosophy, and aimed to apply the lessons he took from it to his politics as well as his private life. The briefest biographical outline, as follows here for prefatory context,¹ will suffice to show that Julian's intellectual allegiances and aspirations gave his politics a distinctive colour, and would set a basic

¹ A compression of Smith 1995: 1–9 (life), 23–34 (education), 180–89 ('conversion'), 207–16 (anti-Christian activism). Rosen 2006 is now the outstanding modern biography.

parameter for his posthumous reception: no informed critic could plausibly deny his cleverness and learning; and all would agree that in his case the heart of the matter was his religion.

Julian was born in 331 at Constantinople, a year after its formal inauguration as the Empire's new Eastern capital. His parentage placed him on the fringe of the empire's first Christian dynasty — his father was Constantine's half-brother — and his early life was traumatized on that account: when Constantine died in 337, one of his sons (Constantius II) devised a putsch to eliminate potential rivals in the extended family, and Julian's father was among those murdered. Julian himself was spared, as a child — but he remained a suspect person in Constantius' eyes, and for six years in his teens he was kept confined on a remote imperial estate in Cappadocia. He received a sound education in Greek literature and Scripture there, under the direction of a Christian bishop, and impressed his teachers as a precocious pupil: his first encounter with Greek philosophic writings perhaps occurred at that time. In any event, philosophy and literature became abiding passions for him, Homer and Plato serving as his lodestars (his own writings are suffused with quotations from them and allusions to them). When he was nineteen, in 351, he was permitted to pursue his philosophic studies at a Neoplatonic school at Pergamum, with a dramatic consequence; it was a milieu in which an intellectualized form of pagan ritualism had persisted, and Julian was inspired by one of his teachers to undergo initiation into a pagan mystery cult. This conversion away from his dynasty's Christian affiliation was decisive, but for a decade it remained a secret disclosed only to a few intimates.² In the interim Julian's public profile was massively enhanced when Constantius decided in 355 to elevate him as a Caesar (junior emperor). He went on to win brilliant success in Gaul as a military commander — and then finally turned to challenge his cousin. A civil war was in prospect, but Constantius then fortuitously died, and in December 361 Julian entered Constantinople as sole emperor, engaging openly now in pagan rituals, and issuing a declaration of religious toleration: his rule, he avowed to friends, would be grounded in philosophic principles. In the brief (eighteen month) reign that followed, he energetically pursued a two-track policy: at home, an undoing of the Christianizing programme of his immediate predecessors, with a restoration across the empire of the pagan cults they had suppressed; and abroad, a grand invasion of Persia. In preparation for the campaign, he moved his court in summer 362 to

² I here differ from Rosen 2006: 99–101, 229–23, who argues for separate philosophic and pagan 'conversions', and postpones the latter by ten years, until after Constantius' death in late 361.

Syrian Antioch, and resided there till the spring of 363. During his stay there Julian's relations with the Antiochenes soured irreparably, not least because the city seemed indifferent, at best, to his pagan revival — and elsewhere too, there were signs that the project was not proceeding smoothly. Julian responded partly as a litterateur, with satirical invectives that rebuked the Antiochenes and derided Constantine's memory, and with a polemical critique of Christian teaching and practice — but also with legislation discriminating against Christian subjects; most notably, an 'education edict' prohibited the teaching of Classical literature, rhetoric and philosophy by Christian professors in the empire's schools.³ That hardly squared with Julian's initial declaration of religious toleration — but in the event, a catastrophe supervened. The expedition to Persia proved disastrous; in June 363, at the age of thirty-two, Julian was fatally wounded in a skirmish as his army retreated. His attempt to eradicate Christianity as a social force and revive ancestral cult across the empire died with him: his religious measures were quickly annulled under his Christian successors.

Julian's project for a de-Christianizing 'pagan revival' had excited controversy in his own lifetime — and in the aftermath, antique writers' judgments and representations of his purposes and person increasingly polarized. For admirers and detractors alike, though, writing in hindsight, the project's catastrophic end added greatly to its piquancy. The scale of the failure was unarguable — but how to explain it? Ancient writers harped on that in *parti pris* accounts.⁴ For some, the 'revival' had been tyrannical madness and arrogance from the outset, and Julian's violent end was a fitting punishment, divinely ordained to avenge the sufferings inflicted on his Christian subjects. Admirers preferred to recall a heroic enterprise tragically curtailed by fate, or by circumstance, or by Christian treachery, and pondered why Julian's own protector-gods had not chosen to grant him a longer life and reign. An enigmatic counterfactual was implicit within that question: what if Julian had defeated the Persians and returned home triumphant to continue his reign — perhaps, then, his pagan revival would have prospered, and the advance of the Christians in the Empire might have been checked and reversed?

³ Pace McLynn 2014, I adhere to the long-standing view (supported by Ammianus 22.10.7 and 25.4.20) that the Julianic text in question (on which see below at pp. 247–48) was intended to announce a general prohibition of such teaching by Christians.

⁴ For individualized discussions of the near-contemporary retrospectives on Julian in Gregory Nazianzen, Libanius and Ammianus, see Braun and Richer 1978: 9–237 ('le dossier Julien'); and most recently, Marcone 2020: 326–59; Van Nuffelen 2020: 360–97.

This aspect of the case, especially — the brute fact of the failure of Julian's pagan restoration, and the kinds of question that it prompted and left hanging — was to ensure him a long and highly variegated afterlife in post-Classical reception, too. In a line that one could trace from a sixth century Syriac fiction to a memorable cycle of poems composed in the 1920s by C.P. Cavafy, post-Classical representations of Julian have commonly been coloured in some degree by the religious affiliations, or antipathies, or anxieties of the writers in question;⁵ and 'the Apostate' has repeatedly been resurrected and pressed into service in ideological or political conflicts over religious authority that were current in the later writers' times and minds. On that count, the history of Julian's posthumous representations in reception constitutes a complex and fascinating subject for study in its own right.

As my title signals, this paper focuses on a particular phase, and a particular aspect, of Julian's post-Classical afterlife: it addresses learned evocations of his career and person in English works of disputation and satire published over (roughly) a century and a half, ca.1600–ca.1750. Even within that frame of discourse, to be clear, my focus is purposely restricted on two counts. Firstly, I intend to deal only with cases that had a significant political edge (so purely theological disputation, for instance, is excluded). Second, my discussion will privilege evocations that disclose some direct engagement with passages in Julian's own writings: I aim especially to show that certain pieces and particular passages in Julian's literary repertoire came to be repeatedly deployed as weapons of argument within my designated period — and my selection of English authors is tailored to highlight that point. I will focus chiefly on evocations of Julian by six authors, taken in chronological order, and on the lines of influence or reaction that (I shall argue) connect them. In all six cases, the evocations were composed in highly charged political contexts: one was published in the name of England's first Stuart king, and a second figured in a volume that was widely assumed to preserve a set of writings produced *in extremis* by his successor (respectively, James I and Charles I); two others figured in prose publications by authors most famous now as poets (John Milton and Andrew Marvell); the fifth was the work of a

⁵ Braun and Richer 1978/81 collect contributions from various hands on Julian's reception from antiquity to the mid-twentieth century; the most recent overview is Rebenich 2020. On the Syriac 'Romance', see Drijvers 1999; on Cavafy's Julian, Bowersock 2009. The early sixth and early twentieth century 'termini' here selected may be reckoned over-conservative: at a pinch one could trace the line's origin further back, to an early fifth century depiction of Julian as persecutor in the earliest version of the *Passio Cyriaci* (on which see now Trovato 2018); and further forward to the celebrated 1964 novel *Julian* by Gore Vidal.

learned Whig propagandist, pamphleteering under a pseudonym that has left his identity uncertain (though one can speculate); the sixth, which will serve as a coda to this paper, was published among the ‘miscellanies’ of the celebrated novelist Henry Fielding.

In principle, evocations of Julian in scholarly historiography could fall within the paper’s purview, provided that the author could be reckoned to be writing with a political slant or purpose; and my discussion will touch at several points on the history of Julian-scholarship in the period. But it ought to be said that, if my focus lay primarily with Julian’s reception in historical scholarship proper in the seventeenth and earlier eighteenth centuries, English writings would offer quite slim pickings. Gibbon’s famous account of Julian, to be clear, is excluded from my discussion: it was composed in the late 1770s and published in ‘Volume the Second’ of *Decline and Fall* in 1781, well after my ca.1750 end-point — and in any case, its cultural and political contexts have been often and exhaustively studied.⁶ In the period I am concerned with, the historical study of Julian was chiefly advanced, rather, by three Continental writers whose learning Gibbon’s footnotes would duly acknowledge — the French historians Le Nain de Tillemont and the Abbé de La Bletterie, and the German scholar-diplomat Ezechiel Spanheim.⁷ Even in the cases of these erudite savants, to be sure, personal religious affiliations had an evident bearing on their approaches to Julian. Both Le Nain de Tillemont and La Bletterie were Jansenists, and as such they were attracted by Julian’s personal asceticism — but keen also to cast him as the author of a state-directed religious persecution; Spanheim, for his part, was the devout son of a Calvinist theologian who had combined his Julianic studies with service as Brandenburg’s Ambassador at Versailles, and he privately relished the deflation of imperial pomp that he found in Julian’s writings.⁸ But that said, each of these three scholars was painstakingly scrutinizing sources

⁶ E.g. Womersley 1988: 156–68; Womersley 2002: 135–44; Pocock 2015: 145–214.

⁷ On Nain de Tillemont and on La Bletterie respectively, Neveu 1966 and Neveu 2000 are both classic; and for Spanheim, see still Loewe 1924. Gibbon’s frequent citations of these three authors in relation to Julian can be traced ‘s.v.’ from the ‘bibliographical index’ in Womersley’s now standard edition of *Decline and Fall* (Womersley 1994, vol. 3): 1231 (La Bletterie, ‘remarkably distinguished by elegance of style, critical disquisition, and religious prejudice’); 1263 (Spanheim, ‘coarse, languid, and correct’); 1268–69 (Tillemont, ‘whose bigotry is overbalanced by the virtues of erudition, diligence, veracity, and scrupulous minuteness’). For learned receptions of Julian in French discourse over (and beyond) the whole of my chosen time-span, from Montaigne to Voltaire, see especially now the extensive survey of Boch 2013.

⁸ In Spanheim’s case, it is possible also to postulate (speculatively) a personal acquaintance with one of my English authors, the so-called ‘Philaretus’ of 1681: see below n. 76.

in order to discover what he took to be the historical truth about Julian — and on that score, their names are signalled here largely to point up a contrast: they exemplify a discourse different in type from that in which my English authors were engaging. All of my English authors were unquestionably learned persons, in their ways — and some of them were *very* learned, alert to the key antique testimonies, and well able if they wished to consult them directly. But while they might be interested to extract and deploy historical facts about Julian, the elucidation of the historical truth of the case was not my authors' object; they were engaged as controversialists or litterateurs in political-religious argument, and they deployed Julian as an exemplum with political or literary ends in view.

As generally received in the English setting over the period at issue here, the biographical data for Julian were usually derived, directly or indirectly, from the works of a small number of fourth and fifth century authors: Gregory of Nazianzus, a Greek Christian contemporary of Julian who had encountered him in his student days, had composed two lively invectives in *Against Julian* immediately after the emperor's death; and in the fifth century, three Greek ecclesiastical historians in turn (respectively, Socrates Scholasticus, Sozomen, and Theodoret) had each attended to Julian's case at some length, with predictably hostile slants: they demonized him as a tyrannical persecutor and a self-deluding maniac. The popular representation of Julian in the early modern period as a nightmare figure, especially as transmitted in the Roman Catholic tradition, derived mainly from these four early Christian authors.⁹ On the pagan side, if one cared to consult them, there were several retrospective histories of the reign extant. The most important of them, for a historian of Julian's English reception, was a Latin work by another contemporary of Julian: the soldier-historian Ammianus Marcellinus had served as an officer in the Persian campaign, and had later composed an admiring narrative of the reign in his *Res Gestae* that extolled Julian as a lost pagan hero.¹⁰

Latin versions (and in two cases, English versions) of all four of the antique Christian authors at issue were available in several editions well

⁹ One should note that the caricature of Julian as a 'nightmare figure' derived from the antique hagiographic as well as the ecclesiastical historiographical tradition; the latter, although hostile, did not entirely omit or suppress mention of Julian's claim to attention as an intellectual and litterateur: see Trovato 2010/11.

¹⁰ Montaigne, notably, had already deployed Ammianus in a celebrated essay rehabilitating Julian ('De la liberté de conscience': *Essais* 2.19 (1580)); it was to circulate widely in English in Florio's famous translation of the *Essais*, first published in 1603.

before 1600; and several editions of Ammianus, too, had been published by then.¹¹ For my selected English authors, these antique depictions of Julian were all effectively open books: the works of the Christian historians, especially, were widely circulated; and it need hardly be said that all of my English authors could read Latin (and in some cases, Greek) with ease. But no attentive reader of any of these ancient witnesses could fail to register that another, privileged, antique author was potentially available; in the course of their histories, Ammianus and the Christian writers had all made reference to works composed by Julian. The English writers' evocations of Julian to be discussed in this paper would have held a lesser interest than they do, if they had all rested simply on the familiar external antique testimonies. Their special interest lies in the fact that, in most cases, they show knowledge of more than that; most of them disclose, expressly or implicitly, an awareness of specific items and passages in Julian's own writings. In that connexion, we shall see, it can be important to identify as closely as possible the published edition of the text that was used by a given author. So before I pass to close discussion of my individual cases, there is a last essential preliminary: a brief outline of the early editorial tradition of Julian's own writings, and an indication of some particulars that connect the early editions to the reading and reception of Julian in England in my time-frame.

Julian's earliest appearance *qua* printed author came in *Epistulae diversorum philosophorum, oratorum, rhetorum*, an Aldine volume published at Venice in 1499, in which he figured as one of more than thirty ancient epistolographers: it included forty-eight letters ascribed to him (a fair few were spurious), in the original Greek.¹² His second appearance came at one remove, in a Latin translation (made at Basel in 1528, directly from a Greek MS) of Cyril of Alexandria's *Contra Julianum* — the conduit

¹¹ Gregory Nazianzen's invectives against Julian were included in bilingual versions in J. de Billy, ed., *Gregorii Naz. opera omnia* (Paris 1569; 2nd edn. 1583; 3rd 1609); an early critical edition of the Greek was edited by H. Savile as *Invectivae duae contra Julianum*, Eton 1610. The *Ecclesiastical Histories* of Socrates and Sozomen had first been published together in Greek at Paris 1544, and then several times with Latin translation (1549, 1569, 1570). Socrates' history was also accessible in English, along with Eusebius, translated by Meredith Hanmer as *The auncient ecclesiasticall histories* (1577, repr. 1585, 1607, 1619 and 1637). Theodoret was less widely read, and (notably) published *only* in Latin translations (1556 and 1573) until the bilingual Paris edition of 1642. Ammianus (ed. princeps 1474; first complete edn. 1533), was available in many editions by 1600, and was soon to be translated into English by Philemon Holland (1609).

¹² M. Musurus, ed., *Epistulae diversorum philosophorum, oratorum, rhetorum*, t.2, Venice 1499. Several collections of letters by (or ascribed to) Julian had circulated in antiquity: see now Elm 2017: 54–68.

through which what survives of Julian's largely lost *Against the Galileans* had been transmitted, in the form of highly selective and slanted quotations by Cyril.¹³ But apart from these two marginal cases, Julian was a late starter in the age of the printed book. Over the first half of the sixteenth century — a great boom-period for the publishing of Classical authors¹⁴ — he was passed by entirely: it was only in 1560s and '70s, at Paris, that any his extant literary works appeared in book-form. First, there was an edition of the *Misopogon* by P. Martinius [= Pierre Martini], with a substantial preface 'de vita Juliani', and with the Aldine's 48 Julianic letters republished [**Martinius 1566**]; then an edition of *Caesars* by C. Cantoclarus [= Charles de Chanteclair (or 'Chanteclère'), a high-ranking lawyer and judge]: '**Cantoclarus 1577**'.¹⁵ Both of these editions offered parallel Latin versions, and within a few years they were re-published as a unit, together with two other orations and some additional letters, in a volume whose title asserted that it contained 'all of the extant works'.¹⁶ This **Martinius/Cantoclarus 1583** edition could have been more aptly styled a 'selected works' — in truth, it omitted more than half of the corpus — but it constituted the most substantial and widest-circulating 'Julian' for half a century. The first proper 'complete extant works' only appeared in 1630, edited by the Jesuit scholar D. Petavius [= Denys Petau].¹⁷ The **Petavius 1630** edition, retaining the parallel Latin, and offering an improved text and further letters, would serve as the standard 'Julian' for the rest of the seventeenth century; and it remained the main base-text from which Ezechiel Spanheim worked in his parallel edition of the 'complete extant works', published in at Leipzig in 1696, with Cyril's *Against Julian* appended.¹⁸ **Spanheim 1696** thereafter came to be regarded as the standard edition (and would remain so till the later nineteenth century). It was not, though, Spanheim's first

¹³ J. Oecolampadius, trans., *Operum Divi Cyrilli*, v.3: *Contra Julianum*, Basel 1528 repr. 1546, repr. Paris 1573; on the MS context, see Malley 1964: 70–74.

¹⁴ Febvre and Martin 1976: 145–46, 262–68, 272–74, 283.

¹⁵ '**Martinius 1566**' = P. Martinius, *Misopogon et Epistulae et Martinii præfatio de vita Juliani*, Paris 1566; '**Cantoclarus 1577**' = C. Cantoclarus, *Juliani Imperatoris de Caesaribus sermo ... in lucem nunc primum editus, et ab eodem Latine factus*, Paris 1577.

¹⁶ '**Martinius/Cantoclarus 1583**' = P. Martinius and C. Cantoclarus, *Juliani imperatoris opera quae extant omnia ... [Ejusdem Martinii præfatio de vita Juliani]*, Paris 1583.

¹⁷ '**Petavius 1630**' = D. Petavius, *Juliani opera, quae quidem reperiri potuerunt, omnia*, Paris 1630.

