

Introduction

Greek and Latin Epistolography and Epistolary Collections in Late Antiquity

CRISTIANA SOGNO, BRADLEY K. STORIN, and EDWARD J. WATTS

Letters have long been an object of attention for scholars of ancient history, and yet the privileged relationship between epistolography and historiography—one that extends back to antiquity itself—has often been uneasy. For instance, ancient readers of Cicero's letters to Atticus thought they offered an actual history of the late Republic, but modern readers in the nineteenth century, guided by the imperatives of scientific historiography, viewed letters differently. Rather than treating letters as literary documents that, like narrative historiography, used a reconstruction of the past to develop certain historical themes and illustrate the character of individuals, these modern historians mined letters for the raw material, so to speak, of unmediated information on which they could base an accurate reconstruction of the classical and postclassical past. Letters were understood to be unbiased "captured conversations"—a counterpoint to the digressions, biases, and thematic concerns complicating the use of ancient narrative historiography.

In reaction to the tendency to treat letters as unprejudiced *documents*, recent decades have witnessed a renaissance of interest in ancient letters as *literary* artifacts. Among Anglo-American classicists, Michael Trapp spearheaded this new approach to epistolography with his anthology of Greek and Latin letters.¹ Trapp's sophisticated introduction and selection of letters point out the painfully obvious difficulty of defining what a letter is. Eschewing Derrida's provocative definition of the letter as "not a genre but all genres, literature itself,"² Trapp and other historians began to treat ancient epistolography as a distinctive literary genre, seeking to issue a broad and inclusive definition that would nonetheless resist dilution into meaninglessness. Two significant consequences of moving beyond the "scientific" analysis of letters as historical documents immediately emerge. First, Adolf Deissmann's traditional but rigid distinction between real missive (*Brief*) and literary letter (*Epistel*) collapses.³

Deissmann treats the real missive as a confidential text intended to be read by the recipient alone and as a text devoid of any literary artistry, but recent studies on the literary aspects of ancient epistolography have shown Deissmann to be not only mistaken but also informed by theological prejudices. Second, the value of ancient epistolary theorists (to borrow the title of another useful anthology)⁴ for determining the nature of a letter has been substantially limited and contextualized. Although ancient theorists do prescribe general guidelines about the material, linguistic register, or length appropriate to the epistolary form, epistolary practice does not always conform to epistolary theory, as is true of other genres.⁵ Moreover, literary scholars have rightly stressed the dangers that the obsession with “categories, taxonomies, and ‘epistolary theory’” poses to the study of letters as literature.⁶

Recent scholarship on letter writing has rightly set aside the issue of genre in order to privilege a “less atomistic and more functional approach” to Greek and Latin letters.⁷ As a result of this ecumenical and integrated approach, the most thought-provoking and exciting studies on letters in recent years have focused on the *letter collection* rather than the individual letter. Indeed, this line of study has pushed scholars to understand ancient letter collections as literary works in their own right, complete with sophisticated, comprehensive, and tactical strategies of internal arrangement comparable to the aesthetic of the poetry book.⁸

This shift in focus, however, returns us to the issue of genre with a certain urgency. Defining a letter collection is no less daunting a task than defining a letter: does the questionable value and legitimacy of using genre to study an individual letter also apply to the study of letter collections? And, more fundamentally, can an epistolary collection be considered a separate genre in its own right? We believe it can.⁹ In our view, an epistolary collection constitutes a distinct genre that achieved its fullest development during late antiquity, when it became something of a literary hallmark of the period.

A couple of preliminary observations about terminology may be in order. The choice of the word “collection,” which figures prominently in the title of this volume, implies the “later activity of an editor applied to ready-made letters.”¹⁰ While not appropriate for what Owen Hodkinson calls “literary” (i.e., fictional) letters, it perfectly describes the epistolary corpora under consideration in the present volume. As recent scholarship has demonstrated,¹¹ the editorial violence perpetrated on ancient letter collections from the Renaissance onward has obscured the literary nature of such collections as organic units and privileged individual letters as sources for ancient history or authorial biographies. This volume hopes to undo some of that violence by bringing a collection’s “macrotextual” dimension to the forefront of critical analysis¹² and, consequently, offering readers the tools to more fully understand the nature and purpose of this genre without falling into atomism or formalism.

