

*In the name of the brother: encomium and
invective in Gregory of Nazianzen's "Funeral
oration for his brother Caesarius"**

*En el nombre del hermano: encomio e
invectiva en la "Oración fúnebre por su
hermano Cesario" de Gregorio de Nacianzo*

ALBERTO QUIROGA PUERTAS
Universidad de Granada
aquiroga@ugr.es
ORCID: 0000-0002-1439-7825

Recibido: 15 / julio / 2025

Aceptado: 03 / septiembre / 2025

*This paper has been written within the framework of the research project I+D+i PI21_00046 ("The culture of invective in Imperial and Late Antique literature") funded by the Consejería de Universidad, Investigación e Innovación- Junta de Andalucía. An earlier draft of this paper was delivered in the XIX International Conference on Patristic Studies at the University of Oxford (5-9 August, 2024). The author wants to thank the feedback from the audience, as well as the useful criticism given by Dr Ryan Fowler.

ABSTRACT

This paper offers a study of a section of Gregory of Nazianzus' *Or. 7, Funeral oration for his brother Caesarius*. In particular, the paper analyzes a δῆγμα that Gregory composed to narrate an encounter between his brother and the pagan emperor Julian. Gregory resorted to the oratorical and rhetorical elements involved in this encounter to highlight the pious ethos of Caesarius as opposed to the anti-Christian behaviour displayed by Julian. The aim of this analysis is to underline the interpretative possibilities that a rhetorical and literary examination of Gregory's epitaph provides for a better understanding of the religious history of the 4th century AD.

Keywords: Gregory of Nazianzen, Caesarius, emperor Julian, encomium, invective, δῆγμα.

RESUMEN

Este trabajo presenta un estudio de una sección de la *Or. 7* de Gregorio de Nacianzo, *Oración fúnebre por su hermano Cesario*. Se trata en concreto de un análisis de un δῆγμα del que Gregorio se sirvió para relatar un encuentro que mantuvo su hermano con el emperador pagano Juliano. Gregorio se aprovechó de los componentes oratorios y retóricos de dicho encuentro para subrayar el ethos piadoso de Cesario frente a los signos anticristianos manifestados por Juliano. Con este análisis, se persigue poner de manifiesto las posibilidades interpretativas que un examen retórico-literario de un epitafio como el compuesto por Gregorio aporta para tener un mejor conocimiento de la historia religiosa del siglo IV d.C.

Palabras clave: Gregorio de Nacianzo, Cesario, emperador Juliano, encomio, invectiva, δῆγμα.

INTRODUCTION

Rhetoric and oratory were active players in the cultural, political, and religious landscape of Late Antiquity, so research on narrations of public speaking occasions (including declamations, homilies, oratorical contests, etc.) is important because these narrations provide information not only about the oratorical standards of the period, but also about the close relationship between self-presentation, rhetoric, and religious beliefs. Fortunately, our knowledge on the adaptation of secular rhetoric to early and late antique Christian discourse has improved in the last decades thanks to literary and historical analysis of texts approached from a rhetorical perspective¹.

Following this trend of studies, this paper aims to show that in Gregory of Nazianzus' works allusions to rhetorical and oratorical aspects are often linked to the religious and theological position of his friends and enemies, and that their oratorical prowess (or lack of) was interpreted as a demonstration of authority and as a vehicle for displaying other virtues or flaws. Given the number of works written (or attributed) to Gregory, in this paper particular attention will be paid to his *Or. 7, Funeral oration for his brother Caesarius*. Thus, I will firstly give some examples of Gregory's criticism of his religious and theological rivals based on their oratorical and rhetorical flaws. Then I will explore the δῆγμα ("rhetorical narration") that Gregory composed to report the contentious meeting between Gregory's brother, Caesarius, and the emperor Julian. The study of the δῆγμα will show the interpretative possibilities that an analysis of the rhetorical and oratorical elements of a narration can offer².

RHETORICAL CRITICISM AND RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

There are numerous references scattered throughout Gregory of Nazianzus' oeuvre in which he criticized those who practiced a kind of oratory that was

1 For instance, M. W. Gleason, *Making Men. Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*, Princeton 1995; W. Guast, *Greek Declamation and the Roman Empire*, Cambridge 2023; A. J. Quiroga Puertas, *The Dynamics of Rhetorical Performances in Late Antiquity*, London, 2018.