¹⁸ '**Spanheim 1696**' = E. Spanheim, *Juliani Imperatoris Opera quae supersunt omnia*, Leipzig 1696.

foray into Julianic studies. He had already, during his years of diplomatic service at Versailles, made a notable, if quirky, contribution with a prolix commentary on *Caesars* (1683): it rendered the text of *Caesars* in a stilted French; and on most pages the translated text occupied only a line or two, squeezed out by a mass of learned but often irrelevant footnotes.¹⁹ And *Caesars* was to be edited once again by a German scholar within the time-frame at issue in this paper: in 1736 Johann Heusinger produced a new edition of *Caesars*' Greek text,²⁰ with his own text-critical observations appended. He also appended to this volume reprints of two previously published translations of *Caesars*: one was Spanheim's 1683 French version, with its ballast of footnotes now entirely stripped out; the other was a Latin version by P. Cunaeus [= Pieter Kuhn] that had first been published over a century earlier (Leiden 1612) as an appendage to Cunaeus's *Sardi venales*, a neo-Latin satire of his own devising.

Other than *Caesars*, to be clear, no literary work by Julian was to be translated for publication in any modern language until almost the ca.1750 endpoint of the period addressed in this paper: the pioneer was La Bletterie, whose elegant French version of a selection of Julian's works was first published at Paris in 1748.²¹ And no English translation of any Julianic work was published until well beyond that endpoint:²² it was only in 1784 that the Revd. John Duncombe produced a 'selected Julian' in English (an amateur's version that depended much, in fact, on La Bletterie's learning and polished French).²³ For my chosen English authors, then, any direct sampling of Julian in his own words would require recourse to one or more of the published items in the early (mainly French) textual tradition that I have specified – and certain features in that tradition deserve a comment here, for their bearing on the English receptions I discuss.

The first point concerns the prefatory 'de vita Juliani' that Martinius had composed in Latin for his 1566 *Misopogon*. It was to be reproduced entire in all three editions of the 'opera omnia' itemized above (the

¹⁹ 'Spanheim 1683' = E. Spanheim, *Les Césars de l'Empereur Julien traduits du Grec*, Paris 1683.

²⁰ 'Heusinger 1736' = J.M. Heusinger, *Iuliani Imp. Caesares Cum integris adnotationibus aliquot doctorum virorum et selectis Ezech. Spanhemii interpretatione item latina et gallica additis imperatorum nummis*, Gotha 1735.

²¹ l'Abbé J.P.R de La Bletterie, *Histoire de l'empereur Jovien, avec la traduction des Césars de Julien et autres ouvrages de cet empereur*, Paris 1748.

²² With the exception of one so-called 'letter' (on which see below, pp. 271–72): the 'letter to the Bostrans' (really an edict [*diatagma*] issued 1 Aug 362), given as *Ep.* 52 in the early printed editions (and in Hertlein).

²³ [Revd.] J. Duncombe, *Select Works of the Emperor Julian*, London 1784.

Martinius/Cantoclarus 1583 and **Petavius 1630** and **Spanheim 1696** editions), and it thus became a widely consulted source for biographical information about Julian: it would constitute the most easily accessible ‘potted life’ of Julian for any seventeenth century English reader of any of those editions (the essayist Sir William Cornwallis offers an early case in point).²⁴ Drawing on Julian’s own satirical self-portrait in the *Misopogon* and on Ammianus as much as Gregory and the ecclesiastical historians, Martinius had presented a relatively nuanced account ‘wherein its author’s life is recounted from various sources’: the ‘stain of impiety and apostasy’ was dutifully regretted at the outset — but it was regrettable partly (he proceeded to avow) because the ignominy arising from it had deprived Julian of the high measure of admiration that his eloquence and intelligence would otherwise have guaranteed him. Martinius was here cautiously dissenting from the demonizing of Julian in conventional Catholic reception — and one can relate that stance to his own affiliations, and to the 1560s political context in which he was writing. Martinius was a Protestant (in 1572, he would be appointed head of a newly founded college at the Huguenot stronghold of La Rochelle), and it is telling that his *Misopogon*, in both the 1566 and 1583 editions, bore a fulsome dedicatory letter to Odet de Coligny, the Cardinal de Chatillon (1517–71). Chatillon was an eminent aristocrat and a member of the Royal Council; after long working as liberal-minded Catholic for an accommodation with French Protestants, had publically identified with the Huguenots in 1561, and had been excommunicated by Papal order in 1563.²⁵ For Martinius, the (ex-)Cardinal was an inspirational emblem of

²⁴ Cornwallis, *Essayes or rather Encomions, Prayses of Sadnesse: and of the Emperour Julian the Apostate* [London 1616, unpaginated]; the ‘encomion’ of Julian in this volume comprises ‘The prayse of the Emperour Iulian the Apostata: His Princely vertues, and finall Apostacie’ and ‘Julian’s Dialogue of the Caesars’. Cornwallis knew Montaigne’s celebrated praise of Julian (on which see above, n. 10), but his own ‘paradoxical encomion’ of Julian draws also on verbal specifics in Martinius’s preface (Poole 2016: 174 and 184 n. 79), and it ends with a précis of the narrative of Julian’s own satire *Caesars*, and its comparison of Julius Caesar and Alexander. Cornwallis’s use of the **Martinius/Cantoclarus 1583** ‘Julian’ can thus be safely inferred; and his précis of *Caesars* is of interest for being the earliest published engagement with that piece by any English writer. But Cornwallis’ *Encomion* of Julian is otherwise of marginal relevance for my present purpose: composed without any political edge or purpose, it was only published posthumously, two years after the author’s death in 1614 (see Whitt 1932); it was one of a number of ‘paradoxical praises’ of unlikely subjects (others were Sadness, Richard III, ‘the French Pox’ [syphilis], ‘Nothing’, and Debt) that Cornwallis had playfully worked up and had not published.

²⁵ There would soon be an English dimension to the case: by 1568, the (ex-)Cardinal had fled to England, where he petitioned Elizabeth to support the Huguenots; he was to die there in 1571, and was buried in Canterbury Cathedral, after an abortive attempt

cultivation and political moderation — and in a text appreciatively dedicated to such a high-profile Huguenot ‘convert’, Martinius’ expression of regret at Julian’s apostasy struck a particular note. Potentially, it opened the way for a sympathetic representation of the apostasy as a tragedy — a tragic prefiguration of the turn which Papal oppressiveness and corruption had forced upon another, later, person of high intelligence and moral worth. On this Protestant line of argument, what Julian had disowned was not the true Faith, but a Constantinian dispensation that was proto-Catholic, already tainted with corruption — for was it not the claim of the Roman Church that its temporal authority had been underwritten and bequeathed by the dispensation of Constantine? In Martinius’ own preface, to be sure, this line of argument still lay dormant — but just such an exonerating account of Julian’s case, it will emerge, was later essayed by one of my English authors.

Suggestive connexions with England can be noted, too, in the cases of the subsequent editors Petavius and Spanheim. Petavius’ 1630 ‘complete works’ was the fruit of a long project, intermittently pursued over two decades, to which several other scholars had made some limited contributions — one of whom was Patrick Young, the Royal Librarian in London. Young was a churchman — he had formerly been an Oxford college chaplain — and on that score it has been nicely observed that Petavius’ 1630 Julian was ‘to some extent an Anglo-French collaboration [...] gingerly bridging sectarian divides — [an enterprise] laboured over in common by (at least a few) Jesuits and Anglicans’.²⁶ As for Spanheim, a personal friendship made in the course of a sojourn in England was to nurture his Julianic studies significantly. Prior to his diplomatic posting to Versailles, Spanheim had spent a good two years (1678–80) as the envoy at London of the Electors of both the Palatinate and Brandenburg, and in autumn 1679 he stayed as a house-guest with the émigré Dutch scholar Isaac Vossius, now resident as a canon at Windsor.²⁷ The purpose of his visit related to Julian: Vossius owned, and now lent to Spanheim, the best and oldest of all the MSS. of Julian’s works [= ‘Vossius 77’, nowadays held at Leiden]. At that time, Spanheim’s interest in Julian was focused principally on the *Caesars* commentary with French translation that he was to publish at Paris four years later, in 1683. But subsequently,

to return to La Rochelle. One of his siblings, Pierre de Coligny, had just founded there the Protestant college of which Martinius was to become head the following year.

²⁶ Poole 2016: 169. To be precise, the volume to which Young had contributed was not the **Petavius 1630** ‘complete works’ itself, but an edition of three component orations that Petavius had produced earlier: *Juliani imperatoris orationes III panegyricae, ab eo cum adhuc christianus esset scriptae*, Paris 1614.

²⁷ **Spanheim 1696**, preface (at p. xxxiv).

it was partly on the strength of readings he found in Vossius' MS. that Spanheim would justify his undertaking a new edition of Julian's works to improve on that of Petavius; in that sense, a scholarly encounter at Windsor implanted seeds that would flower two decades later in Spanheim's 1696 'complete Julian'.

Spanheim's initial prioritizing of *Caesars* as a text to work on had a precedent of sorts a century earlier. In the editorial tradition I have outlined, two texts stand out as privileged: the very earliest editors, **Martinius 1566** and **Cantoclarus 1577**, had focused their efforts respectively on the *Misopogon* and on *Caesars*; the stand-alone editions they had produced for them had been the earliest-published of any of Julian's works (and subsequently, we have seen, *Caesars* would be the first to be translated into a modern language, and the first to appear in a commentary-form). The special interest that was taken in these two pieces is attributable in the first place to their literary quality (they were his wittiest works) — but the affinity between them went further than that. Composed in close proximity to each other late in the reign, in the mid-winter of Julian's ill-starred stay at Antioch, both could be classified broadly as satire — but it was satire with a distinctive autobiographical edge that might seem to some readers to open a window directly onto an emperor's inner thoughts and character. In the *Misopogon* ['The Beard-Hater'] Julian slyly cast himself as an innocent abroad in a city of ingrates — a gauche and hirsute ascetic whose philosopher's beard is mocked by the effeminately depilated (and Christian) Antiochenes. In *Caesars*, he devised a fantasy in which he obliquely reviewed and commended his own actions and purposes and merits as a ruler: in his depiction of a parade on Olympus at which all the previous emperors of Rome compete to be rewarded or (in Constantine's case) condemned as the gods deem fit, Julian implicitly ranked himself close kin to the gods' elected winner, the great Marcus Aurelius²⁸ — the very anti-type of Constantinian impiety. Significantly, details drawn from one or other of these two pieces, the *Misopogon* and (repeatedly) *Caesars*, will figure prominently in the majority of the English evocations of Julian to which I now turn.

2. The Evocations

One can assume that any purposeful depiction or evocation of Julian in a work of religious or political disputation would be meant to work to the advantage of the writer's own religious or political affiliations. But to serve its purpose persuasively, the evocation had better at least appear to

²⁸ Hunt 1995.

pay *some* regard to what passed for historical facts, as transmitted in the antique testimonies; and as I observed at the outset, certain basic realities in Julian's case did set a parameter of sorts for his posthumous reception in antiquity, even in the polarized depictions offered retrospectively by pagan admirers and Christian detractors. By extension, the same constraint would apply to any post-Classical evocation of him that purportedly respected the historical record. So for the English writers I am concerned with, then, selective reference to the ancient source tradition would be hard to avoid entirely — and potentially it was an advantageous tool in argument: but they would be minded to privilege certain basics that chimed with their prejudices and purposes, and to explain away (where they could not suppress) others that were hard to accommodate. What, then, were the basics that my writers counted especially salient? They can be boiled down, perhaps, to yield four key items:

First, and most obvious, there was Julian's status as 'the Apostate' (the soubriquet goes back to the fifth century ecclesiastical historians): he had been born into the Constantinian dynasty and raised under the direction of bishops, only to convert away from Christianity and work as emperor for a pagan restoration.

Second, there was Julian's status in the antique Christian tradition as a determined persecutor. There was a difficulty with that charge: at no point in his reign were Christians ever subject to arrest or execution *qua* Christians, as they had been under pre-Constantinian emperors. And the reign had opened with a declaration of toleration: pagans and Christians were permitted to practise their respective religions freely; and the Christian bishops and clerics who had been exiled as sectarians or heretics by Julian's (Arian) predecessor Constantius were all recalled, and told they were free to return to their churches. Julian's intention in that, though, was probably to foster division among the Christians (certainly, his admirer Ammianus took that view); and as the reign proceeded, Christians were disadvantaged in law on various counts (notably, by the edict forbidding Christian professors to teach the Classical literary canon — which even Ammianus criticized as unjust and oppressive). For the Christian writers, these features of the reign marked Julian as emphatically a persecutor — albeit a guileful one.

Third, there was Julian's intellectual standing. His learning and intelligence and his philosophic interests were manifest, and could not be plausibly denied; his pagan conversion had been informed by his philosophic studies, and during his reign his closest intimates at court were his Neoplatonist mentors.

Lastly — a point of particular importance for its potential repercussions on Julian's reception in the early age of print — Julian had been

a talented and prolific writer. Far more was extant from his hand than from any other Roman emperor's, and it disclosed an unusually cultivated ruler: the oeuvre included panegyrics, polemics, satires, theological treatises and a collection of letters. Several of these works were already available in bilingual Greek and Latin editions by 1600; and after 1630, almost all of them were, as they circulated in Petavius' edition.

On the four basic counts here itemized, Julian potentially offered rich pickings as an exemplum for writers engaged in disputations over regal or religious or civil authority. His case was such that there were several 'Julians' available, so to speak. At the crudest level of argument, one could simply adduce the caricature figure of the antique ecclesiastical historians — the archetype of apostasy, a perverse enemy of God, and a devious persecutor of the faithful. At more sophisticated levels, one could manipulate two or more of the four 'basics' in combination, privileging 'x' or ignoring 'y', as one wished, to fit a case. And potentially, Julian's own writings could be added to the mix: those who were familiar with them might be inclined to privilege some particular work or passage as the quintessence of the man, or in order to emphasize a particular point.

In the cases that follow I shall find Julian adduced in series of often contrasting guises. He will be reviled, in turn, as a persecutor of Roman Catholics and as a tyrannical Papist idolater; tarred first as an oppressor of Puritan teaching, then as an apologist for Puritan regicide; rationalized as a disenchanted cradle-Catholic; enrolled as a recruit in the British resistance to Bourbon Absolutism; commended as a pre-Enlightenment *philosophe* — until reincarnated, finally, as a Protestant bishop and martyr.

2.1 Perfidious Apostate: Julian in the disputation of Bellarmine and James I, 1607/8

The earliest substantial reference made to Julian in English disputation arose in reaction to a prod from Continental Europe — and like all the cases that I discuss, it occurred in a volatile political context. The occasion in this case was a tit-for-tat exchange between very eminent persons — a king of England and a leading bigwig at the Vatican. In 1606, in the wake of the Gunpowder Plot, James I had promulgated an Oath of Allegiance requiring English Catholics to swear loyalty unconditionally to his royal person, irrespective of any Papal ordinance to the contrary. The Vatican's response included a letter sent from Rome in September 1607 to the Catholic Archpriest of England, George Blackwell, urging him (and by his

example, English Catholics in general) to refuse to take the oath.²⁹ Its author was a highly learned Jesuit, Robert Bellarmine, a quondam professor of Theology who had risen to be an eminent Cardinal. He was well known across Europe as a leading counter-Reformation polemicist, and as an astute political theorist — in particular, for his formulations of the Papal claim to international authority in matters spiritual.³⁰ He composed his letter in Latin (the normal Vatican protocol in such a diplomatic context), but an English version, under the title *To the most Reuerend Master George Blackwel, Archpriest of the English*, was soon afterwards (1608) prepared for publication at London by James I's printer, Robert Barker. In the course of this letter, Bellarmine devised a barbed comparison (here quoted in the English version):

But, as I saide, these vaine pretexts [i.e., the justifications offered by James for his promulgation of the Oath of Allegiance] are but the trappes and stratagemes of Satan: Of which kinde I could produce not a few out of Ancient Stories, if I went about to write a book and not an Epistle. One onely for example sake I will call to your memory: S. Gregorius Nazianzenus in his first Oration against Iulian the Emperour, reporteth, That he, the more easily to beguile the simple Christians, did insert the images of the false gods into the pictures of the Emperour, which the Romanes did use to bow downe unto with a civill kind of reverence: so that no man could doe reverence to the Emperours picture, but withall he must adore the Images of the false gods; whereupon it came to passe that many were deceived. And if there were any that found out the Emperours craft, and refused to worship his picture, those were most grievously punished, as men that had contemned the Emperour in his Image. Some such like thing, me thinkes, I see in the Oath that is offered to you, which is so craftily composed, that no man can detest Treason against the King and make profession of his Civill subiection, but he must be constrained perfidiously to denie the Primacie of the Apostolicke See.³¹

²⁹ Two papal breves had preceded the September 1607 letter; for a full account of the context, see Patterson 2000: 75–84.

³⁰ On Bellarmine's career and activities, see Tutino 2010 (esp. at pp. 117–58, on his part in the 'Oath' controversy). In England, Bellarmine's name would become a byword for prodigious scholarly learning throughout the seventeenth century: in Swift's *Battle of the Books* (Swift 2008: 11 [1st edn. 1704]) he ranks alongside Aquinas and Duns Scotus as a general commanding the Moderns; at Oxford, a particularly capacious type of bottle was called a 'Bellarmine' (Wood 1961: 224).

³¹ Bellarmine, R: Robert of the holy Church of Rome Cardinall Bellarmine, sendeth greeting to the most Reuerend Master George Blackwel Arch-priest of the English:

The thrust of the comparison is patent: James I's pretence that his oath could be sworn in good conscience by English Catholics, so Bellarmine maintains, was a sly 'stragem' that disclosed James as a latter-day 'Emperour Julian' (one observes that Bellarmine does not care to deploy overtly the appellation 'Apostate' in this context; his attention is focused principally on Julian as an emblem of state persecution of the faithful, and as the perpetrator of a devilish imposture). Julian, Bellarmine avows (plucking an apt story he had read in Gregory of Nazianzus), had deviously arranged for pagan ritual images to be placed unobtrusively among or within the portrait statues of his own person to which his subjects customarily swore loyalty in the context of the Imperial Cult, so as to lure simple-hearted and unsuspecting Christian subjects into an unwitting betrayal of their faith, 'so that no man could do reverence to the Emperour's picture, but withall he must adore the Images of the false gods; whereupon it came to pass that many were deceived ... [And] some such like thing, me thinkes, I see in the Oath that is offered to you'. England's Roman Catholics, Bellarmine insisted, were now being similarly tricked into swearing an oath 'so craftily composed' as to seem on the face of it unobjectionable for any loyal subject of the Crown to take, but which would actually entail a disavowal of a fundamental principle on which Papal authority rested. And just as those who had seen through and rejected Julian's chicanery had been 'most grievously punished', so now any Catholic who refused to swear what James demanded faced torture and execution.