The astute reader might object that we cannot speak of a genre if we cannot speak of an author. And yet uncertainty about the identity of the editor of Cicero’s letters has not prevented Mary Beard from studying the collection as a literary artifact whose organization is comparable to that of the Augustan poetry book (see note 8). The editor’s intention is not necessarily the only norm that would allow us to regard letter collections as a genre. Already

Johannes Sykutris in a still-relevant contribution pointed out that Cicero's *epistulae ad Atticum* became literature against the intention of their author when a later editor collected and circulated them after Cicero's death.¹³ Chronological considerations and authorial intent do not determine whether, in the end, groups of letters are epistolary collections or mere assemblages of epistolary texts written by the same author. Collections may have been assembled during the author's lifetime (perhaps by the epistolographer himself), or years, decades, or centuries after his death. Following Sykutris, we define literary letter collections as collections of letters that were put together and made public either during or after their epistolographer's lifetime. Furthermore, we place no chronological limit on the moment when these collections of late antique letters were assembled. Some, like the collection of Gregory Nazianzen, were assembled by the author during his lifetime. Others, like the collection of Paulinus, are a much later production. Each late antique letter collection addressed in this volume exists as a collection precisely because, at a certain moment in time, its crafter(s) elevated it to the status of literature and proclaimed it worthy of reading and imitation.

Ultimately we can speak of an author in relation to late antique letter collections, even if the author's identity is hard to pin down and his role in shaping the work is quite complicated. Traditionally understood, the author constructs a text, which often works within, subverts, or tears down the conventions of a given genre at a particular time and in a particular context. Authorship implies a basic intentionality: a text comes to be because an author crafted it with specific goals in mind. Of course, whether or not an author accomplishes those goals is a different question, and one that must be informed by the possibility of interpretive multiplicity. By tracking an author's creative impulses and intentions (to the extent that this is possible), scholars can chart points of literary innovation and better understand the political, social, and cultural consequences of the created texts. There are a number of questions that help scholars get a sense of these things: Why did the author compose X text at Y time? How did the author utilize, exploit, avoid, or subvert the expected conventions of the text's genre? What did the author intend to express by producing it? What kind of response did the author hope to elicit?

This volume examines the late antique reinvention and popularization of the epistolary collection as a literary genre by considering most of the major Greek and Latin letter collections whose raw materials originate in the years between the 340s and early 600s. This gives a comprehensive sense of the process of literary experimentation that unfolded across these centuries even if scholars cannot always identify the individuals who sparked it. The trouble of authorial identification stems from the collections' collective silence. Few late antique epistolary collections acknowledge their respective authors, and when they do so, more often than not they identify the epistolographer himself as collector. Furthermore, the Greek and Latin worlds seem to have different models for the assembly and organization of an epistolary collection.

The Latin literary tradition in late antiquity was long familiar with self-authored letter collections. As Michele Salzman points out, Cicero had toyed with the idea of self-collecting (though he never followed through with it), and Julius Caesar published a self-made collection

of letters that no longer survives. It was Pliny the Younger who published the first extant major and widely read self-compiled epistolary collection. Late antique Latin epistolographer-collectors pushed the tradition in new directions, capitalizing on the self-presentational opportunities afforded by such a special type of text. Gérard Nauroy argues that Ambrose's disordered collection acted as a coded assertion of his pastoral, exegetical, and episcopal authority, and Cristiana Sogno notes that Symmachus's collected letters modeled for his contemporaries how an idealized sense of Roman nobility might be retained in an era of uncertainty and change. Andrew Cain tracks how Jerome's multiple collections asserted his ascetic and interpretive expertise to a Western audience, whereas Sigrid Mratschek demonstrates that Sidonius's multiple microcollections, circulated independently at first but later gathered into a single macrocollection, publicized his poetic expertise. Finally, Shane Bjornlie's essay on Cassiodorus reveals that the *Variae* showcased the encyclopedic and universal knowledge that characterized, from Cassiodorus's vantage point, the post-Byzantine Italian government.