2 This episode has recently been dealt with by Nathan Howard in his monograph *Christianity and the contest for manhood in Late Antiquity: the Cappadocian Fathers and the rhetoric of masculinity*, Cambridge 2023, pp. 160-172, but I think that an analysis that focuses on the rhetorical and oratorical elements of that contest can complement Howard's study.

contrary to his understanding of this discipline³. For example, in his autobiographical poem *De vita sua* Gregory presents himself as the stereotypical *vir Christianus dicendi peritus* because his oratory was consecrated to God and was impervious to the public opinion (vv 267-273)⁴

But to me rhetoric was not a matter of noisy applause or of showy expressions or verbal contortions in which the sophists delight amidst crowds of young men. I had set this as the first step in the philosophic life: to cast everything before God, including my attempts at oratory, like those who gave up their land to be grazed by sheep, or who threw their gold into the depths of the sea

Throughout this poem, Gregory persists with this idea by presenting himself as a sort of “anti-sophist”, understanding “sophist” as a word to describe those dazzling and entertaining figures from Imperial times to whom Philostratus dedicated his *Lives of the Sophists*⁵. In contrast with these figures, Gregory characterized himself in verses 696-702 as a

man of such abject poverty, withered, bent and shabbily dressed, wasted by the restraints imposed on the stomach and by tears as well as by fear of what was to come and by the wickedness of others, not possessed of a handsome appearance, a stranger, a vagrant, buried in the darkness of the earth

In accordance with this humble appearance, Gregory solemnly states that the sole aim of his oratory is to speak the truth (1246: ἀληθεύειν γάρ ἐστιν ὁ σκοπός).

His oratorical standards helped Gregory create his public persona, but they also had an identity imprint as those individuals who did not meet these standards were the object of Gregory’s chastisement. He used to sprinkle his religious and theological criticism with references to flaws in his adversaries’ oratorical performances and rhetorical capacities. For instance, in a short *ethopoia*⁶ in *De vita sua*, Gregory made his religious rivals in Constantinople say that (vv 704-711) they were flatterers, slaves to the whims of others, and “like the chameleon and

3 For an overview of Gregory’s understanding of rhetoric, see J. Børtnes, “Prompting for meaning in Gregory’s rhetoric”, *Gregory of Nazianzus. Images and reflections*, Copenhagen 2006, pp. 9-17.

4 Translation taken from C. White, *Gregory of Nazianzus. Autobiographical poems*, Cambridge 2009.

5 On the use of the term “sophist”, see B. Puech, *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d’époque impériale*, Paris 2002, p. 12: “Le terme «sophiste» peut donc prendre des nuances différentes, de même que, selon le contexte, ses connotations peuvent être laudatives, péjoratives ou neutres, souvent chez le même auteur”.

6 On the use of *ethopoia* in the works of the Cappadocian Fathers, see M. Ludlow, *Art, Craft, and Theology in Fourth Century Christian Authors*, Cambridge 2020, pp. 119-121.

the polyp, we continually change the colours of our words”⁷. Maximus the Cynic was one of the most notable of Gregory’s adversaries, so it is unsurprising that Gregory characterized him as a “true sophist and worker of wickedness” (v 786), and that he described him as a showy individual, (vv 769-772) “as if he were of some importance in the city, with his darling curls falling over his shoulders, shooting forth his clever ideas with swinging locks and wearing all his learning on his body”⁸.

Oratorical criticism resurfaces again in verses 1240-1250, in which Gregory lambasts the rhetorical and oratorical style of pagans:

“The borders of the Mysians and the Phrygians are far apart and so too are my words and those of the pagans. For their rhetoric aims at display (πρὸς ἐπίδειξιν οἱ λόγοι) and is full of fictitious arguments with which impress young boys”. Apart from the evident charge of superficiality (ἐπίδειξιν), there seems to be an interesting intertext: the reference to Mysians and Phrygians might not have been a coincidence, but an allusion to Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ text in which Asianism was described as a “Mysian or Phrygian or Carian creature (Μυσὴ ἢ Φρυγία τις ἢ Καρικόν τι κακόν).