London 1607, at pp. 38–39. The letter in English and Latin was published as a component in 'Anonymous' [= James I], *Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus. Or An apologie for the Oath of allegiance against the two breues of Pope Paulus Quintus, and the late letter of Cardinal Bellarmine to G. Blackwel the Arch-priest*. Imprinted at London: By Robert Barker, printer to the Kings most excellent Maiestie, Anno 1607.

In Bellarmine's Latin:

Sed, ut dixi, vani isti praetextus decipulae sunt, et stratagemata Satanae. Qualia non pauca in Historiis veterum temporum inueniuntur, quae facillè referre possem, si non epistolam, sed librum integrum scribendum suscepissem: vnum tantùm, exempli gratiâ, ad memoriam tibi reuocabo. Scribit Sanctus Gregorius Nazianzenus in primâ oratione in Iulianum Imperatorem, illum, ut s implicibus Christianis imponeret, in imaginibus Imperatoriis, quas Romani ciuili quodam genere honoris pro more adorabant, imagines deorum falsorum admiscuisse, ut nemo posset Imperatoris imaginem adorare, quin simul deorum simulachris cultum adhiberet. Hinc nimirum fiebat, ut plurimi deciperentur, ac si qui fortè fraudem subodorati, Imperatoris imaginem venerari recusarent, ii grauissimè punirentur, ut qui Caesarem in suâ imagine contempsissent. Tale aliquid in Iuramento vobis oblato mihi videre videor, quod eâ fraude compositum est, ut nemo possit prodicionem in Regem detestari, ciuilemque subiectionem profiteri, quin primatum Sedis Apostolicae perfidè abnegare cogatur.

If one collates this passage in Bellarmine's letter with the relevant chapter in the speech of Gregory Nazianzen that he signalled as its source-text, it immediately becomes evident that Bellarmine was drawing very closely and precisely on the Gregorian source.³² But the comparison that Bellarmine drew witnesses more than his close knowledge of an oration by a hostile Christian contemporary of Julian. There was a neat *ad hominem* edge to Bellarmine's choice of this particular Roman emperor as the emblem of persecution: Bellarmine was also well aware (in his ecclesiastical and diplomatic milieu it was common knowledge that in his infancy James's mother Mary Stuart had had him baptized a Roman Catholic).³³ Once the comparison is read with that knowledge, there surely is discernible within it a mischievous evocation by Bellarmine of Julian *qua* Apostate: he chose to leave it implicit, with the word itself unstated — but James certainly did not mistake the jab, and it evidently irked him. He was to address the comparison at some length, in a passage of rebuttal which recurs with variations in three publications; first in a text that I shall call for short *An Apologie*, issued in two editions in 1608 and 1609 respectively; and again, in an abbreviated form, in 1616.³⁴ In *An*

³² Greg. Naz., *Against Julian* 1, 81, here cited as rendered in the *Post-Nicene Fathers Library* version, with some clear parallels to particulars in Bellarmine's letter marked in **bold**:

Now what does this man contrive, and **what snare does he set for the former [i.e., 'simpler'] sort of Christians?** Like those who mix poison with food, **he mixes his impiety (idolatry) with the customary honours of the sovereign, thus bringing into one the Roman laws and the worship of idols; he associates his own portraits with the figures of his demons, pretending that they were some other sort of customary representations.** He exposes these figures to peoples and to cities, and above all to those in government of nations, so that he could not miss being in one way or another mischievous: for either by the honour paid to the sovereign that to idols was also insinuated, or else by the shunning of the latter the sovereign himself was insulted, the worship of the two being mixed up together. This treachery, and so cunningly devised snare of impiety, **a few indeed escape (of the more cautious and intelligent sort), but these get punished for their sagacity on the pretext that they had offended against the respect due to the emperor;** but, in reality, because they braved the danger for the sake of their true sovereign and their religion. But many of the more ignorant and simple sort were caught in the trap, who, perhaps, deserve pardon for their ignorance, thus drawn away by stratagem into impiety.

³³ Patterson 2000: 86 (adducing Bellarmine's own remark in his *Responsio* to James's *Apology*)

³⁴ The *Triplici Nodo, Triplex Cuneus: or, an Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance* was first issued anonymously in 1608 (but with 1607 on title-page); it was re-published with revisions in 1609 under James's name (now prefaced by another piece, the *Premonition*, addressed to fellow-monarchs). The relevant passage on Bellarmine's comparison recurs in abbreviated form in James's *Remonstrance* 1616 (on which see below, p. 244)

Apologie, James accused his detractors of having mistaken, or misrepresented, the narrow civil purpose of the Oath of Allegiance. There is good reason to think that the whole of the piece (it runs to more than a hundred pages) was substantially composed, and later revised, by James himself;³⁵ and that is certainly true of the passage on Julian. To best convey its flavour, I quote the passage here from the revised 1609 edition, in which James openly identified himself as the author (I note that in the 1609 version the passage comprises a single, simple, paragraph; in my quote, I number and sub-paragraph the ‘proofs’ adduced, for clarity):³⁶

And wheras for illustration of this strong [= principal] argument of his, hee [Bellarmine] hath brought in for a similitude [ie. a comparison] the hystorie of Julian the Apostata his dealing with the Christians, when as he straited [= forced] them either to commit idolatrie, or to come within the compasse of treason: I would wish the authour [= Bellarmine] to remember, that although a similitude may bee permitted *claudicare uno pede* [‘to limp on one foot’], yet this was a very ill chosen similitude, which is lame both of feet and hands, and every member of the body. For I shall in few words proove, that it agreeth in no one point, save one, with our purpose, which is, that Iulian was an Emperour, and I a King.

[1] First, Iulian was an Apostata, one that had renounced the whole Christian faith, which hee had once professed, and became an Ethnike [= pagan] againe, or rather an Atheist: whereas I am a Christian, who neuer changed that Religion, that I dranke in with my milke: nor euer, I thanke God, was ashamed of my profession.

[2] Iulian dealt against Christians onely for the profession of Christes cause: I deale in this cause with my Subiects, onely to make a distinction betweene true Subiects, and false hearted traitours.

[3] Iulians end was the ouerthrow of the Christians: my onely end is, to maintaine Christianitie in a peaceable gouvernement. Iulians drift was to make them commit idolatrie: my purpose is to make my Subiects to make open profession of their naturall Alleagiance, and ciuill obedience.

³⁵ On James’s authorship of the piece, see North 2002: 215–16; Patterson 2000: 85.

³⁶ James I, *Apologie* (1609) 78–81 (a lightly revised version of pp. 78–80 of the ‘anonymous’ first edition of 1608, in which James had referred to himself in the third person form).

[4] Iulians meanes whereby hee went about it, was by craft, and insnaring them before they were aware: my course in this is plaine, cleare, and void of all obscuritie: neuer refusing leaue to any that are required to take this Oath, to studie it at leisure, and giving them all the interpretation of it they can crave.

[5] But the greatest dissimilitude of all, is in this: that Iulian pressed them to commit idolatrie to idoles and images: but as well I, as all the Subiects of my profession are so farre from guilt in this point, as wee are counted heretiques by you, because we will not commit idolatrie.

[6] So as, in the maine point of all, is the greatest contrarietie. For Iulian persecuted the Christians because they would not commit idolatrie; and yee count me a persecutour, because I will not admit idolatrie. So as to conclude this point, this olde sentence may well be applied to Bellarmine, in using so unapt a similitude, *Perdere quos vult Iupiter, hos dementat* [‘Those whom Jove wants to destroy, he (first) renders mad’].

It is telling that, in the exposition of his refutation, James chose to begin with a rebuttal of the sly point of comparison that had not been overtly voiced in Bellarmine’s letter, but which hovers around it — the suggestion of personal apostasy. His answer to it should be appraised with an eye to a passage in the text that James conjoined as a preface to his *Apologie* as published in 1609 — his ‘Premonition to all most mighty Monarchs’. There, he acknowledged his Catholic baptism, but in terms that belittled its import and reviled its ritualistic elements, and allowed himself a side-swipe for good measure at the Jesuit order to which Bellarmine belonged:

For first, I am no Apostate, as the Cardinall [Bellarmine] would make mee; not onely hauing euer been brought up in that Religion which I presently professe, but euen my Father and Grandfather on that side professing the same: and so cannot be properly an Heretike by their owne doctrine, since I neuer was of their Church. And as for [Mary Stuart] the Queene my Mother of worthie memorie, although she continued in that Religion wherin she was nourished, yet was shee so farre from beng superstitious or *Iesuited* therein, that at my Baptisme (although I was baptized by a Popish Archbishop) shee sent him word to forbear to use the spettle in my Baptisme; which was obeyed, being indeed a filthy and an apish trick, rather in scorne then imitation of CHRIST. And her owne very words were, That shee would not haue a pockie Priest to spet in her child’s mouth. As also the Font wherin I was Christened, was sent from the late Queene heere of famous memorie

[Elizabeth I], who was my Godmother; and what her Religion was, [Pope] Pius V. was not ignorant.³⁷

When he addressed the matter in the 1609 *Apologie* proper, James chose not to revert to the awkward fact of the baptismal ceremony; he merely rehearsed the *Premonition's* assertion that he remained what he had always been since his infancy: a steadfast and faithful adherent of the Christian religion, the very opposite of an apostate. That done, he passed on (paras. 2–4) to rebut the charge that his imposition of the Oath marked him out as a devious persecutor, and then (paras. 5–6) moved to the attack in a closing twist. If anyone deserved to be likened to the Emperor Julian, James declared, it was not he, but rather Bellarmine himself. It was the Catholic Cardinal who merited the title of persecutor — and one could add idolatry to the resemblance: the adoration of statues and images that Bellarmine and his confreres at the Vatican prescribed and practised was idolatry; and they persecuted as heretics those (like James) who refused to countenance it. This closing riposte reads as a debater's device, and perhaps an over-strained one; but it served its purpose in the exchange — and beyond that, it is tempting to think, it has a certain aptness. Cardinal Bellarmine, so concerned in 1608 to protect the freedom of religious conscience of English Catholics, served as an expert adviser to the Congregation of the Holy Office (that is, the Inquisition); in 1600 he had sat on the board that tried and condemned Giordano Bruno as a heretic — and he would soon (in 1616) be interrogating Galileo.³⁸

The underlying issue that had prompted Bellarmine's evocation of Julian — the problem (as he saw it) inherent in any action by a State's civil authority to constrain the universal reach of the Papal authority in matters spiritual — continued to be rehearsed in a proliferating discourse over the next few years. Bellarmine, on the Pope's instructions, composed a pseudonymous *Responsio* (1608) to James's *Apology*, later expanded (1610) in response to James's *Premonition*.³⁹ Bellarmine did not himself return in these pieces to his Julian-comparison, but in 1615 the French Cardinal Du Perron picked up on it, and redeployed it an oration published that year (and translated in 1616 as the *Oration on the Part of the Lords Spiritual*). James's *Remonstrance* (1616) was intended as a refutation of that oration. In the course of it he briefly revisited the Julian/James comparison, in a passage which effectively compressed his

³⁷ James I, *Premonition* (1609) 33–34.

³⁸ Godman 2000: 174–78, 214–16.

³⁹ Patterson 2000: 86, 102.

earlier points, and professed surprise at Du Perron's failure to appreciate that Bellarmine had been decisively answered in this matter:

Nor in any sort doe I purpose, to set Iulian the Apostata before mine eyes, as a patterne for me to follow.

Julian of a Christian became a Pagan: I professe the same faith of Christ still, which I haue euer professed:

Iulian went about his designs with crafty conueiances; I neuer with any of his captious and cunning sleights:

Iulian forced his subiects to infidelitie against Iesus Christ; I labour to induce my subiects vnto such tearmes of loyaltie towards my selfe, as Iesus Christ hath prescribed and taught in his word.

But how farre I differ from Iulian, it is to bee seene more at large in my answer to Bellarmines Epistles written to Blackwell; from whence the Lord Cardinall [Du Perron] borrowing this example, it might well haue beseemed his Lordship to borrow likewise my answer from the same place.⁴⁰

In his own estimation, at least, then, James had emerged the clear winner in the 1607–9 exchange with Bellarmine about Julian. It had been all along, of course, only a sideline in a larger argument — an argument about the limits to be placed on the power of a temporal civil authority to demand unqualified obedience of its subjects, and about the circumstances in which the subject could properly withhold full obedience in the face of a tyrannical demand. And it is not clear that, in the immediate aftermath, the interest of contemporaries in Julian's particular case was much quickened or broadened by James's depiction of him in 1608/9. There is no cause, certainly, to imagine that Cornwallis owed anything to it when he wrote the mock-encomion on Julian that I have mentioned earlier (see n. 24). Soon after James's accession, admittedly, Cornwallis had briefly tried his luck at court; but his composition of the encomion quite possibly pre-dated the *Apologie* — and in any event, it was a piece of a very different temper: the sources that inspired and underpinned his encomion were clearly Montaigne, and Martinius, and Julian's own *Caesars*. A rather better case could be made, perhaps, for a reverberation of James's Julian in an early Jacobean drama: it has recently been argued that the figure of Julian is obliquely evoked in a Middleton play, *The Lady's Tragedy*, first performed by the King's Men at Blackfriars in either late 1610 or 1611, and subsequently at court.⁴¹ On

⁴⁰ James I, *Remonstrance* (1616) 240–41.

⁴¹ Streete 2017: 95, 111–20.

that argument, the play's basic thrust was anti-Catholic, and the characterization of its principal villain, 'the Tyrant', shows a marked affinity with the figure of Julian as represented in James's *Apologie* — tyrannical, idolatrous and cunning, a cipher for Catholic persecution of Protestants. It might just be, then, that Middleton had read or knew the gist of James's recently published evocation of Julian by the time he wrote the play, and was purposely echoing it.

That is a speculation, not a proof — but if it is hard to specify any immediate resonances of James's Julian in English discourse, there is no doubt that on one key point it set down a lasting marker: under a later Stuart, we shall see, Julian would be notably deployed again as an exemplum in political disputation over the limits of 'passive obedience' to a monarchic civil authority — and as a warning against the re-imposition of Roman Catholic 'tyranny' in England.

2.2 'The subtlest enemy': Julian's Education edict in Milton's *Areopagitica*, 1644

It is not in question that James had the capacity, and the appetite, to engage with Classical authors, and Bellarmine was famously learned; he certainly had read fragments of Julian's *Against the Galileans* (as quoted by Cyril of Alexandria) in his extensive studies in the 1570s and '80s for the preparation of his magnum opus, the *Controversiae*; ⁴² and it is hard to think that he had never looked at any other works or letters of Julian. But that said, it seems clear that neither he nor James was drawing directly on Julian's own writings in their exchange of 1607/8: Bellarmine had ingeniously fished out a particular passage from an oration of Gregory Nazianzen — but the image of Julian that he presented in his letter remained at bottom the stock figure of the tyrannical, quasi-Satanic persecutor that the Catholic tradition had constructed on the basis of the antique ecclesiastical historians. And James was happy to concur entirely with that caricature; in his rejoinder to the comparison, he adduced no other ancient source.

In the case of the second Julian-allusion I highlight for discussion in this paper, the question whether a direct encounter with Julian's own writings was at play is a more finely balanced one. Here too, the trope of Julian as a devious persecutor figured prominently — but in this case it

⁴² Bellarmine in his *Controversiae*, vol. 3 (1593), ch. III, p. 274, cites Cyril, *Contra Julianum* (= Julian C. Gal. ap. Cyril. 86A) on Julian's sarcastic questioning of the means by which the serpent in Eden had acquired the power of human speech and a knowledge of Hebrew.

was adduced as something more substantial than a convenient rhetorical exemplum; it was deployed with a genuinely subversive edge at a time of deep political crisis. The text is very famous — Milton's *Areopagitica* of 1644, a polemical pamphlet directed against a recent Parliamentary Licensing Order (1643) which had imposed pre-publication censorship on the press: with the Civil War in progress, the Presbyterian-dominated parliament had determined to suppress both Royalist propaganda and radical Puritan pamphleteering. Suppression of the former, it may be suspected, would have caused Milton little worry — but the threat to the latter was emphatically objectionable to him.⁴³ He deplored the licensing order as a measure of the kind one would have expected of the Papal Inquisition, or of King Charles's Star Chamber, only abolished three years earlier, and a repellant memory for Milton.

Areopagitica has spawned a vast bibliography, but my interest in it is restricted to a particular passage recounting an episode that had occurred in the mid-fourth century Roman empire. It was common knowledge that after the accession of Constantine, early in the century, State persecution of Christians had ceased; and according to Milton, at least (the picture is historically misleading), censorship or licensing of books was unknown until ca.AD 400: until then, he asserted, no measures were introduced by either the Christian emperors or by the bishops of the Church to restrict the freedom of the early Christians to read whatever they wanted; they had been left free to read the Classical pagan authors without hindrance — and they had profited from reading them critically. But there was an exception of sorts to all this: Milton now paused his argument, to adduce the case of a legal enactment by the pagan Emperor Julian. Milton's treatment of it turns on a contrast: whereas in the first century St Paul, by his own exemplary practice in his epistles, had commended and encouraged the study of pagan literature by the early Christians, Julian in the fourth had gone so far as to issue a decree that prohibited it entirely. I quote below, first, the relevant passage in *Areopagitica*, and then parts of the Julianic text to which Milton's passage refers (for clarity, I occasionally expand or gloss the texts, within square brackets; and I highlight key clauses in **bold**):

Not to insist upon the examples of Moses, Daniel & Paul, who were skilfull in all the learning of the Aegyptians, Caldeans, and Greeks, which could not probably be without reading their Books of all sorts, in [relation to] Paul especially, who thought it no defilement to insert into holy Scripture the sentences of three Greek Poets, and one of them a

⁴³ Egan 2007.

Tragedian, the question [*i.e. the question whether it was permissible and profitable for Christians to be left free to read 'heathen' literature if they wished*] was notwithstanding sometimes controverted among the Primitive Doctors, but with great odds on that side which affirm'd it both lawfull and profitable, **as was then evidently perceiv'd, when Julian the Apostat and sottlest enemy to our faith made a decree forbidding Christians the study of heathen learning: for, said he, they wound us with our own weapons, and with our owne arts and sciences they overcome us.** And indeed the Christians were put so to their shifts by this crafty means, and [were] so much in danger to decline into all ignorance, that the two Apollinari were fain as a man may say, to coin all the seven liberall Sciences out of the Bible, reducing it into divers forms of Orations, Poems, Dialogues, ev'n to the calculating of a new Christian grammar. But, saith the Historian Socrates, The providence of God provided better then the industry of Apollinarius and his son, by taking away that illiterat law with the life of him who devis'd it. So great an injury they [the Christians] then held it to be depriv'd of Hellenick learning; and thought it a persecution more undermining, and secretly decaying the Church, than the open cruelty of Decius or Dioclesian.⁴⁴

The Julianic text that Milton here calls a 'decree' was extant, and was traditionally published as a letter: in the Martinius/Cantoclarus 1583 and Petavius 1630 editions of Julian's works, it was given with a parallel Latin version as *Ep.* 42 [= *Ep.* 36 in the Loeb]. The date and particular context of its issue, and its precise standing as a legal text, have been much discussed by Julian scholars. On the standard view (which I believe correct) it had legal force: it is a 'rescript' that Julian wrote and issued in the summer of 362 (either en route to Antioch, or soon after his arrival there), and was intended to clarify the requirements of an earlier, brief, 'education edict' (issued on 17 June 362) in which he had curtly stipulated that teachers must be men of honest character. I here quote key excerpts from the rescript (in the Loeb translation [= *Ep.* 36], occasionally adapted):

I hold that a proper education results not in laboriously acquired symmetry of phrases and language, but in a healthy condition of mind ...

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 ...

⁴⁴ Milton, *Areopagitica*, p. 10 in the original 1644 edition.

So I give [Christian teachers in the Schools of grammar and rhetoric] this choice: either not to teach what they do not think admirable; or else, if they wish to teach, let them first persuade their pupils that Homer [and all the other Classical pagan writers] are not to be declared guilty of any impiety or foolishness or error in what they wrote about the gods ...

However, if they [i.e. the Christian teachers] think that those [pagan] writers were in error with respect to the most honoured gods, then let them take themselves off to the churches of the Galilaeans [= the Christians] to expound Matthew and Luke ...

For religious and secular teachers let there be a general ordinance [a *koinos nomos*] 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.

The rescript made it clear that unless Christian teachers declared themselves pagans to their pupils and taught the Classical authors in that spirit, they were to be banned from all teaching in the Schools of grammar and rhetoric. The ban is reported by Gregory Nazianzen and by all the early Christian ecclesiastical historians — and it is alluded to also (and deplored) by Ammianus. None of them, though, had quoted details from the law — and on the face of things, a reader might think that Milton does precisely that; in which case he could not be relying solely on these familiar testimonies. The formulation of the crucial sentence in question embraces a first-person direct quotation, and implies a direct reading by Milton of Julian's rescript: **[he] made a decree forbidding Christians the study of heathen learning: "for," said he, "they wound us with our own weapons, etc."**...'. But on a closer reading, the quote introduced by 'said he' is a distraction, and as evidence of direct reading of the rescript it is weightless. While it may appear to render a part of the 'decree' *verbatim*, the 'quote' is nowhere to be found in the text of Julian's rescript. The words Milton put into Julian's mouth are a loose version, rather, of an item that only figures as an unplaced fragment in modern editions of Julian's works — and its claim to authenticity is very suspect. The item at issue, it must be stressed, was not transmitted in the MS tradition of Julian: in MS form, it is preserved solely in the *Ecclesiastical History* of a fifth century Christian author, Theodoret — who depicts it as

an expansion of a proverbial saying on Julian's part.⁴⁵ What might seem a quotation by Milton of Julian's 'decree', then, is nothing of the sort: it is only a loose version of what Theodoret had represented as a Julianic variation on a traditional saying.

Like Bellarmine and James, Milton puts emphasis on the craftiness and guile of the Apostate: *Areopagitica* ranks Julian as Christianity's 'suttlest enemy' (cf. Rufin. *hist.* 10.33: *callidior ceteris persecutor*). That is a high compliment, of a sort — but it still may not convey the full depth of the enemy's subtlety. On a close reading, Julian's rescript on Christian teachers did not actually forbid the study of 'Hellenick learning' by Christians *tout court*. What it expressly forbade was the *teaching* of pagan literature by Christian professors; it closed with a rider (included in my excerpt) in which Julian stressed that Christian youths were still welcome to attend the Schools, if they wished, to be taught Classical Greek literature and philosophy. There was a very material consideration at issue: for anyone (and there were many) who hoped to serve and progress in the secretariat of the greatly enlarged bureaucracy of the later empire, such an education was virtually *de rigueur*. Under Julian's 'education law', Christian youths could aspire, still, to a career of that sort — but there was catch, of course. Henceforth, they were only to be taught by professors who venerated the ancestral pagan gods; they would be 'correctly' instructed in a purified pedagogical environment. Julian's law thus posed a stark choice not just for Christian teachers, but for any Christian family of respectable social status that wished good things for its sons. It signalled an ideologically determined programme to marginalize Christianity at the upper levels of imperial society — and for a modern reader, very sinister twentieth century parallels spring to mind.

The lack of any reference in *Areopagitica* to Julian's distinction between the teacher and the student has little bearing on the question whether Milton wrote the piece with, or without, any first-hand acquaintance with the rescript: even supposing Milton *had* read it, and was aware of the fact that Julian had specified that Christian youths were free to study at the Schools, it would hardly have served his purpose to air that fact in *Areopagitica*. But in any case, Milton was not alone in eliding the teacher/student distinction: it went largely ignored, in general, in the

⁴⁵ Theodoret *HE* 3.4: 'First of all he prohibited the sons of the Galileans, for so he tried to name the worshippers of the Saviour, from taking part in the study of poetry, rhetoric, and philosophy, "For", said he, "**in the words of the proverb 'we are shot with shafts feathered from our own wing,' for from our own books they take arms and wage war against us**" [I cite the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Library trans.] The ostensible quotation is given as Fr. 9 in Hertein's edition of Julian = Fr. 7 in Loeb.

early modern reception of Julian's 'education law'. Milton's imprecision on the point is thus most easily and economically explained on the premise that his own knowledge of the 'decree' was drawn simply from the ecclesiastical historians, without any direct acquaintance with the Julianic rescript. In my view, that is probably the truth of the matter; Socrates Scholasticus, after all, is explicitly named by Milton as one of his sources, and Theodoret was patently another — and there is nothing else said in the passage that would count as evidence for the contrary view. Perhaps the question is best left hanging: strictly speaking, one cannot preclude the possibility that Milton had already had some direct acquaintance with Julianic writings by the time he wrote *Areopagitica*⁴⁶ — but on the evidence we have, the proposition is otiose. Either way, the essential point to observe is unaffected. When Milton adduced Julian in his pamphlet, he cast Parliament's Presbyterian legislators as akin to an odious and tyrannical Apostate, and by implication to the English king they were currently at war with. *Areopagitica* represents Julian's 'crafty' assault on the early Christians' intellectual liberty as more injurious than the physical sufferings inflicted on them previously in the pre-Constantinian period; 'to be depriv'd of Hellenick learning [was] a persecution more undermining, and [more] secretly decaying [of] the Church, than the open cruelty of Decius or Dioclesian'. The evocation of Julian in *Areopagitica* castigates Parliament's impulse to censor Puritan pamphleteers as likewise a subtle persecution: tyrannical, contrary to the enlightened practice of Paul and the early Church Fathers — and unless challenged, morally and intellectually enfeebling.

Within the overall argument of *Areopagitica*, Julian is only an aside — but the case perhaps already had a particular edge for the future author of *Paradise Lost*. It is surely telling that in his Julian-evocation Milton contrived to refer to the story that Socrates Scholasticus (*HE* 3.16) had told of the response of the two Apollinariii to Julian's ban: forbidden to teach Homer and the poets in the Schools, a Christian litterateur and his son had composed substitute texts for Christian readers in which the substance of the Pentateuch was re-cast into the hexameters of Homeric epic and the strophic verse-forms of Greek tragedy. For Milton, who would soon himself be rehearsing a biblical narrative in a neo-Classical verse epic, the accommodation of Classical thought and literature by Christians was a fundamental moral and poetic question — and it is

⁴⁶ To be clear, on the evidence we have, it cannot be proved that Milton *ever* read any work of Julian's. Poole 2016 has observations which by convergence would commend a hypothesis for the *likelihood* that Milton at some point read and pondered some works by Julian, especially the *Misopogon*; but that does not amount to proof.

important to be clear that he had already taken an interest in Julian's attitude to the matter well before he wrote *Areopagitica* in 1644. It has been nicely noted lately that the kernel of what Milton had to say about Julian in *Areopagitica* — even the 'quote' culled from Theodoret that he attributes to him there — can be found already in a 1638 entry in Milton's commonplace book.⁴⁷

The evocation of Julian in *Areopagitica*, then, turns out to constitute more than one of a sequence of exempla adduced by Milton in 1644 to support a case against a censorious Parliamentary Licensing Order enacted at a time of civil war. For Milton, Julian's 'education edict' already had a deeper significance and resonance: Julian was of the devil's party, but his edict had identified and crystallized a problematic question that would confront any intelligent Christian at any time: in what spirit should Classical literature be read?

2.3 Republican regicide: a motto from Julian's *Misopogon* in *Eikon Basilike*, 1649

Milton, when he wrote *Areopagitica*, was in my view almost certainly portraying Julian on the basis of external witnesses, not from first-hand knowledge of Julian's own works. But five years after *Areopagitica*'s publication, an anonymous learned person indubitably did make ingenious play with a Julianic text in a volume produced at a time of extreme political crisis. Again, the book at issue is very famous — *Eikon Basilike: The Pourtraicture of His Sacred Majestie in His Solitudes and Sufferings*, a work of Royalist propaganda first published only a few days after Charles I's execution on 30 January 1649. It was to circulate very widely: before the year was out it had been issued over fifty times, in more than thirty editions — and there were to be many more in subsequent years.

⁴⁷ Poole 2016: 165 and 180 n. 21: a very acute observation. Poole first cites the 1638 entry as Milton wrote it (in Latin, and with the quote attributed to Julian in the Greek), and then in translation, as follows: 'Even the faithless Julian saw by what weapons his cause might be weakened, when he forbade to Christians the teaching of poetry, rhetoric, and philosophy: "for," said he, "as the proverb has it, we are struck by our own quills."'

The persons who produced it had gathered and ‘methodized’ for publication a set of reflections that had been written by Charles himself at

Figure 1



Greek motto at bottom line:
Τὸ Χι οὐδὲν ἠδίκησε τὴν πόλιν, οὐδὲ τὸ Κάππα

various points in the course of the 1640s (or such, at least, was their claim). In any event, the material was carefully arranged to project an image of Charles as a regal martyr — a long-suffering, saintly figure,

Christ-like in his willingness to sacrifice himself for his subjects' good. The substance of the claim to regal authorship, and the identities and particular purposes of the men who compiled and edited the texts for publication, have been the subject of many studies⁴⁸ — but here I can leave that aside: my interest lies not with *Eikon Basilike's* text proper, but with its opening paratext, rather. In several of the earliest editions, an intricate frontispiece sheet [FIG. 1] has an engraving showing a solitary Charles at prayer, as if meditating in anticipation of his execution; a set of Latin and English verses placed beneath this scene explains its allegorical details, lauding the king as a holy martyr; and then, at the very bottom of the frontispiece sheet (and quite distinct from the Latin and English verses), there stands one further line of text — a short unattributed sentence, in Greek:

Τὸ Χί οὐδὲν ἠδίκησε τὴν πόλιν, οὐδὲ τὸ Κάππα.

Neither the Chi nor the Kappa ever inflicted any harm upon the city.

Presented (as it was) with no indication of its author or source, this motto will have seemed utterly perplexing to all but a very few among the frontispiece's readership, whether or not they were able to construe the literal meaning of the Greek. To appreciate the motto's purport in the frontispiece, one needed a very precise knowledge of its origin and connotations within a particular antique text. It is actually a quotation — almost an exact one — from Julian's *Misopogon*, the satire he composed and posted up in January 362 at Antioch (his headquarters, at the time) to chide the city's (predominantly Christian) populace for its indifference to his pagan revival. As the relevant sentence appears in the *Misopogon*, though, there is a small but significant difference that bears on this context — an additional verb of speech:

Τὸ Χί, φασίν, οὐδὲν ἠδίκησε τὴν πόλιν οὐδὲ τὸ Κάππα. (*Misopogon*, 357a)

'Neither the Chi,' **they say**, 'nor the Kappa ever inflicted any harm upon the city.'

The Greek sentence cited in *Eikon Basilike's* frontispiece, then, had been cited by Julian as a direct quotation of something spoken by others; and in the context of the *Misopogon*, their identity is clear. Julian is quoting

⁴⁸ Wilcher 1991 is a lucid review of these questions. On the early publishing history of the work, and the editions containing the frontispiece in the particular form discussed below, see Madan 1950: 33–34.

a riddling jibe that an Antiochene crowd had recently chanted (quite likely in his presence) to insult and provoke him. The Greek letter Chi was an acronym for Christ; the letter Kappa denoted Constantius [‘Konstantios’ in Greek spelling], the son and successor of Constantine — and Julian’s cousin and immediate predecessor. Now Constantius, though an odious memory for Julian, had been a ruler well-liked at Antioch: the Antiochenes’ jibe asserted their city’s fond remembrance of Constantius ‘the Kappa’ as an admirable Christian emperor, and also its continuing attachment to the religion of the Christian God that the Constantinian dynasty had identified itself with, and had consistently promoted — until Julian abandoned and assaulted it. And there was possibly a further twist in the jibe, in so far as it praised the ghost of Constantius; Constantius had promoted Julian to be his junior colleague — and Julian had repaid him by marching his army against him; the jibe might carry the suggestion, then, that Julian was a treacherous usurper.

For those readers of *Eikon Basilike* (precious few, to be sure) who were alert to all this, the point of the Greek motto in the frontispiece was deducible by analogy. Kappa transliterated is the Latin ‘C’, and now serves an acronym for Carolus (Charles): he stands, like Constantius the son of Constantine, as an emblem of stable governance, Christian monarchy, and filial loyalty. Chi/Christ now signals Charles’s established Church in England; the ‘city’ he had never done any wrong to is the English people. Charles, on this reading, is a paragon of faith and piety — an English revival of antiquity’s greatest champions of Christian monarchy. By contrast, the New Model Army leaders and the clique of ‘republicans’⁴⁹ who have just recently connived to try and kill their king now collectively reincarnate the impiety and treachery of the ungrateful Apostate. In short, a Greek tag that had been devised at Antioch in 362 in mockery of Julian and his project to de-christianise the Roman State is now redeployed in application to an English political catastrophe. In its location at the foot of *Eikon Basilike*’s frontispiece, beneath a picture and verses representing Charles as God’s suffering servant *in extremis*, the tag mourns England’s loss of a saintly king, and scorns the legal pretexts (treason and tyranny) that the regicides had devised to justify their putting Charles on trial. Such a recondite ‘quote within a quote’ riddle would do nothing, of course, to further what was presumably the prime practical aim of *Eikon Basilike* — the preservation of a popular support-

⁴⁹ I here use the term loosely as a convenient shorthand; but few (if any) of those who tried Charles in 1649 would have identified themselves as ‘Republicans’, and in the recent historiography of the Civil War period a more restricted application of ‘Republicanism’ is commended, to strictly denote and entail the principle of ‘anti-monarchism’: see Worden 2002, with Hammersley 2012: 324–27.

base for the Royalist cause. It offered, rather, a compressed enigma to be pondered by the cognoscenti; it was the heartfelt flourish of some learned man involved in the book's production. The name of that person eludes us now (the likeliest candidates are Jeremy Taylor, a chaplain to Charles, or else William Dugard, an erudite printer)⁵⁰ — but whoever he was, he had read Julian's satire the *Misopogon* with close attention, and had persuaded himself that a witticism quoted there by Julian could be aptly recast as a plangent dirge in the aftermath of Charles's execution.

2.4 Tolerant tyrants: Julian and his *Caesars* in Marvell's *Rehearsal Transpros'd*, 1672/73

One might have hoped to find in Milton's *Eikonoklastes* (1650) — a work he wrote by commission as a counterblast to *Eikon Basilike* — an early reaction to the oblique play made with Julian's 'Chi and Kappa' riddle in *Eikon Basilike*'s frontispiece. *Eikonoklastes*' preface, after all, does contain a scornful reference to the 'conceited portraiture' of the famous engraving of Charles at prayer in the frontispiece; but Milton makes no mention of Julian's riddle there — nor anywhere else in *Eikonoklastes*. His silence on this detail *might*, of course, be taken to indicate simply that at the time he wrote *Eikonoklastes* he had not read the *Misopogon* — but there is no proving that: the silence could be explained as well in other ways.⁵¹ And in the sequel, it seems, no later seventeenth century writer would address the implications of the puzzling Greek sentence in *Eikon Basilike*'s frontispiece.⁵² Julian's actions and utterances at Antioch, however, *did* still come to figure notably in late seventeenth century disputation: the demands he had pressed upon his subjects there, and the mockery of his person and religious policy he encountered in response,

⁵⁰ For these possibilities (and others: among them, John Gauden), see Poole 2016: 162–63.

⁵¹ As was noted above, the quotation from the *Misopogon* only occurs in some — by no means all — of the 1649 editions of *Eikon Basilike*; in others, the frontispiece prints the engraved scene, but without the quotation; it is possible, then, that Milton had only seen the frontispiece in a form that lacked the quotation. Or again, on the supposition that he *had* seen the quotation, and *had* recognized the source, he might have thought it too trivial to merit any comment in a popularizing work of refutation.

⁵² The solution to the 'riddle' would be immediately clear to any reader of the *Misopogon*, and one can find it explicated as such by seventeenth century authors (e.g. by William Cave *Ecclesiastici*, 1683, Intro., Section III, p. xlv). But there appears to be no printed discussion of it with specific reference to *Eikon Basilike* earlier than the eighteenth century (so Poole 2016: 162, observing a debate in the *Gentleman's Magazine*).

raised once again a key question that had attached to Julian in the discourse of Bellarmine and James I: what could a civil authority legitimately require of its subjects, especially in matters touching on religion? And what should the response of the subject be, if the state's requirements go beyond a legitimate limit? To elucidate the uses to which Julian was put in disputation over this matter, I pass from the aftermath of Charles I's beheading to the era of the Restored Monarchy, to discussion of a memorable satirical polemic of the 1670s: one finds in it a pugnacious depiction of Julian — and a learned and highly subversive deployment of a particular Julianic text.