In these lines, Gregory would therefore have been accusing pagans of displaying an Asianist style and, at the same time, likening them to Arians, as Gregory had levelled this same charge (the practice of Asianism) against Arians in other orations (*Against the Eunomians*; *Against the Arians*), as pointed out in an interesting study by Byron MacDougall⁹.

7 On chameleons and octopus as elements of comparison referring to fickle individuals, see A. Cappone, “Emperor Julian, Paul of Tarsus, and the Octopus”, *Religions* 16 (2025) 802; and R. Penella, “Libanius the Flatterer”, *CQ* 62.2 (2012) 892-895.

8 On the relevance of physiognomics in Antiquity, see E. C. Evans, “Physiognomics in the Ancient World”, *Trans. Am. Philos. Soc.* 59.5 (1969) 1-101. On Maximus the Cynic, see A. De Blasi, “(Im)pious Sisterhood: Maximus the Cynic’s Dangerous Liaisons. A new conjecture on Greg. Naz. carm. II 1, 41, Contra Maximum 1”, *Studia Philologica Valentina* 26 (2024) 161-183.

9 B. Macdougall, “Asianism, Arianism, and the *Encomium of Athanasius* by Gregory of Nazianzus”, *Rhetorical Strategies in Late Antique Literature. Images, Metatexts and Interpretation*, Leiden-Boston, 2017, 104-116.

AN ORATORICAL AGON: CAESARIUS VS THE EMPEROR JULIAN

Gregory's oration 7 is a funeral speech dedicated to his brother Caesarius, who died in the winter of 368-369¹⁰. Caesarius was a well-educated and celebrated physician who had worked first at the court of the emperor Constantius in Constantinople, where he became an influential person and a close friend of the emperor. After Constantius' death, Caesarius remained at the court of Julian, which led to a strong reprimand from Gregory (*Or.* 7.15): "I had often admonished him before, when I was distressed that his nobility of nature should be devoted to inferior pursuits and his philosophic soul should be continually immersed in public affairs even as the sun is hidden by a cloud"¹¹.

At the beginning of the oration, Gregory warned his audience that he will not (*Or.* 7.1) "deliver a long and elegant discourse for the delight of men", or "make this sad event an occasion for display (ἐπίδειξιν)", yet in the section devoted to the exposition of Caesarius' actions and achievements, Gregory stated that he was going to narrate an episode between his brother and the emperor Julian in the form of a δῆγμα ("narration") in which Gregory himself will delight (*Or.* 7.12: κατατρύψω τοῦ δηγήματος).

In rhetorical textbooks from Imperial and late antique times, a δῆγμα included the development of a number of στοιχεῖα (or "elements"). For instance, the rhetorician Theon proposed six elements when composing a δῆγμα (*Prog.* 78): "the person, whether that be one or many; and the action done by the person; and the place where the action was done; and the time at which it was done; and the manner of the action; and sixth, the cause of these things"¹².

In the case of Gregory's δῆγμα, it seems that he aimed to comply with the στοιχεῖα advised by the rhetorician Theon in his account of the episode between Caesarius and Julian:

10 On the circumstances surrounding the composition of this speech, see M. G. Calvet Sevasti, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 6-12*, Paris 1995, pp. 41-52; T. Hägg, "Playing with expectations: Gregory's funeral orations on his brother, sister and father", *Gregory of Nazianzus. Images and reflections*, Copenhagen 2006, pp. 133-140. On Caesarius' life, see S. Elm, *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church. Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome*, Berkeley 2015, pp. 148-154; R. Radford Ruether, *Gregory of Nazianzus. Rhetor and philosopher*, Oxford 1969, pp. 73-77.

11 Translations of *Or.* 7 taken from L. McCauley, *Funeral orations by Saint Gregory Nazianzen and Saint Ambrose*, Washington D.C. 1968. Gregory's epistle 7 addressed to Caesarius also had invective overtones concerning Caesarius' work in the court of Julian.

12 Translation taken from G. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata. Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, Atlanta 2003.

*The person or persons involved in the narration: Caesarius and Julian.

*The action: Caesarius' behaviour in the contests between him and Julian.

*The place: Gregory speaks metaphorically of a stadium (*Or.* 7.12: Τὸ μὲν οὖν στάδιον τοιοῦτον).