The author of the polemic was Andrew Marvell, a Member of Parliament of twelve years' standing when he wrote it, and a close friend of Milton's; under the Commonwealth, he had been employed as his assistant (and he had certainly read *Areopagitica*).⁵³ By a neat coincidence, he was also the creator of English poetry's most famous image of Charles I, pictured at the moment of his execution — and most moderns would think of him as a poet. But Marvell's literary reputation in his lifetime rested chiefly on his prose satires, not least on the two-part work I am concerned with here: *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, and *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part*, published respectively in 1672 and 1673 to much acclaim.⁵⁴ (For brevity, when I need to distinguish between the two parts, I will designate them respectively *RT1* and *RT2*). It was a best-seller in the 1670s in several editions (some pirated), and was still a popular classic thirty years later: Swift commends it as such, and as a product of 'great genius', in his *Tale of a Tub*.⁵⁵ Its wide circulation in the 1670s and 80s (and later), I wish to argue, will have been instrumental in enhancing and modifying Julian's profile in the consciousness of a broader English readership — and in particular, in a curious text that bears on the Exclusion Crisis of the early 1680s (see below, pp. 267–70).

The use to which Marvell put Julian in *Rehearsal Transpros'd* is mordantly subversive. The political and literary contexts for its composition and publication are intricate, but for my purposes it will suffice to sketch a summary background. I will then turn to its particular evocations

⁵³ Marvell patently borrows an analogy from *Areopagitica* early in *RT1*, at p. 5 in 1672 edn. (= Marvell, *Prose Works* (2003) vol. 1, 46, with Dzelzainis' n. 29 *ad loc.*).

⁵⁴ In what follows, my discussion of the political contexts of *RT1* and *RT2*'s composition is indebted to the introductions to *RT1* (by A. Dzelzainis) and to *RT2* (by A. Patterson) in Marvell, *Prose Works* (2003) vol. 1, at pp. 3–40, 207–13; and to Smith 2010: 247–78.

⁵⁵ Swift 2008: 66: 'We still read Marvell's answer to Parker with pleasure, tho' the book it answers be sunk long ago' (I quote from the prefatory 'Apology' to the [1710] 5th edition of *A Tale of a Tub*).

of Julian: first, a jibe made in passing in *RT1*, and then the sequel it prompted in *RT2* — a sustained sequence of allusions that played out over ten pages in the original 1673 edition, with close engagement at one point with a specific Julianic text.

The political context, first. In March 1672, Charles II had issued a Declaration of Indulgence permitting freedom of religion to both Protestant Nonconformists (or ‘Dissenters’) and Roman Catholics, by a suspension of the penal laws that had previously applied. There was much opposition to this policy in Parliament, and in pamphleteering — and it was effective enough to press the King to withdraw the Declaration in March 1673. Very prominent among the opposition was the then Archdeacon of Canterbury, Samuel Parker. Parker was a seasoned controversialist — and a vitriolic anathematizer of Protestant Nonconformists, especially. At the time in question, he was the leading (and the most extreme) conservative Anglican proponent of the doctrine and duty of ‘Passive obedience’ in religion to royal and civil authority. On that score, Parker was firm that Roman Catholics in the kingdom, as well as Nonconformists, must be required to be obedient. Between 1670 and 1672, he published three lengthy works demanding the retention or re-imposition of the various laws and penalties that privileged the Anglican establishment — and it was in response to the last of this trio of works, published in 1672 (I shall call it here the *Preface*, for short),⁵⁶ that Marvell entered the ring with his *Rehearsal Transpros’d; or Animadversions upon a Late Book, Intituled, a Preface ...* [= *RT1*]. Its first publication in December 1672 (which was anonymous, and formally illegal) spurred Parker to produce another massive screed, of over 500 pages: *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros’d* (May 1673). *The Rehearsal Transpros’d: The Second Part* [= *RT2*] was published (November 1673) as Marvell’s response to that ‘*Reproof*’ of Parker’s. By contrast with *RT1*, it was not published anonymously; *RT2* was openly published under Marvell’s name. The reason for that is intriguing: the King himself had read and greatly enjoyed *RT1*, and had made clear his view that it should not be suppressed; and Marvell had other eminent supporters too, in the persons of the First Earl Shaftesbury and Lord Anglesey.⁵⁷ *RT2* was composed and released, then, in the confidence that anonymity was no longer necessary.

The nuances of Marvell’s political and religious allegiances constitute a central topic in current Marvell scholarship, but in this particular case,

⁵⁶ For the relationship of these three works of Parker, and their full titles, see Patterson’s comment in Marvell, *Prose Works* (2003) vol. 1, 7–8.

⁵⁷ See Dzelzainis’ comment in Marvell, *Prose Works* (2003) vol. 1, xxii.

there is a broad consensus on what his fundamental political purpose was in attacking Parker's *Preface*: it was to defend the interests of Protestant Nonconformists ('Popery' was as repellant to him as it was to his good friend Milton). But in *Rehearsal Transpros'd*, Marvell deliberately avoided signalling that specific aim, and took care not to voice his personal hostility to Roman Catholics. He was well aware, from his contacts with highly placed insiders in the government, of the rumours of Charles II's own private Catholic sympathies, and of the Catholic conversion of the King's brother and designated successor James, the Duke of York; but the immediate threat to the Nonconformists came from conservative Anglicans, not from Rome. It suited Marvell in *Rehearsal Transpros'd* to pose as an adherent of the doctrine of Divine Right of kings and as a loyal supporter of the King's project for religious toleration with a broad application — and to affect to be demonstrating his loyalty with a demolition of the intemperate attack on the King's policy that Samuel Parker had recently published in his *Preface*.

Viewed as a work of satirical literature, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* in its two parts is a highly original and brilliantly sustained performance. It exhibits real scholarly learning, and a remarkable breadth of reading (not least, in the ancient classics: Marvell had excellent Latin and Greek; and in 1672–73 he had the use of the extensive library of a highly-placed helper, Lord Anglesey).⁵⁸ And it deploys its learning ingeniously in coruscating ridicule of Parker's person and writings. Parker is mockingly named throughout as 'Mr Bayes', after an absurd figure in a popular play of the day on whose title Marvell now played in his satire. In Buckingham's *The Rehearsal*, a burlesque of heroic drama first performed in 1671, 'Mr Bayes' had served as the leading character — a puffed-up, plagiarizing dramatic poet (his name alluding to his laureate's crown). Marvell now undertakes to transfer — or to 'transpose' — 'Mr. Bayes' from the realm of poetic drama to the world of prose literature.

RT1 is for my purposes less important than *RT2*; but it is relevant for a particular passage, in which Marvell picks up on Parker's demand in his *Preface* that all Penal Laws affecting non-Anglicans must be applied with unremitting rigour. Parker had set out various possible means to compel the obedience of subjects on that count, on a rising scale of severity, in which the top (fifth) level amounted effectively to a persecution — but which Parker nonetheless insisted must be enforced without compunction, if need be. That prompted Marvell in *RT1* to draw a comparison, in the knowledge that 'Mr Bayes' was a high-ranking Anglican cleric:

⁵⁸ See Dzelzainis and Patterson 2001.

But Mr. Bayes nevertheless is [keen] for his fifth [level of enforcement]: Persecution [is] recommended; and he does it to the purpose. Julian himself, who I think was first a Reader, and held forth in the Christian churches before he turned apostate and then persecutor, could not have outdone him ['Mr. Bayes'] either in irony or cruelty. Only it is God's mercy that Mr. Bayes is not emperour. You have seen how he inveighs against trade: [he says that] 'whilst men's consciences are actuated by such peevish and ungovernable principles, to erect trading combinations is but to build so many nests of faction and sedition.' Lay up your ships, my masters, set bills on your shop-doors, shut up the custom house; and why not adjourn and immure-up Westminster-hall, leave plowing and sowing, and keep a dismal holy-day through the Nation? for Mr. Bayes is out of humour. But I assure you, it is no jesting matter.⁵⁹

Marvell's allusion to the youthful Julian as having been an enthusiastic Christian (a church Reader) before his apostasy is accurately drawn from a precise report in Sozomen's *History* (4.2). And on this score, Marvell's likening of Parker to Julian not simply *qua* persecutor, but as one whose impulse to persecute arises from a change of mind ('Mr. Bayes is out of humour'), was a particularly shrewd punch: it was common knowledge that Parker had not always been a watchman for conservative Anglicanism; as a student at Oxford he had been, for a time, an enthusiastic Puritan Dissenter. Parker, in the prolix response to *RT1* that he published the following year (the *Reproof*), unwisely tried to deflect this jab by scorning Marvell's depiction of Julian in the passage from *RT1* I have quoted as the work of an historical ignoramus:

Your [Marvell's] fifth Play is 'Persecution recommended'; and here in the opening of your first Scene you bring the Emperour Julian upon the Stage as a more cruel and execrable Monster of Persecution than Antichrist or the Dragon himself, and you throw your slaver upon him with so much scorn and rudeness, that the People take him for as very a rake-shame as Bishop Bonner or Pope Hildebrand. And yet, poor Gentleman, he was a very civil person, and a great Virtuoso, and though he were somewhat Heathenishly inclined, yet he had nothing of the persecuting Spirit in him against the Christians, as you may see at large in [the writings of] Ammianus Marcellinus, unless you will suppose (as he did) that there is no such effectual way of persecuting an establisht

⁵⁹ *RT1*, at pp. 122–23 in 1672 edn. = *Prose Works* (eds. Dzezainis and Patterson, 2003) vol. 1, 104.

Church as by suspending all Ecclesiastical Proceedings against Schismatics and Hereticks, and granting an Unlimited and Universal Toleration. So that you might have found out some other Emperours that might better have become your Character of Cruelty than Julian. And how you will reconcile this hard usage of him with that deep Respect you profess to Sovereign Princes is past my Understanding.⁶⁰

When Parker depicted Julian as a cultivated intellectual who was positively disinclined to persecute anyone unless the alternative would result in an anarchic collapse of the entire fabric of the State religion, he was drawing an idealized self-portrait, of course. The depiction had a basis, of sorts, in the ancient evidence, inasmuch as Julian never had never intended to subject Christians to violent persecution, and had never outlawed them *qua* Christians — but Parker’s harping on Ammianus to make his point was a poor tactic. Marvell knew his Ammianus well, and in November 1673, when he called up his heavy battalion of ancient sources in the *Rehearsal Transposed, The Second Part*, Ammianus was a weapon he used skillfully, quoting the text with precise chapter references. I here give a substantial representative extract for flavour. Marvell’s direct quotations of Parker are given in **bold**; his direct quotations of Ammianus are in *italics*; it should be noted that Marvell’s source references to Ammianus in the passage establish that he was working directly from the Latin of a 1609 Hamburg edition (and not from Philemon Holland’s English translation):

You [‘Mr Bayes’] return me [this] in answer to this passage (for in my whole Book [= *RT1*] I have but this once mentioned him [= Julian]):
‘You bring the emperour Julian upon the stage, as a more cruel and execrable monster of persecution than Antichrist or the Dragon himself, and you throw your slaver upon him with so much scorn and rudeness, that the people take him for as very a rake-shame as Bishop Bonner or Pope Hildebrand.’ [= Parker, *Reproof*, p. 73] You are very gentle, Mr. Bayes, and good-natured to extremity; which makes me the more wonder at this transport, for in your whole Book there are not above one or two like instances, and you have imbraced no man’s quarrel with more concernment and vehemency. There must be something extraordinary in it. Had I then known that he [Julian] was so old an acquaintance of yours as I since find in your Platonick Philosophy, or had I imagined that he was so near of kin to you, and one of your

⁶⁰ *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transposed, by the author* [= Parker] of *Ecclesiastical politie*, London 1673, p. 73.

‘dearest cuzzes,’ I should perhaps, according to the rules of conversation, have spoke of him with more respect; but however I am cautioned sufficiently for the future. Especially seeing he has so ample testimonial from you, **‘that he was a very civil person, a great virtuoso, and though somewhat heathenishly inclined, yet he had nothing of a persecuting spirit in him against Christians, as may be seen at large in Ammianus Marcel. 1. 22.’** And you add immediately: **‘unless you will suppose, as he did, that there is no such effectual way of persecuting an established Church as by suspending all Ecclesiastical proceedings against Schismatics and Hereticks, and granting an unlimited universal toleration.’** I do not suppose it, but you do; and it is one of the greatest arguments in your Ecclesiastical Politie against toleration or indulgence.

Therefore let us see what your Ammianus saith: *“But when Julian observed that he was now free to do what he would, he revealed his secret design, and by plain and absolute edicts commanded that the temples should be open’d, sacrifices offer’d, and the worship of the Gods restored: and to strengthen the effect of what he had proposed to himself, he therefore called the Christian Bishops that were at odds with one another, and their divided people, together into his palace, admonishing them that laying aside their intestine quarrels, every one should boldly exercise without all disturbance his own religion; which he therefore did, that this liberty increasing their dissentions, he might be secured thence- forward against the unanimating of the Christian people, for he had found by experience that no beasts were so cruel against man as Christians for the most part are inveterate against one another. [Ammianus, L 22, p. 225.] ...”*

But further, does not your Ammianus tell you of *“a most inhumane edict, and in respect to Julian’s memory fit to be buried in perpetual silence—that no grammarian or rhetorician should presume to teach any Christian? [Ammianus, 1. 25, p. 316; l. 22, p. 239.]”* This he twice mentions with the same remark.

Does he not tell you that Apollo’s Temple at Antiochia *“being burnt down,”* whether by chance [or] otherwise, *“he upon meer suspicion caused the Christians to be question’d and tormented more severely than usual, and commanded their great church at Antioch to be shut up thenceforward. [Idem, 1. 23, p. 257.]”*

He saith too *“that Julian left behind him there a turbulent and cruel governour on purpose, affirming that he was not worthy of the place, but the people deserved to be so handled:”* so that this Author makes

as much herein against your ‘great virtuoso’ as could be expected from one that was no Christian, and in Julian’s service ...⁶¹

Having quarried Ammianus to his satisfaction, Marvell rounds off his assault by endorsing the (wishful) claim of the ancient Christian sources that Julian had engaged in bloodthirsty persecution, and launching an *ad hominem* attack upon Parker:

Would you but have given as much credit to Gregory Nazianzen [...] and all the Ecclesiastical writers of that time, as to Ammianus Marcellinus an Heathen soldier, you could not sure have had so good an opinion of him [Julian] ... [It is] manifest that during his short reign there was by his means and under his authority as great, if not greater, ravage and cruelty exercised then in any of the former persecutions ...

[But] you do openly aver a known falsehood in defence of Julian, for whom you have so great a friendship, and whose actions you approve of. But no man will think the better of your cause for your justifying it by panegyricks of Julian the Apostate ... Truly, Mr. Bayes, you have a very notable face ... one would almost swear you were spit out of [Julian’s] mouth. He set up a nickname [viz. ‘the Galileans’] for the Christians, to make them out to be knock’d o’ th’ head [i.e. to be insane]: so [likewise] do you give the Nonconformists the name of Fanaticks, as he them of Galileans Pray Sir, who are these Fanaticks? Most of them, I assure you, [are] better men than your self, of truer Principles than you are, and more conformable to the Doctrine of the Church of England Julian’s wit and yours is incomparable, but betwixt you there is not any more Token of a mean Spirit than to taunt and scoff at those in Affliction ...⁶²

Marvell’s many coffee-house readers could smile at that as a well-aimed spit at Parker’s face — but there was more for them to relish than that in *RT2*. Marvell did not confine himself in it to mocking Parker’s pretence to scholarly learning by citing Ammianus; he also drew ingeniously on a text by Julian himself.

In his *Reproof*, Parker had at one point asserted that the King’s proposal to grant freedom of religion, if put into practice, would prove fatal to the State — so much so, that it would be preferable to grant his

⁶¹ *RT2*, pp. 276–81 in 1673 edn. = *Prose Works* (eds. Dzelzainis and Patterson, 2003) vol. 1, 377–79.

⁶² *RT2*, pp. 280–82 in 1673 edn. = *Prose Works* (eds. Dzelzainis and Patterson, 2003) vol. 1, 379–80.

citizens full licence for utter debauchery in their private lives. And warming to this theme, Parker had proceeded to compose, for the amusement of his readers, a parody of Charles II's Declaration of Indulgence: a cod-'Proclamation of Toleration for all Debaucheries'. Parker had intended this parody to display his literary originality and wit — but Marvell deftly mocked the effort without mercy. Did Mr. Bayes not realize, he asked, that — quite apart from the shocking disrespect it showed towards His Majesty — his supposedly original conceit of a edict granting free rein to Debauchery had been anticipated long ago by his bosom friend Julian, at the climax of his satire entitled *Caesars*? In *Caesars*, Julian had imagined all the emperors of Rome competing for the title of 'best Caesar' in a contest arranged for the gods' amusement. The big loser in the contest, predictably, is Julian's uncle, Constantine: he ends up arraigned on a charge of murder, and runs off as an outlaw in search of a protector — which is Julian's cue to deride the Christian sacrament of baptism. I quote the relevant passage (*Caes.* 335d–336b) in Marvell's own translation, in *italics*:

But because I have observed how careful you [Parker] are to find out, before you attempt a great jump of wit, some convenient rise, and you would not doubtless have penn'd so notable a declaration [as your 'Toleration for all Debaucheries'] without some precedent, after a little searching, I found this in the *Caesares Juliani*, where that emperour, having undertaken to marshal his predecessors under the patronage of some proper Deity, when he comes to Constantine does thus satyrically represent him:

"But Constantine not being able among all the Gods to find a Pattern of his own life, casting his eye about saw the Goddess of Luxury near him, and straight ran to her. She hereupon receiving him delicately and embracing him, tricked him up in woman's cloaths, and conducted him to the Goddess of Intemperance, finding his [Constantine's] son returned and making to all men this public proclamation:

"Let all men take notice, of whatsoever condition and quality, whether they be adulterers, or murtherers, or guilty of any other immorality, vice, or debauchery, that hereby they are warranted and invited to continue boldly and confidently in the same; and I declare that, upon dipping themselves only in this water, they are, and shall be so reputed, pure and blameless to all intents and purposes. And moreover, as oft as they shall renew and frequent such other vices, immoralities, or debaucheries, I do hereby give and grant to them and every one of them respectively, that by thumping his breast, or giving

but himself a pat on the forehead, he shall thereupon be immediately discharged and absolved of all guilt and penalty therefore incurred, any law or statute to the contrary notwithstanding ...” This is in the 99th page of that book printed at Paris 1583 ...⁶³

This source-citation of a ‘99th page’ (which is exactly accurate) in a Parisian publication of 1583 identifies the specific edition of Julian’s works that Marvell was here translating from; it is the old **Martinius/Cantaclarus 1583** edition — and it will soon emerge [pp. 270–71] that there is a particular interest, and an irony, in his translating from that edition’s text in his depiction of Constantine’s flight. But for the moment, the key point to hold is that Marvell’s translation of the close of Julian’s *Caesars* was published in the pages of a best-seller: the coffee houses were thick with copies of the *RT2* (and it reached to far grander places also; as was noted earlier, we have a contemporary’s testimony that the King himself ‘read [both parts] over and over again’).⁶⁴ Marvell was thus instrumental in alerting a broader Anglophone readership to the existence of Julian’s wittiest work — a satire in which all the Caesars of Rome are gathered to parade as rivals in an imperial beauty contest, and in which Constantine figures as a convicted murderer who seeks to evade his punishment by means of an easy ritual pardon offered to all-comers by a Christian huckster.