*The time at which the action was carried out: Gregory says that the episode took place when Julian issued his famous "school edict" to ban Christians from teaching, that is, around June 362¹³.

*The manner of the action: Gregory mentions Caesarius' προθυμία (*Or.* 7.13: Ἄρ' οὐκ ἔδειςας περὶ Καισαρίου, μή τι πάθῃ τῆς προθυμίας ἀνάξιον;) and that he was fortified by the sign of Christ (*Or.* 7. 12: τῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σημείῳ φραζάμενος).

*Finally, the cause that motivated the narration: obviously, Gregory aimed to provide his audience with an account of Julian's failure at trying to convert Caesarius.

Gregorius used the στοιχεῖα of the διήγημα suggested by Theon as the background for Caesarius' and Julian's contest, in which references to oratorical and extralinguistic aspects play an important role at a semiotic and a narratological level. Gregory encircled the account of the contest with references to the clothing and adornments worn by Caesarius and Julian. The former entered the agon (*Or.* 7.12) "fortified by the sign of Christ (τῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σημείῳ φραζάμενος)", that is, wearing a cross, while at the end of the episode there is a reference to Julian's (*Or.* 7.14) "exalted purple robe and costly diadem", considered by Gregory as objects that were worth less than Caesarius' victory. The robe and the diadem, which also appeared in Gregory's invectives against Julian¹⁴, can be interpreted as more than mere symbols of power. Gregory mentioned them to represent how earthly power was beholden to God, and this was even more significant in the case of Julian as he was wearing a diadem when he was proclaimed emperor by the troops stationed in Paris against the will of his cousin, the Christian emperor Constantius¹⁵. Thus, the reference to the diadem could be

13 There is abundant bibliography on this edict. One of the latest contributions that includes previous research on the topic is L. Niccolai, "Julian the Emperor and the Reaction against Christianity. A Case Study of Resistance from the Top", *Articulating Resistance under the Roman Empire*, Cambridge 2022, 219-238.

14 Robe: *Or.* 4.80, 113, 117; 5.40; diadem: *Or.* 4.46, 80; 5.17.

15 Amm. Marc. XX.4.17; Lib. *Or.* 12.59. On this topic, see García Ruiz, "Julian and the Consulship: Politics and Representation", *Emerita* LXXXIX 2 (2021) 335-360.

understood as an intended pun and as a *memento mori* addressed to Julian for having usurped power from a Christian emperor.

The διήγημα that Gregory composed to inform about Caesarius' and Julian's contest brims with vocabulary full of allusions to oratorical agons to instil a strong sense of disputation on the audience. This vocabulary ranged from παρρησία (*Or.* 7.11) to other terms like τοὺς ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας ἀγῶνας καὶ λόγους (*Or.* 7.11), φθονέω (*Or.* 7.11), ἀγωνιστής (*Or.* 7.12), ἀθλητής (*Or.* 7.13), νικάω (*Or.* 7.14). These words were clearly meant to underline the atmosphere of confrontation between Caesarius and Julian by using unnuanced vocabulary without leaving any room for different shades of meaning.

In this polemical context, Gregory made Julian enter the scene first. The emperor was presented as a sophist in the derogatory sense of the word because he used sophisms (σόφισμα), persuasion (πειθώ), and the witchery of his words (γοητεία) to try to convert Caesarius or, at least, to make him agree with the suitability of his demand that all teachers (but especially those who were Christians) should imitate and believe in the content of the Classical texts they were teaching, in the form of Homer, Plato, Demosthenes, etc. In order to do so, Gregory portrayed a morally corrupt Julian (*Or.* 7.11): “Seducing some by bribes, some by dignities, some by promises, others by all kinds of honors which he did not confer in a royal but in a very slavish manner, in the sight of all, and alluring all by the witchery of his words and his own example, he made trial, after many others, of Caesarius himself”.

Thus, Julian is represented as a manipulative and untrustworthy sophist. This image is connected with his portrayal as a cunning enemy of the Christians (χριστομάχος) because he concealed his impiety (*Or.* 7.11) “under the fiction of reasonableness” as in the case of the school edict. As the ultimate enemy of Christianity, Gregory concluded his portrayal of Julian by animalizing him, a common trope in Gregory's invective arsenal against the emperor. On *Or.* 7, Julian is compared with a “crooked serpent” (*Or.* 7.11: σκολιὸν ὄφιν), a comparison elsewhere present in Gregory's invectives against Julian -especially in the first one (*Or.* 4), in which Gregory connects reptiles with impiety (ἀσέβεια) in the same way as in this funeral oration for his brother (e.g., *Or.* 4.35). There is also an implicit comparison of Julian with dogs when Gregory says that Julian was enraged against Christians by using λυσσάω, a verb applied to dogs suffering from rabies (*Or.* 7.11): “The emperor of evil name was raging (ἐλύσσα) against us”.

For the presentation of his brother Caesarius, Gregory adopted images and words indebted to another subgenre: the Acts of the Martyrs. Thus, Caesarius is now portrayed as an athlete (τὸν ἀθλητὴν) competing in a στάδιον -that is, an “arena”- which is a word frequently used in acts to denote the scenes of martyrdoms¹⁶. After setting the scene, Gregory produced a very dense passage by concatenating several rhetorical figures to increase the pathos: first, a rhetorical question meant to emotionally engage the audience (*Or.* 7.13: “Did you not fear for Caesarius that something unworthy of his zeal might befall him?”). Then, there is a quotation from John 16:33 (*Or.* 7.13: *Take heart! Ἀλλὰ θαρσεῖτε*), in which Jesus encourages his disciples to be brave even though they will suffer for he has overcome the world. It is possible to argue that in Gregory’s narrative this passage from the Gospel of John could be extrapolated to the ordeal Caesarius was about to face (that is, confronting an enemy that caused suffering but will not stop Christianity). Finally, Gregory added an apophasis in which he expressed his desire to detail what Caesarius and Julian said in their tête-a-tête, but refused to do so as “this would be wholly outside the scope of this occasion and this discourse”¹⁷.

The omission of the content of their dispute in the shape of an apophasis was, in my opinion, a strategy designed by Gregory to draw the audience’s attention to the sphere of the symbolic, thus leaving aside any reference to religious or doctrinal disputations. Caesarius’ reply to Julian’s “verbal subtleties” was to proclaim “in a loud and clear voice that he was a Christian (τὸ Χριστιανὸς εἶναι) and would so remain”. The reference to Caesarius’ voice (μεγάλῃ καὶ λαμπρᾷ τῇ φωνῇ) is not superfluous, but it would have resonated with Gregory’s audience as a similar expression had been used in the Acts of the Martyrs when they confessed that they were Christians in front of pagan officials¹⁸. In this way, Gregorius would have been recasting the image of Caesarius as a martyr, which was something that Julian had avoided in his persecution against the Christians¹⁹.

16 For στάδιον, see for instance: *Of Pionius* 21; *Of Polycarp* 6, 8, 9, 12. For ἀθλητής, see for instance *The Martyr of Lyons* 19, 36, 42; *Of Dasius* 9; *Of Carpus, Pappylus and Agathanice* 35.

17 On Gregory’s use of rhetorical figures, see A. Daunt-Fear, “Can we hear the spoken words of Gregory of Nazianzus?”, *Scrinium* 13 (2017) 72-83; M. Guignet, *Saint Grégoire de Naziance et la rhétorique*, Paris 1911; R. Radford Ruether, *Gregory of Nazianzus. Rhetor and philosopher*, Oxford 1969.

18 For instance, *The Martyrs of Lyons* (10: “the clearest voice” τοῦ δε λαμπρότατη φωνή); *Of Pionius* (16: “a booming voice” μεγάλῃ φωνῇ); *Of Conon* (3: μεγάλῃ τη φωνῇ).

19 H. C. Teitler, *The Last Pagan Emperor: Julian the Apostate and the War against Christianity*, New York 2017, pp. 41-48. See also Libanius of Antioch’s *Or.* 60 (*A monody on the temple of Apollo at Daphne*) for a better understanding of Julian’s attitude towards relics and the cult of martyrs.