The deployment of Julian in *Rehearsal Transpros’d* has a curious twist. Its representation of Julian is on the face of things stereotypically hostile: Marvell first introduces him in *RT1* as a prototype of Parker the scourge of Nonconformists, an emblem of the ‘cruel’ persecutor; then, in *RT2*, he scorns Parker’s rejoinder that Julian was ‘a very civil person’ and a ‘great Virtuoso’ with ‘nothing of the persecuting Spirit in him’, rebutting it at length with appeal to Ammianus and the Christian sources, and to Julian’s own testimony: in citing his ‘ingrateful’ abuse of Constantine in his *Caesars*, Marvell makes Julian prefigure the disrespect Parker has

⁶³ *RT2*, at pp. 375–76 in 1673 edn. = *Prose works* (eds. Dzelzainis and Paterson 2003) vol. 1, 376: Marvell was translating *Caesars* 335d–336c from the **Martinius/Cantaclarus 1583** edition: ὁ δὲ Κωνσταντῖνος, οὐχ εὐρίσκων ἐν θεοῖς τοῦ βίου τὸ ἀρχέτυπον, ἐγγύθεν τὴν Τρυφήν κατιδὼν ἔδραμε πρὸς αὐτήν: ἡ δὲ ὑπολαβοῦσα μαλακῶς καὶ περιβαλοῦσα τοῖς πῆχεσι πέπλοις τε αὐτὸν ποικίλοις ἀσκῆσασα καὶ καλλωπίσασα πρὸς τὴν Ἀσωτίαν ἀπήγαγεν, ἵνα καὶ τὸν υἱόν [sic] εὐρῶν ἀναστρεφόμενον καὶ προαγορεύοντα πᾶσιν, “Ὅστις φθορεὺς, ὅστις μαιφόνος, ὅστις ἐναγῆς καὶ βδελυρός, ἴτω θαρρῶν: ἀποφανῶ γὰρ αὐτὸν τουτῶι τῷ ὕδατι λούσας αὐτίκα καθαρὸν, κὰν πάλιν ἔνοχος τοῖς αὐτοῖς γένηται, δώσω τὸ στήθος πλήξαντι καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν πατάξαντι καθαρῶ γενέσθαι. On Cantoclarus’ (mis)reading of MSS’ *iv* as *υἱόν* in this passage, see below, pp. 270–71.

⁶⁴ See Dzelzainis in *Prose Works* (eds. Dzelzainis and Patterson) vol. 1, 20, quoting Gilbert Burnet.

shown towards Charles II in his *Reproof*. But Marvell's extensive quotation from the end of *Caesars* adds a new note which complicates the tone: Julian is now disclosed as not just a precursor of Parker, but as an original literary talent in a manifestly higher league — and *qua* satirist, a precursor of Marvell himself. Marvell plainly could, and did, admire Julian as a fellow-satirist: in selecting and translating the *Caesars* passage at issue, a Restoration satirist was drawing on the wit of an antique one in order to ridicule a contemporary opponent's claim to literary originality. Although he does not care to confess it explicitly, Marvell here savoured and evoked Julian as the cultured 'Virtuoso'.

It is noteworthy that the passage in *Caesars* picked by Marvell for translation relates to Constantine — and not mere coincidence, perhaps, that it depicts him in a most unflattering light. The depiction, admittedly, is entirely focalized through the pen of the 'ingrateful' Julian; but there is reason to think that Marvell's own estimate of Constantine — his regime, at least, if not the person — was less than positive. In *Rehearsal Transpros'd* itself, however, he chose not to dwell upon that. Marvell was affecting, there, to write as a stout supporter (by contrast with Parker) of the King's project for a broad application of religious 'toleration' — which is to say, an application of it which would benefit not only Protestant Nonconformists (Marvell's real concern), but also Roman Catholic subjects of the Crown; and to preserve that pose, he will have judged it wiser in his *Rehearsal* not to register any criticism of the convert heroized in the Catholic tradition as Constantine the Great, the founder and champion of a Christianized Roman empire. On the contrary, Constantine is momentarily likened in *RT2* to Charles II in his concern to promote tolerance and concord in religion — which is ostensibly a praise of his intentions. But in the radical discourse of Nonconformists — not least, in the young Milton's *Of Reformation* (1641) — Constantine's reign had been identified as the point at which an unholy compact, forged between the state and the Church, had corrupted the purity of the early Christians, and had opened the way for an enriched and ambitious episcopate to construct, in the form of the Papacy, an oppressive simulacrum of the true Faith.⁶⁵ This is broadly the view that Marvell himself would express, three years after the *Rehearsal*, in a provocative text that he published pseudonymously along with his *Mr Smirke* in 1676 — *A Short Historical Essay concerning general councils, creeds, and impositions, in matters of religion*. The *Essay* articulated a radical challenge to the authority of all formal creeds and councils, beginning with the Council of Nicaea to which Constantine had summoned some three hundred bishops in 325,

⁶⁵ Hill 1977: 84–86.

and the Nicene Creed that it formulated:⁶⁶ Constantine's regime, Marvell now avowed, had sown the seeds of a 'Pestilence' which had flourished horribly under his successor Constantius, and which rendered Julian's apostasy comprehensible:

It show'd it self first in Ambition, then in Contention, next in Imposition, and after these Symptoms broke out at last like a Plague-Sore in open Persecution...

It is [hence] not strange to me that Julian, being but a Reader in the Christian Church, should turn Pagan: Especially when I consider that he succeeded Emperor after Constantius. For it seems rather unavoidable that a Man of great Wit, as he [Julian] was, and not having the Grace of God to direct it and [to] show him the Beauty of Religion, through the Deformity of its [Christian] Governours and Teachers; but that he must conceive a Loathing and Aversion for it. Nor could he think that he did them any Injustice, when he observed that, beside all their Unchristian Immorality too, they practised thus, against the Institutive Law of their Galilean, the Persecution among themselves for Religion ...⁶⁷

In explaining Julian's apostasy as a reaction against the Constantinian Catholic ecclesiastical authority's 'deformity', 'Unchristian immorality' and 'persecution' of honest Christians, Marvell was building, no doubt, on the anti-Constantinian strand in radical English discourse instantiated in his friend Milton's anti-prelatical *Of Reformation*. But the impulse to depict the apostasy in this manner had roots running back a century: as I have signalled in my introduction [see above pp. 233–34], the basic idea was already forming in embryo in the dedicatory letter and potted 'Life of Julian' that had prefaced the Huguenot Martinus's 1566 edition of the *Misopogon*.

If Marvell in his *Essay* represented Julian's apostasy as comprehensible in its context, he was not himself disposed to excuse or justify it, still less to find in it any cause for praise of Julian: at bottom, Marvell remained committed to the same censorious view of him as a subtle persecutor that had underpinned his friend Milton's picture of the Apostate in *Areopagitica*, and before that, James I's picture of him in his

⁶⁶ Marvell, *Prose Works* (eds. Dzelzainis and Patterson, 2003) vol. 2, 17–19; Smith 2010: 306–8.

⁶⁷ *Mr. Smirke; or, The divine in mode: together with a short historical essay, concerning general councils, creeds, and impositions, in matters of religion by Andreas Rivetus, Junior*, London 1676 [repr. 1680], at pp. 126 and 154 = Marvell, *Prose Works* (eds. Dzelzainis and Patterson, 2003) vol. 2, at pp. 51 and 63.

Apologie. But after his death in 1678, Marvell soon came to be posthumously adopted by the early Whigs as an ally in their efforts to exclude the Catholic Duke of York from the succession; and in the sequel, as I will now argue, Marvell's highlighting of Julian's assault on Constantine at the close of *Caesars*, and his *Essay*'s depiction of the Constantinian regime as an emblem of ecclesiastical corruption, could in some contexts encourage the paradoxical deployment of Julian as an exemplum of Protestant virtue, rather than Papist persecution or idolatry.

2.5 An Apostate's Exclusion Crisis: Julian as Whig in 'Philaretus Anthropopolita', 1681

In 1681 a pamphlet circulated in London under the title *Seasonable Remarks on the Deplorable Fall* [i.e., the apostasy] *of the Emperour Julian*.⁶⁸ The political context, once again, was exceptionally volatile. The Exclusion Bill Crisis was peaking: 1681 was the year in which the efforts of the First Earl of Shaftesbury to exclude the Duke of York from the line of succession earned him imprisonment in the Tower in July, on a charge of treason. Shaftesbury was a founding Whig (and formerly, in 1672/73, an influential behind-the-scenes supporter of the publication of both parts of Marvell's *Rehearsal Transformed*). The pamphlet *Seasonable Remarks* was composed by a highly learned author who styled himself 'Philaretus Anthropopolita' ('a Virtue-loving Citizen', as he might have put it in English), and devised as subtle propaganda in defence and support of Shaftesbury's cause. Ingeniously, though, the author did not mention Shaftesbury's name or particular case at all; instead, he found an ancient precursor to them in Julian:

Had not our Holy Religion degenerated much from its Native goodness, and the integrity in which our Saviour Jesus and his blessed Followers left it, it would have been indeed admirable that any once instructed in it, and much more so excellent a person as Julian, should ever desert it ... for a person [so] severely Vertuous, profoundly Speculative, admirably Learned and Eloquent, and (which is yet more) firm and positive in the belief of a Deity and future life, to relinquish a Religion of so much genuine Piety, and simple innocence as ours [Christianity] is, for the fond Superstitions of Heathens and gross Idolaters, would be not only unaccountable, but above measure stupendious, did we not

⁶⁸ *Some seasonable remarks upon the deplorable fall of the Emperour Julian with an epistle of his to the citizens of Bostra now made English by Philaretus Anthropopolita*, London 1681.

find the lamentable causes of it in the debauched Christianity of those times; I mean the times of the two Emperours, Constantine, and Constantius; for then first our Religion was converted into Faction, Policie, and vile Hypocrisie ... [and] by [these] steps the flock of Christ came at last to be a prey to the Avarice and Ambition of Bishops, in the time of our unhappy Emperour Julian ... This discerning Prince soon saw their [the Bishops'] Designe was to erect in all parts of the Empire their own Mosaick or Ecclesiastick Politie, by themselves Metamorphos'd from a Democracy into an Absolute Tyranny: they having advanced so far already, as to procure of Constantine the sole Jurisdiction over Christians.⁶⁹

The Emperor's 'deplorable Fall', to be glossed later as a 'tragical apostasy', is here presented as a lamentable turn, but by no means one for which he is to be condemned or judged culpable: its contemporary analogue is Shaftesbury's momentous switch of political allegiance over the years 1679–81; in that period, he had switched from service as Lord President of Charles II's Privy Council to help direct the parliamentary Opposition to him, taking leading roles in the formulation of the anti-Catholic Exclusion Bill and in the championing of Protestant Nonconformists. Like Shaftesbury, Julian was an 'excellent person' (so Philaretus argued) whose 'tragical Apostasy' would never have occurred in better times; its root cause had been 'the Avarice and Ambition of Bishops', whose 'modelling [of] Religion on Court-Intrigues' had 'metamorphos'd [the Roman State] into an Absolute Tyranny' under Constantine and Constantius. The pamphleteer here implicitly placed Constantine and his son in the damnable company of Popes and bishops, and idealized his nephew Julian the Apostate as a virtuous proto-Whig — a Nonconformist Protestant champion of political moderation and religious toleration, standing resolute against Roman Catholic authoritarianism and avarice, and against the Catholicising Absolutism instantiated in the Bourbon regime of Louis XIV. And to illustrate the debauched condition of the Catholic Church which the virtuous Julian had abandoned, 'Philaretus' alighted on its peddling of ritual pardons to the most wicked and unrepentant villains. For example (he observed), there was the matter of the murderous putsch that had deprived the young Julian at a stroke of his father and male relatives; and on the strength of that 'Philaretus' proceeded to offer his own lively rendering of the very same passage that Marvell had a few years earlier picked out and translated in his *Rehearsal Transpros'd* — the scene at the close of *Caesars* in which Constantine's

⁶⁹ Philaretus' *Seasonable Remarks* at pp. 1–2, 14–15 and 18–19.

son (or so Marvell and 'Philaretus' supposed) promises a general amnesty for all sinners through the sacraments of baptism and confession.

I am perswaded nothing offended him [Julian] so much, as the vile Hypocrisie of the then Clergy, who besides their coining of contrary Creeds, in the Reigns of Constantine and Constantius, and [their] modelling Religion by Court-Intrigues, seemed almost wholly to dispense with Morality, placing Sanctimony not so much in a good Life, as in the strict Observance of the Rituals and the Symbolical Representations of our Religion; such as Baptism, the Eucharist, Chrism, but above all in submitting to the Formalities of Confession and Penance, upon which the worst of offences were too easily remitted. What flesh could bear to hear the Murderers of ones Father, Uncle, two Brothers, six Cousin germans, harangued to Heaven in Pulpits, as very holy and good men, because (forsooth) absolved by their own Friends the Priests? And I the rather suspect this to have been the principal Cause of his Tragical Apostacy, because I do not finde his Satyr any where so truculent, as upon this occasion. In the end of his *Caesars* we finde his Uncle Constantine conducted by the Goddess Effeminacy to her Sister Debauchery, where he findes his Son Constantius making Proclamation as followeth ... "*Ho! whosoever is either Sodomite, Murderer, Rogue or Villain, let him dread nothing but repair hither, with this water I'll make him clean in a trice: And if he shall happen (as humane Nature is frail) to repeat the same Crimes, if he will but thump his breast, and box his noddle, I'll warrant him as innocent as the Child unborn.*" This [passage in *Caesars*] was the vengeance Julian took for the Barbarous Murders committed upon almost his whole Family and Blood.⁷⁰

As 'Philaretus' saw it (and he wholly concurred with Julian on the point), this Constantinian advertisement for the automatic pardoning of unrepentant repeat-offenders with a splash of water was noxious hypocrisy: it nicely epitomized the pernicious impact of the Roman Catholic Church on the body politic, and the danger posed to England by Catholic intrigue in high places; the rot, 'Philaretus' is clear, had come to reach even the King's own family and intimate counsellors. Philaretus' *Seasonable Remarks* thus unmistakably conveyed a 'timely' warning: unless King Charles denounced and prevented the plotting of the Catholic intriguers, he would come to be viewed by his subjects as a monarch quite as corrupt and oppressive as Constantine and Constantius had been in Julian's eyes — and in that event, many a hitherto loyal subject of the Crown besides

⁷⁰ Id., pp. 17–18.

Shaftesbury might well be tragically compelled to contemplate a political ‘apostasy’.

What prompted ‘Philaretus’ to adduce Julian’s apostasy as a metaphor for the First Earl of Shaftesbury’s case in his pamphlet? And what prompted him to pick up so precisely on the Julian’s depiction of Constantine’s baptism at *Caesars’* close? On both counts, the best answer is surely that he was drawing on his reading of Shaftesbury’s quondam literary protégé and ally Andrew Marvell: ‘Philaretus’ was surely familiar both with Marvell’s rationale for the apostasy in his anti-prelatical *Short Historical Essay* (it had been republished in 1680), and with his exuberant depiction in the best-selling *Rehearsal Transpros’d* of Constantine’s effort to evade justice by a ritual washing. Quite likely, ‘Philaretus’ had first encountered this passage in Marvell’s translation — but if so, it led him to read more of Julian at first hand; his translation of *Caesars’* baptism-scene is his own, and it can be inferred from a detail in his preamble to it that he was working from a later edition of Julian than the **Martinius/Cantoclarus 1683** volume that Marvell had used:

These words, though the learned Loyalite [= Jesuit] Petavius durst not translate [them] to his Catholick friends, I may [translate] to pious Protestants without the least offence, since they [the Protestants] derive not their religion from Constantine’s bishops, but from Christ immediately.

‘Philaretus’, then, was reading *Caesars* in the **Petavius 1630** edition: as he pointedly notes, Petavius [Denys Petau], in the Latin crib he had provided, had skipped over the closing baptism-scene in *Caesars* — an omission ‘Philaretus’ attributes to the passage’s extreme offensiveness to the sensibilities of a Roman Catholic ritualist. By contrast, ‘Philaretus’ trusts, his Protestant readers would recognize in Julian’s case a virtuous Protestant *avant la lettre*: what the ‘Apostate’ had turned away from was not the true faith, but a travesty of it first inflicted on the Roman State under Constantine, and then perpetuated by the Papacy.

There is an irony to observe in this connexion; the jibe ‘Philaretus’ directed at Petavius had a sharper edge than he himself knew. ‘Philaretus’ (and Marvell likewise, for that matter) would have been distinctly less inclined to make any play with the scene of Constantine’s baptism in *Caesars* if either had realized that, in a crucial particular, his own translated version had misunderstood and misrepresented what Julian had written. In both of their versions, that is to say, the preacher who promises a general pardon for sins at the climax of the *Caesars* is represented as Constantius, the son of Constantine — but quite erroneously.

The misunderstanding of Julian's Greek on this point went back to an error perpetrated by the first editor of *Caesars* [**Cantoclarus 1577**]; he had garbled the Greek text in a crucial manuscript, misreading as $\acute{\upsilon}\iota\omicron\nu$ ('son') what was actually an abbreviated MS form of Jesus' name in the accusative ($\acute{\iota}\nu = \text{'}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\nu$). This false reading, $\acute{\upsilon}\iota\omicron\nu$ ('son'), then persisted in all the early editions of Julian's works throughout the seventeenth century, up to and including **Spanheim 1696**; it was not until 1736 that a keen-eyed German editor, Heusinger, detected the error — and even he felt obliged to keep the point corralled in an endnote, rather than printing the correct form of the Greek in his volume's main text.⁷¹ But there is no doubt that, in the true reading, the preacher is actually Jesus — which renders the passage not merely offensive to Catholics, but spectacularly blasphemous for Catholics and Protestants alike: Julian's Jesus is a huckster peddling a fake salvation through baptism while cohabiting with 'Madam Pleasure' (*Tryphe*) and 'Mistress Wantonness' (*Asotia*) — a pair of luxurious tarts.

'Philaretus' did not confine himself to translating this one passage from Julian. In closing, he professed to be worried lest his readers might suspect him (as they well might) of projecting his own views or sentiments onto the figure of Julian. In order to reassure them that the views he ascribed to Julian were authentically Julianic, he undertook (pp. 20–23) to close his 'seasonable remarks' by 'adventur[ing] to translate an Epistle of his [Julian's] to the Citizens of Bostra, who had been in some disorders, by reason, as it should seem, of a Toleration allow'd by Julian to the yet unconverted Heathens of that Town.' This so-called 'Epistle to the Bostrans' — it figured as 'letter 52' in the early editions of Julian — was in fact an edict that Julian had issued at Antioch on 1 August 362: it required the Christian and pagan citizens of Bostra to put a stop to the violent rioting that had afflicted their city, and to live henceforward in civic harmony (but the Christians were also told to expel the local bishop, who in Julian's eyes was the prime instigator of the disorder). The 'letter' is an item well-known to students of Julian's subsequent reception in the discourse of the eighteenth century Enlightenment: it is a text which inspired Voltaire in his *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* to elevate Julian as

⁷¹ J.M. Heusinger, *Iuliani Imp. Caesares, cum integris adnotationibus aliquot doctorum virorum ...*, Gotha 1736, identifies the true reading in tortuous note at pp. 142–44. To be clear, only one of the extant MSS of *Caesars* (the thirteenth century *Augustanus*) transmits the passage depicting Constantine's baptism; in all the other codices, the passage is lacking (presumably because it had been suppressed relatively early by a scandalized copyist): see the comments of the editor in the Budé *Les Belles Lettres* edition (vol. 2.ii, ed. C. Lacombrade, Paris 1964, at pp. 30–31).

a model of philosophic tolerance (and which Gibbon more cannily characterized as a missive in which Julian ‘professes his moderation, and betrays his zeal’).⁷² The picking out of this item by ‘Philaretus’ for translation can thus be viewed as a harbinger of the later idealization of Julian as an Enlightenment *philosophe* — and perhaps as itself a significant early stimulus for that later idealizing turn. It is noteworthy, at least, that the earliest eighteenth century deployment of the ‘letter to the Bostrans’ as a means to commend Julian as a tolerant enlightenment *philosophe* was a translation of the ‘letter’ published in 1714, in an essay by an English author — and that the author at issue was the Third Earl of Shaftesbury:⁷³ that is to say, the author was the grandson of the First Earl of Shaftesbury, in support of whom ‘Philaretus’ had written his pamphlet (and one may add that in 1681 the Third Earl was being tutored by an erudite employee of his grandfather’s — John Locke — with whom he thereafter maintained a lifelong personal friendship). There is a case to made, then, that the Third Earl’s knowledge of ‘the letter to the Bostrans’ went back to his days as a youthful pupil of Locke — or at least that he had first been alerted to its significance by a publication that Locke, his quondam tutor, had later brought to his notice.

Just who ‘Philaretus’ was now eludes us. John Locke himself has been conjectured — and it is not impossible: as an intimate friend, employee

⁷² I quote Gibbon *DF* (ed. Womersley, 1994) 1.876 n. 33. ‘Ep. 52’ is the text from which Voltaire had earlier selectively quoted (at p. 6) in the prefatory ‘Portrait de L’Empereur Julien’ that he contributed to the Marquis d’Argens’ *Discours de l’Empereur Julien contre les Chrétiens* (Berlin 1769): ‘On lit ses lettres, et on admire. “Les Galiléens”, dit-il, “ont souffert sous mon prédécesseur l’exil et les prisons; on a massacré réciproquement ceux qui s’appellent tour à tour hérétiques, j’ai rapellé leurs exilés, élargi leurs prisonniers; j’ai rendu leurs biens aux proscrits, je les ai forcés de vivre en paix. Mais telle est la fureur inquiète des Galiléens qu’ils se plaignent de ne pouvoir plus se dévorer les uns les autres.” Quelle lettre, quelle sentence portée par la philosophie contre le fanatisme persécuteur!’ A compressed version of this praise was subsequently offered by Voltaire in his *Questions sur l’Encyclopédie* (Geneva 1774) vol. 1, 268 (s.v. ‘Apostat’): ‘... [Julien] voulait extirper la persécution et l’intolérance. Relisez sa lettre cinquante-deuxième, et respectez sa mémoire’; for the full quotation, see the epigraph to the present paper.

⁷³ The Third Earl of Shaftesbury, *Characteristicks*, vol. 3 (London 1714) gives an abbreviated translation of ‘Julian’s Epistles Number 52’ at pp. 87–88, under the following preamble: ‘A Letter of that elegant and witty Emperor may be not improperly plac’d amongst our Citations, as a Pattern of his Humour and Genius, as well as of his Principle and Sentiments.’ It may be added that the Third Earl’s interest in Julian had another expression ca.1700: Haskell 1980: 198 observes that he was almost certainly the deviser of the programme for an allegorical fresco painted by Verrio at Hampton Court whose central scene depicts the contest of the emperors in Julian’s *Caesars* (on which see Wind 1939/40).

and supporter of the First Earl of Shaftesbury, Locke had certainly engaged previously in anonymous pamphleteering in collaboration with him and on his behalf, and in 1681 he had contributed to another anonymous pamphlet produced in the Earl's defence.⁷⁴ The idea at Locke also had a hand, at least, in the composition of the *Seasonable Remarks* is thus quite plausible, *per se* (and one can observe in this connexion that Locke's personal library contained several copies of Marvell's *Rehearsal Transpros'd*, and also a copy of the *Short Historical Essay*).⁷⁵ But that said, 'Philaretus' could just as easily have been some other learned man who moved in the First Earl's intellectual circle.⁷⁶ Whoever he was, though, his pamphlet of 1681 had a curious sequel. In the immediate aftermath, it may have been a stimulus for a much longer Whiggish pamphlet produced by a less incisive mind in the years of the Exclusion Crisis — the Reverend Samuel Johnson's *Julian the Apostate*, published in 1682.⁷⁷ Johnson was a Protestant clergyman in service as a chaplain to Lord Russell, another Whig grandee (and an ally of Shaftesbury), and Johnson's basic political object chimed with that of 'Philaretus' — the Catholic Duke of York was to be prevented from succeeding his brother as King of England. A reading — or simply a report — of the *Seasonable Remarks* quite likely gave Johnson the basic idea of harping on Julian in an item of anti-Catholic propaganda. Johnson reverted, though, to the stereotypical trope of Julian as a demonic and tyrannical persecutor: his

⁷⁴ Wind 1939/40: 133–44 made the conjecture; for Locke's pamphleteering activities in 1681 and previously, see Cranston 1957: 202 and Ashcraft 1986: 348–49.

⁷⁵ For Locke's ownership of these volumes, see Patterson 1999: 26 and 47 n. 6.

⁷⁶ It is a tempting speculation, in view of his intellectual milieu, that 'Philaretus' may have heard something of the *Caesars* commentary that Ezechiel Spanheim was preparing in the late 1670s, and may even have encountered Spanheim in person. As was noted above (p. 234), the scholarly Calvinist Spanheim was serving in London from 1678 until April 1680 as the diplomatic envoy of the Electorates of the Palatinate and of Brandenburg; his stay there thus coincided closely with the Exclusion crisis, and the Electors he represented were keen to support the English opposition to a Catholic succession (see O'Malley 1976: 348–49, with Brinkmann 1909: 464–66). Spanheim's employers will certainly have expected him to acquire and pass on information on the activities of Shaftesbury and his circle, and judicious contact with members of the circle would constitute the most effective means to do so. As for Locke, there is sure evidence that by the later 1680s at least, he had at least some passing acquaintance with Spanheim: in 1689, while Locke was residing in Holland, a Parisian friend wrote to let him know that he had entrusted certain books he wished Locke to have to an intermediary — namely, to Spanheim, who was about to travel from Paris to Amsterdam (see Di Biase 2013: 733, at nn. 177 and 178).

⁷⁷ *Julian the Apostate, being a short account of his life, the sense of the primitive Christians about his succession and their behaviour towards him: together with a comparison of popery and paganism*, London 1682.

pamphlet, running for over 60 pages, represented the Catholic Duke of York as a reincarnated Julian — a devilish apostate from the Protestant road who was waiting in the wings to take the Crown and then wreak havoc on the British nation. Johnson's *Julian* was for a brief time a very widely read best-seller, and for historians of the Exclusion Crisis of the 1680s its popular reception and the rejoinders it prompted lend it a greater political insignificance than 'Philaretus'.⁷⁸ For my present purposes, though, it is a text of much less interest and significance than the *Seasonable Remarks*: Johnson's depiction of Julian as a Papist tyrant is a laboured and prolix effort, a caricature heavily reliant on the ancient ecclesiastical historians, and uninformed (despite the author's occasional pretences to the contrary) by any direct acquaintance with any of Julian's writings.⁷⁹ In closing, I will pass, rather, to a much more sophisticated text in which a vestigial memory of the 'Philaretan' portrait of Julian as an heroic Protestant seems to persist. The text in question was published a good sixty years after 'Philaretus' wrote his *Seasonable Remarks*, but it offers scope for a retrospective of sorts on the several seventeenth century 'receptions' of Julian that this paper has aimed to explain and connect.

⁷⁸ It is the subject of a recent study by Rose 2018; see also Zook 1999: 37–39, 56–62.

⁷⁹ Johnson occasionally cites Julianic works (including, at pp. 21–22, the 'Chi and Kappa' riddle in the *Misopogon*); but in all these instances his knowledge actually comes at second hand: a key intermediary source was the long introduction supplied by the learned patristic scholar William Cave to his *Ecclesiastici*.

That volume was published in 1683, so subsequently to Johnson's *Julian*; but Cave pointedly makes it clear in his preface (unpaginated [= p. 5]) that the Revd. Johnson was much in his debt (or rather, perhaps, was a plagiarist): 'I thought good to premise an Historical Survey of the state of Paganism under the Reign of the First Christian Emperours ... [but] I wrote not an History but an Introduction. I know not whether the Reader may expect to find more particular Accounts of some things relating to the Reign of Julian (of late so hotly contested among us.) But besides my natural averseness to Controversie, this Introduction was not only Written, but Printed some Months before ever the Dispute was started concerning Julian, which has made so much noise amongst us. If the Reader shall meet with any Passages in the body of the Book, which may more properly seem to challenge a place in the Introduction, he may please to take notice, that this last was a Piece of a later date, done after the other was completed.'

3. Concluding Coda: From London to Elysium: ‘Mr. Julian the Apostate’ in Fielding’s *Journey from this World to the Next*, 1743

In his *Caesars* (309a), Julian had memorably characterized the emperor Augustus as a chameleon, changing colour as circumstance or need or taste required. Something similar could be said of Julian himself, in his posthumous English receptions across the seventeenth century. I have shown him adduced in a sequence of guises (some jarring, some concordant): for Bellarmine and James I, in turn, he is a persecutor of England’s Catholics and a tyrannical Papist idolater; for Milton, a crafty oppressor of Puritan free-speech (and an enemy to poetic imagination); in the logic of *Eikon Basilike* an anti-type to a saintly Constantine, an emblem of ingratitude and regicide; for Marvell, an Anglican scourge of Nonconformist Protestants (but also a model of wit for the satirist); for ‘Philaretus’, as in *Eikon Basilike*, an anti-Constantine, but this time an admirable one — a quondam Catholic driven by force of conscience to work for the Protestant Succession in England, in stout resistance to Bourbon Absolutism and Papal corruption across the water; and finally (in the eyes of the Third Earl of Shaftsbury) a proto-Enlightenment *philosophe*. Vestiges of several of these earlier English ‘Julians’ could be sought in the final text I wish to highlight for discussion — an extended evocation of Julian in a short fiction produced by the novelist Henry Fielding, under the title *A Journey from this World to the Next*.

A Journey was published in 1743, in ‘Volume Two’ of Fielding’s *Miscellanies*. It is an apt text to close this paper: it plays subversively, and very learnedly, with the figure of Julian, disclosing knowledge not only of the key ancient sources but also of some earlier evocations of Julian by English authors; and moreover, a long stretch of its narrative reveals Fielding as an ingeniously creative reader of Julian’s *Caesars*. (Fielding, it should be stressed, had been extremely well trained in Latin (less well in Greek), and had a scholarly bent: he studied for a time at Leiden, and read widely in Classical literature and history throughout his life — and he owned a considerable personal library: it is known, for instance, to have included bilingual Greek and Latin editions of Julian’s *Caesars*, of Ammianus’ *Res Gestae*, and of Socrates Scholasticus’ *Ecclesiastical History* — and the Third Earl of Shaftesbury’s *Characteristicks*).⁸⁰

A Journey is a Menippean fiction on a perennial satirical theme — the exposure of the vanity and hypocrisy underlying claims to glory in ‘this world’. Its principal narrator is a spirit-author who dies at Cheapside in

⁸⁰ On Fielding’s Classical learning, see Mace 1996: 39–60; his personal library is fully catalogued in Ribble 1996.

1741: he wakes up to be greeted by Mercury and sets out on a coach-tour of the ‘next world’. King Minos, the judge of the dead, allows him to make a tour of Elysium, in the course of which he meets a wide assortment of persons in their afterlives — famous historical figures, ancient and modern; humble souls who had had walk-on roles in the antics of the famous; celebrated poets and literary authors. But a complicating twist occurs at Chapter X, when the spirit-author encounters ‘a Spirit by the name of Mr. Julian the Apostate’ enjoying the pleasures of Elysium:

This exceedingly amazed me, for I had concluded that no Man ever had a better Title to the Bottomless Pit than he. But I soon found that this same Julian the Apostate was the very [same] individual [as] Arch-Bishop Latimer. He told me that several Lyes had been raised on him in his former Capacity, nor was he so bad a Man as he had been represented. However, he had [originally] been denied Admittance [to Elysium], and forced to undergo several subsequent Pilgrimages on Earth, and to act in the different Characters [of a good score of men], before his Martyrdom [...] in [his] last Character [as Arch-Bishop Latimer] satisfied the Judge [Minos], and procured him a Passage to the blessed Regions.⁸¹

The spirit-author is keen to hear the details of this story, and ‘Mr. Julian’ now becomes an internal narrator; in the succeeding fifteen chapters of *A Journey*, he gives a first-person account of his successive re-incarnations across a millennium in some twenty lives, as (*inter alia*) a eunuch slave of a Church Father, ‘an avaricious Jew’, a monk, a fop, a courtier, a general, a court-jester, a king, a beggar, a poet — and lastly, ‘three times a bishop’.

In his final, and redeeming, incarnation as a bishop, ‘Mr. Julian’ is the martyred Protestant Hugh Latimer, who burned at the stake under Mary Tudor. That choice is rather intriguing: it hints that Fielding may have heard something about the Whiggish deployment of Julian as an emblem of Protestant moderation half a century or so before *A Journey* was written. Most of the earlier re-embodied existences of ‘Mr. Julian’, too, have embroiled him in the intrigues and dangers of high politics. His narrative dwells often on the folly of mistaking a glorious show for something lasting — and part of the purpose of *A Journey*, as originally conceived, was to satirize the political career and foibles of Robert Walpole, the long-serving Whig Prime Minister (a career notoriously slippery, marked by a trail of bribery, venality and embezzlements). But

⁸¹ *A Journey* (in *Miscellanies II*, ed. Goldgar, 1993) 45.

to some extent, events overtook Fielding's plan: Walpole was forced to resign from government in 1742, a year before *A Journey* was published — and even before the 'fall', Fielding's earlier stance of opposition to Walpole was shifting.⁸² In the chapters of *A Journey* narrated by 'Mr. Julian', at any rate, the underlying joke at play has little to do with Walpole; is an intertextual joke that relates to Julian. The story 'Mr Julian' tells of his posthumous adventures has moments of mischief that a reader who knew Julian's *Caesars* could particularly relish. In *Caesars*, for instance, Julian's Marcus Aurelius is especially esteemed for his abstemious diet and his scrupulous piety: in a *Journey*, Fielding's 'Mr. Julian' is at one point a pagan priest who gets fat from feasting on meats that he has stolen from the sacrificial altars.⁸³ But the intertextual joke in *A Journey* goes deeper than such incidentals. The story that Fielding makes 'Mr. Julian' recount subverts the guiding premise of Julian's original satire the *Caesars*: in Julian's satire, a pagan emperor had passed judgement on his imperial predecessors in the name of the gods, admitting them to Elysium, or consigning them to the Furies, as he saw fit; in Fielding's satire, the dead Julian himself comes to face the judgement of Minos — and is repeatedly found wanting. In the end, he is allowed entry into Elysium, but *A Journey* teasingly denies him that for a good millennium: Fielding's Julian only gets to heaven the hard way, by living out a score of messy lives in other men's bodies, in the course of which his pagan piety has quite dissolved. The Apostate goes to heaven metamorphosed into a Christian martyr, in the burning flesh of a Protestant bishop.