Once it was clear that Caesarius was not to be won over by Julian, Gregorius stated that “a strong desire possessed the emperor to be associated in and adorned with Caesarius’ learning” (καὶ γὰρ δεινὸς ἔρως εἶχε τὸν βασιλέα τῇ Καισαρίου παιδεύσει συνεῖναι καὶ καλλωπίζεσθαι). In my opinion, this line has an echo of Plato’s *Symposium*, more precisely of Socrates’ words in the dialogue when he was asked where he was going (*Symp.* 174a): ““To dinner at Agathon’s,” he answered. “I evaded him and his celebrations yesterday, fearing the crowd; but I agreed to be present to-day. So I smartened myself “up” (ἐκαλλωπισάμην) in order to be a match for my handsome host”²⁰.

My proposal to support the fact that the abovementioned sentence could be a nod to Plato’s *Symposium* is based on two arguments²¹: firstly, eros is the subject (ἔρως εἶχε τὸν βασιλέα) in this sentence in Gregory’s oration, and eros is obviously the main theme of Plato’s *Symposium*; secondly, Socrates and Julian expressed their desire to καλλωπίζεσθαι (that is, to “smarten themselves up”) so they could gain access to a pedagogical institution (in one case, a symposium and on another Caesarius’ entourage). In both cases, it seems that καλλωπίζεσθαι was key to gaining access to an educational situation. It also should be borne in mind that in the two invectives against Julian composed by Gregory, the verb καλλωπίζεσθαι features three times as to mock or chastise: to criticize “those who boast of his [Julian] secret doings” (*Or.* 4.52); to question those pagans who boasted about the teachings derived from morally dubious myths (*Or.* 4.117); and to criticize Julian for his arrogant attitude and ostentatious clothing at the funeral of his cousin, the emperor Constantius (*Or.* 5.17). Among fourth century cultural elites, the cognate ἐγκαλλωπίζομαι was also used to scorn contemporary sophists for the showy attitude displayed in their oratorical performances (Themistius’ *Or.* 28.341).

Regardless of the extent to which these parallels between Plato and Gregory can be categorized as a nod, an allusion, or an intertext, I think that the verb καλλωπίζεσθαι plays a pivotal role in the διήγημα narrating Caesarius’ encounter with Julian. Καλλωπίζεσθαι was a verb with an antiphrastic ring to it, that is, it had a number of almost contradictory meanings that ranged from “embellishing” and “smartening oneself up” to “showing off, putting on a show of vanity”. An expert rhetorician like Gregorius would not have missed the

20 Translation taken from Christopher Emlyn-Jones & William Preddy, *Plato. Lysis. Symposium. Phaedrus*, Cambridge (MA)-London, 2022.

21 D. Bradshaw, “Plato in the Cappadocian Fathers”, *Plato in the Third Sophistic*, Berlin 2014, pp. 193-210 offers a comprehensive view on Plato’s influence in Gregory.

opportunity to apply this verb to Julian as καλλωπίζεσθαι could have served different purposes in Gregory's efforts to criticize Julian. In this way, from a narratological point of view, Gregorius' portrait of Julian wanting to smarten himself up (καλλωπίζεσθαι) to be close to Caesarius implies a subversion of the topic of late antique *pepaideumenoι* toiling to gain a position in the emperor's entourage. In Gregory's account, Julian has not only failed in his attempt to convert Caesarius, but he also wants to be part of Caesarius' inner circle, which implies an admission of defeat on Julian's part.

CONCLUSIONS

The δῦγμα reporting the contest between Gregory's brother and Julian has been analysed using James Fredal's consideration of oratorical performances as a way "to generate all forms of cultural capital through symbolic contests among citizens struggling to be seen and known as men"²². On this occasion, the religious capital generated by the δῦγμα of the oratorical agon between Caesarius and Julian served Gregory to develop his political and religious agenda. It is noteworthy that the composition of *Or.* 7 was more or less contemporary to Gregory's writing of his two famous invectives against Julian (*Ors.* 4 and 5), and also to Libanius of Antioch's orations praising Julian's deeds (*Or.* 17 and 18). With this in mind, it can be argued that the narration of the contest between Caesarius and the emperor would have been part of Gregory's attempt to create the image of Julian as the Apostate. Regarding Caesarius, Gregory would have tried to reshape the image of his brother, who had served in Julian's court, so staging an encounter in which Caesarius defeated the emperor would have contributed to recasting Caesarius as a paradigm of Christian virtue.

²² J. Fredal, *Rhetorical Action in Ancient Athens: Persuasive Artistry from Solon to Demosthenes*, Carbondale 2006, p. 26.