Fielding's literary reputation has rested on other works than his witty *Journey*; it was published hurriedly, and on one view in an uncompleted state; it is nowadays among the least-read of his fictions. But it is interesting to observe that thirty years after its publication, it was to win high praise from Julian's greatest English historian. Fiction did not rank high, perhaps, as a reading priority for Edward Gibbon; but he made an exception in the case of Fielding. A footnote in *Decline and Fall* pays him

⁸² On the general topic of Walpole as a target of satirists, see Beasley 1981: 406–31. On Fielding's satirizing of him in *A Journey*, see Cleary 1984: 31–32, 154–55, 184–86, and the editor's remarks in *Miscellanies by Henry Fielding, Esq., Volume Two* [1743], ed. B.A. Goldgar, Oxford 1993, xxiv–xxvi. The case is complicated by the fact that Fielding was less disposed to criticize Walpole after reaching a rapprochement with him in late 1741, well over a year before a *Journey* was published; but already by then he had drafted several passages that satirized Walpole, and these were retained in the published version.

⁸³ Julian, *Caes.* 317c–d, 334b–d; c.p. *A Journey* (in *Miscellanies II*, ed. Goldgar, 1993) 48–49.

a very remarkable compliment: ‘I am almost tempted,’ Gibbon wrote, ‘to quote the romance of a great master (Fielding’s Works, vol. iv p. 49), which may be considered as the history of human nature’.⁸⁴ The ‘romance’ in question, it transpires, is *A Journey from this World to the Next* (the footnote relates obliquely to the earliest *post mortem* life of ‘Mr. Julian’) — and on the strength of it, Gibbon was prepared to hail Fielding as a fellow-historian, of sorts.

Quite what Gibbon meant when he commended Fielding’s satirical fiction *A Journey* to his readers as ‘the history of human nature’ is a question with ramifications that go well beyond my object in this paper: I restrict myself here to its bearing on the particular case of Fielding’s evocation of Julian. It will surely have been the chapters of *A Journey* in which Julian serves as an internal narrator that initially prompted Gibbon to characterize *A Journey* as a kind of history. The events to be recounted extend over more than a millennium of historical time, and they are organized by the unifying voice of an observant narrator whose perspective has passed beyond the confines of a single individual’s life-span; he participates in the events at issue experientially and sequentially, through the eyes (and in the bodies) of a chain of reincarnated witnesses, and then reports back to the present as narrator. That could be construed as an imaginative metaphor for the business of historiography, at least as Gibbon understood its requirements and objectives: the impulse to see things in the long view; acquaintance with many primary sources; self-immersion in particularly rich or well-placed authors, until one knew their foibles inside out and could intuit their angle of vision; and finally, the artful organizing of one’s findings into a literary narrative. For Gibbon, then, Fielding’s *A Journey* could exemplify the task and the pleasure of writing a history: Fielding’s Julian was both an idealized historical witness and (in comic mode) a kind of historiographer.

Gibbon’s complimenting of *A Journey* as ‘the history of human nature’ may seem extravagant praise for a short and possibly unfinished satirical fiction. But in a roundabout fashion, the publication of *A Journey* in 1743 can at least be argued to have rendered the scholarly study of Julian more accessible than it hitherto had been to a general readership in England. In his *Memoirs*, Gibbon wrote that the seed from which his interest in Julian first grew was a book by a French scholar that he had read as a young man at Lausanne:⁸⁵ the Abbé Jean-Philippe-René de La Bletterie’s *Vie de l’empereur Julien*. It had first been published at Paris in 1735, and Gibbon read it ca.1755 in a French edition — but by the time he

⁸⁴ Gibbon *DF* (ed. Womersley, 1994) 2.242 n. 13.

⁸⁵ Gibbon, *Memoirs* (ed. Radice, 1984) 100.

did so, La Bletterie's biography had been available for a decade to a general English readership; it had been published in 1746 as *The Life of the Emperor Julian*, in a version prepared by a team of translators commissioned for the purpose by a leading London printer-publisher of the day, William Bowyer (the Younger).⁸⁶ The initial recommendation for a translation of the book (so Bowyer's prefatory advertisement announced) had been put to him by 'an eminent Writer who has had the good fortune to please the world, and is therefore best entitled to judge of its taste'.⁸⁷ Bowyer does not name this 'eminent author', but it is tempting to think he was referring to Fielding; they were acquainted — and he had been involved only three years earlier in the printing of Fielding's *Miscellanies* — the three-part series in which *A Journey from this World to the Next* had been published in 1743.⁸⁸ A literary satire of Fielding's briefly in vogue in the early 1740s, it would seem, had raised Julian's profile for an English readership — and a canny publisher had taken the chance to commission an English version of the 1735 French biography by La Bletterie. In the 1746 publication of the *Life of the Emperor Julian*, then, one can observe a curious conjunction. The French scholarly tradition of Julianic studies instantiated in the Abbé de la Bletterie's *Vie de l'Empereur Julien* was now made available to a general English readership; but that English readership's appetite for such a biography had been stimulated by a home-grown discourse that reached back across a century, to the depictions of Julian in the English controversialists and satirists that have furnished the material for this paper.

Rowland Smith

Newcastle University

rowland.smith@ncl.ac.uk

⁸⁶ Nichols 1812: vol. 2, 178–81.

⁸⁷ Id., 182.

⁸⁸ Miller 1961: 12–13 (on Bowyer's part in the printing of *Miscellanies* III), and 15–16 (the financial success of the publication of *Miscellanies* I–III).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary sources

i) Early-modern editions and translations of Julian

a) 'Selected' or 'Collected' Works

- Duncombe, J., trans., *Select Works of the Emperor Julian*, London 1784.
- La Bletterie, l'Abbé J.P.R. de, trans., *Histoire de l'empereur Jovien, avec la traduction des Césars de Julien et autres ouvrages de cet empereur*, Paris 1748.
- Martinius, P. and Cantoclarus, C., eds. *Juliani imperatoris opera quae extant omnia ... Ejusdem Martinii præfatio de vita Juliani*, Paris 1583.
- Petavius, D., ed., *Juliani imperatoris orationes III panegyricae, ab eo cum adhuc christianus esset scriptae*, Paris 1614.
- Petavius, D., ed. *Juliani opera, quae quidem reperiri potuerunt, omnia*, Paris 1630.
- Spanheim, E., ed. *Juliani Imperatoris Opera quae supersunt omnia*, Leipzig 1696.

b) Letters and Individual Works

Epistulae

Musurus, M., ed., *Epistulae diversorum philosophorum, oratorum, rhetorum*, t.2, Venice 1499.

Contra Galilaeos [apud Cyril.]

Operum Divi Cyrilli, v.3: *Contra Julianum*, trans. J. Oecolampadius, Basel 1528, repr. 1546, repr. Paris 1573.

Misopogon

Martinius P., ed., *Misopogon et Epistulae et Martinii præfatio de vita Juliani*, Paris 1566.

Caesars

Cantoclarus, C., ed., *Juliani Imperatoris de Caesaribus sermo ... in lucem nunc primum editus, et ab eodem Latine factus*, Paris 1577.

Cunaeus, P., Lat. trans., *Iuliani Imperatoris Cæsares, sive Satyra in Romanos Imperatores* [appended to id., *Sardi Venales: Satyra Menippea*], Leiden 1612.

Heusinger, J.M., ed., *Iuliani Imp. Caesares. Cum integris adnotationibus aliquot doctorum virorum et selectis Ezech. Spanhemii interpretatione item latina et gallica additis imperatorum nummis*, Gotha 1736.

Spanheim, E., French trans., *Les Césars de l'Empereur Julien traduits du Grec*, Paris 1683.

ii) Writings pertaining to Julian published in English prior to 1750

Ashley Cooper, Anthony [Third Earl of Shaftesbury]:

Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions and Times, London 1714.

Bellarmino, Robert:

To the Most Reverend Master George Blackwel Arch-priest of the English; included in 'Anonymous', *Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus. Or An apologie for the Oath of allegiance against the two breues of Pope Paulus Quintus, and the late letter of Cardinal Bellarmine to G. Blackwel the Arch-priest*, London 1607.

Cave, William:

Ecclesiastici, or, The history of the lives, acts, death & writings, of the most eminent fathers of the church, that flourisht in the fourth century, London 1683.

Cornwallis, [Sir] William:

Essayes or rather Encomions, Prayses of Sadnesse: and of the Emperour Julian the Apostate, London 1616.

Fielding, Henry:

A Journey from this World to the Next, in id. *Miscellanies Volume Two*, ed. B.A. Goldgar, Oxford 1993: 1–128 [1st publ. in id., *Miscellanies vol. II*, London 1743].

Hanmer, Meredith:

The auncient ecclesiasticall histories, London 1577 [repr. 1585, 1607, 1619, 1637].

James I, King of England:

— *Triplici Nodo, triplex nodus; or an Apologie for the oath of allegiance*, London 1609.

— *A Premonition ...*, London 1609.

— *A Remonstrance of the most gracious King James I*, Cambridge 1616.

Johnson, [Revd.] Samuel:

Julian the Apostate, being a short account of his life, the sense of the primitive Christians about his succession and their behaviour towards him: together with a comparison of popery and paganism, London 1682.

Marvell, Andrew:

- *The Prose Works* (A. Dzelzainis, and A. Patterson, eds.), 2 vols., New Haven 2003.
- *The Rehearsal Transpos'd*, ed. A. Dzelzainis, in *Prose Works*, vol. 1, 3–206 [1st edn. London 1672].
- *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part*, ed. A. Patterson, in *Prose Works*, vol. 1, 206–438 [1st edn. London 1673].
- *Mr. Smirke; or, The divine in mode: together with a short historical essay, concerning general councils, creeds, and impositions, in matters of religion by Andreas Rivetus Junior*, ed. A. Patterson, in *Prose Works*, vol. 2, 3–176 [1st edn. London 1676].

Milton, John:

Areopagitica; a speech of Mr. John Milton for the liberty of unlicens'd printing, to the Parliament of England, London 1644.

Parker, Samuel:

A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros'd, by the author of Ecclesiastical politie, London 1673.

'Philaretus Anthropopolita' [pseudonymous]:

Some seasonable remarks upon the deplorable fall of the Emperour Julian with an epistle of his to the citizens of Bostra now made English, London 1681.

[Third Earl of Shaftesbury: see Ashley Cooper, A., above]

II. Secondary works

Ashcraft, R., *Revolutionary Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government*, Princeton 1986.

Beasley, J.C. 'Portraits of a Monster: Robert Walpole and Early English Prose Fiction', *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 14 (1981) 406–31.

Boch, J., *Apostat ou philosophe? La figure de l'empereur Julien dans la pensée française de Montaigne à Voltaire*, Paris 2013.

Bowersock, G.W., 'The Julian Poems of C.P. Cavafy', in id., *From Gibbon to Auden: Essays on the Classical Tradition*, Oxford 2009: 136–50.

Braun, R. and Richer, J., eds., *L'empereur Julien 1: de l'histoire à la légende (331–1715)*, Paris 1978; 2: *de la légende au mythe (de Voltaire à nos jours)*, Paris 1981.

Brinkmann, C., 'The Relations between England and Germany, 1660–1688: Part II', *English Historical Review* 24 (1909) 448–69.

Cleary, T.R., *Henry Fielding: Political Writer*, Ontario 1984.

- Cranston, M., *John Locke: a Biography*, London 1957.
- Di Biase, G., 'Natural Philosophy, Inventions and Religion in the Correspondence between John Locke and Nicolas Toinard (1678–1704)', *Philosophy Study* 3 (2013) 724–38.
- Drijvers, J.W., 'The Syriac Julian Romance: Aspects of the Jewish-Christian Controversy in Late Antiquity', in H.L.J. Vanstiphout, et al., eds., *All Those Nations: Cultural Encounters Within and With the Near East*, Groningen 1999: 31–42.
- Dzelzainis, A. and Patterson, A., 'Marvell and the Earl of Anglesey', *Historical Journal* 44 (2001) 703–26.
- Egan, J., 'Areopagitica and the tolerationist rhetorics of the 1640s', *Milton Studies* 46 (2007) 165–90.
- Elm, S., 'The letter collection of the Emperor Julian', in C. Sogno, B.K. Storin and E.J. Watts, eds., *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide*, Oakland, CA, 2017: 54–68.
- Febvre, L. and Martin H.J., *The Coming of the Book: the Impact of Printing 1450–1800*, London 1976.
- Gibbon, E., *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (ed. D. Womersley), 3 vols., Harmondsworth 1994 [1st edn. in 6 vols, London: 1776 (vol. 1), 1781 (vols. 2 and 3), 1788 (vols. 4, 5 and 6)].
- Gibbon, E., *Memoirs of my Life* (ed. B. Radice), Harmondsworth 1984.
- Godman, P., *The Saint as Censor: Robert Bellarmine between Inquisition and Index*, Leiden 2000.
- Hammersley, R., 'Introduction: The Historiography of Republicanism and Republican Exchanges', *History of European Ideas* 38 (2012) 323–37.
- Haskell, F., *Patrons and Painters: a Study in the Relations between Italian Art and Society in the Age of the Baroque* (2nd edn.), New Haven and London 1980.
- Hill, C., *Milton and the English Revolution*, London 1977.
- Hunt, E.D., 'Julian and Marcus Aurelius', in D. Innes, H. Hine and C. Pelling, eds., *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell*, Oxford 1995: 287–98.
- La Bletterie, l'Abbé J.P.R. de, *La Vie de l'Empereur Julien*, Paris 1735; translated as *The Life of the Emperor Julian*, London 1746.
- Loewe, V., *Ein Diplomat und Gelehrter: Ezechiël Spanheim (1629–1710)*, Berlin 1924.
- Mace, N. A., *Henry Fielding's Novels and the Classical Tradition*, London 1996.
- McLynn, N., 'Julian and the Christian Professors', in C. Harrison, et al., eds., *Being Christian in Late Antiquity: A Festschrift for Gillian Clark*, Oxford 2014: 120–38.
- Madan, F., *A New Bibliography of the Eikon Basilike*, Oxford 1950.
- Malley, W.J., 'The *Contra Julianum* of St. Cyril of Alexandria and St. Peter Canisius', *Theological Studies* 25 (1964) 70–74.
- Marcone, A., 'Pagan Reactions to Julian', in Rebenich and Wiemer 2020: 326–59.
- Miller, H.K., *Essays on Henry Fielding's Miscellanies*, Princeton 1961.

- Neveu, B., *Un historien à l'École de Port-Royal: Sébastien Le Nain de Tillemont (1637–1698)*, The Hague 1966.
- Neveu B., 'Un académicien du XVIIIe siècle, traducteur et biographe de l'empereur Julien: l'abbé de La Bletterie', *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* 144 (2000) 93–133.
- Nichols, J., *Literary anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, vol. 2, London 1812.
- North, M.L., 'Anonymity's Subject: James I and the Debate over the Oath of Allegiance', *New Literary History* 33 (2002) 215–32.
- O'Malley, L.C., 'The Whig Prince: Prince Rupert and the Court vs. Country Factions during the Reign of Charles II', *Albion* 8 (1976) 333–50.
- Patterson, A., 'Marvell and Secret History', in W. Chernaik and M. Dzelzainis, eds., *Marvell and Liberty*, London 1999: 23–49.
- Patterson, W.B., *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*, Cambridge 2000.
- Pocock, J.G.A., *Barbarism and Religion. Vol. VI, Barbarism: Triumph in the West*, Cambridge 2015.
- Poole, W., 'John Milton and the Beard-Hater; Encounters with Julian the Apostate', *The Seventeenth Century* 31 (2016) 161–89.
- Rebenich, S., 'Julian's Afterlife: the Reception of a Roman Emperor', in Rebenich and Wiemer 2020: 398–420.
- Rebenich, S. and Wiemer, H.-U., eds., *A Companion to Julian the Apostate*, Leiden 2020.
- Ribble, R.G. and Ribble, A.G., *Fielding's Library: An Annotated Catalogue*. Charlottesville, VA, 1996.
- Rosen, K., *Julian: Kaiser, Gott und Christenhasser*, Stuttgart 2006.
- Smith, N., *Andrew Marvell: the Chameleon*, New Haven 2010.
- Smith, R.B.E., *Julian's Gods: Religion and Philosophy in the Thought and Action of Julian the Apostate*, London 1995.
- Streete, A., *Apocalypse and Anti-Catholicism in Seventeenth-Century English Drama*, Cambridge 2017.
- Swift, J., *Major Works: including A Tale of A Tub* [1st edn. 1704] *and the Battle of the Books* [1st edn 1704], eds. A. Ross and D. Woolley, Oxford 2008.
- Trovato, S., 'Un antieroe dai molti volti. Giuliano a Bisanzio come Apostata, scrittore, imperatore e in una particolare interpretazione «ratzingeriana» dello storico Sozomeno', *Incontri di Filologia Classica* 10 (2010–11) 1–28.
- Trovato, S., *Molti fedeli di Cristo morirono tra terribili pene: bibliografia agiografica giuliana con edizione della Passio Cyriaci BHG 465b*, Udine 2018.
- Tutino, S., *Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth*, Oxford 2010.
- Van Nuffelen, P., 'The Christian Reception of Julian', in Rebenich and Wiemer 2020: 360–97.
- Voltaire, F.M. Arouet de, 'Portrait de L'Empereur Julien', in Marquis d'Argens, trans., *Discours de l'Empereur Julien contre les Chrétiens*, Berlin 1769.
- Voltaire, F.M. Arouet de, *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*, Geneva 1774.

- Whitt, P.B., 'New Light on Sir William Cornwallis, the Essayist', *Review of English Studies* 8 (1932) 155–69.
- Wilcher, R., 'What Was the King's Book for?: The Evolution of "Eikon Basilike"', *Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991) 218–28.
- Wind, E., 'Julian the Apostate at Hampton Court', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 3 (1939/40) 127–37.
- Womersley, D., *The Transformation of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Cambridge 1988.
- Womersley, D., *Gibbon and the 'Watchmen of the Holy City': The Historian and His Reputation, 1776–1815*, Oxford 2002.
- Wood, A., *The Life and Times of Antony Wood* (abridged), ed. L. Powys, Oxford 1961.
- Worden, B., 'Republicanism, Regicide and Republic: the English Experience', in M. van Gelderen and Q. Skinner, *Republicanism: a Shared European Heritage*, vol. 1, Cambridge 2002: 307–28.
- Zook, M., *Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics in Late Stuart England*, University Park, PA, 1999.