In the Greek East, self-collecting appears to be a purely late antique invention. Gregory Nazianzen's late fourth-century collection is the earliest that survives, and Bradley K. Storin argues that Gregory quite conspicuously circulated his letters among Cappadocians and Constantinopolitans in order to reestablish his authority after a string of career missteps. Other writers were less forthcoming about their editorial activity, but we can suspect that the epistolographer collected and organized his own letters. Andrew Radde-Gallwitz suggests that Gregory Nyssen may have designed one subcollection of letters as a safeguard against potential charges of heresy, while another may have offered students a set of epistolary exemplars. According to Robin Darling Young, the exclusive focus on the idiosyncrasies and hardships of the monastic life indicate that Evagrius likely designed his on the model of Antony the Great's small letter collection (a collection that, because it now survives only in Coptic, is not treated in this volume). Lieve Van Hoof posits that Libanius likely exerted control over the publication of at least some of his letters to advertise the extent of his influence, whereas Daniel Washburn asserts that John Chrysostom may have published his collection to compensate for the loss of his preexilic epistolary archives. It is also possible, as David Westberg contends, that Procopius's collection offers readers a portrait of an influential Christian sophist entrenched within Gazan, Caesarean, and Alexandrian social networks.

As the essays on these individuals and their collections demonstrate, the epistolographer-collector is no innocent archivist. He does not simply present whatever letters he could find in his records in whatever order they were filed. His goal was self-presentation, not comprehensive epistolary inclusion. This means that the letters were both selected for inclusion and deliberately organized. Whether Greek or Latin, this type of authorship required the author to develop a strategy that enabled him to decide which letters to include and exclude as well as which features within the letters ought to be highlighted or downplayed. This process of composition is what makes the self-authored letter collection so special. It is a singular text comprised entirely of smaller, previously discreet texts that are conscripted and

situated into a new literary context. It is a portrait of how an epistolographer-collector wanted to be seen in his own day and an attempt to define his legacy for future generations.

The epistolographer-collector is only one type of author that we find in late antique letter collections. A more frequent type of author is the editor-collector. This is an admirer or associate of the epistolographer who selected, arranged, and published a famous individual's letters to contribute to the epistolographer's broader literary legacy. Editor-collectors are often anonymous, but occasionally they allow themselves license to advertise their authorial status. Gregory Nazianzen directly claims authorship of perhaps the earliest posthumous iteration of Basil's collection, as Andrew Radde-Gallwitz highlights, whereas the contemporary compiler of Barsanuphius and John's letters (perhaps Dorotheus of Gaza) permits his authorial voice to show in the highly formatted structure of the collection, as Jennifer Hevelone-Harper details. More frequently, though, editor-collectors remain silent and leave readers to discern the collection's unity based on thematic, literary, and presentational coherence. Charles Aull argues that Ausonius's posthumous collection reflects a contest over the epistolographer's religious identity in early fifth-century Visigothic Gaul, and Lillian Larsen contends that Isidore of Pelusium's collection—the largest surviving epistolary collection from late antiquity—was a production undertaken by several disciples at his monastery, perhaps as a memorial to his ascetic authority. Similarly, David Maldonado traces the thematic currents (legal concerns, the responsibilities of the nobility, and epistolary style) that run through Synesius's letters, which were perhaps compiled by his brother Evoptius or another figure close to him. Edward Watts shows that Aeneas of Gaza's collection acts as a small educational compendium of epistolary exempla designed by an unknown editor-collector for reading with other letter collections. Finally, Ralph Mathisen focuses on the oddness of Ruricius's collection, which contributed not so much to the epistolographer's legacy as to that of his descendant Desiderius, whose monastery honored him by embedding a small compilation of his letters within a much larger collection of Ruricius's.

The remaining Greek and Latin letter collections from late antiquity can claim no late antique author(s). Rather, the role of author falls to medieval and Byzantine editors. This is most demonstrably true of letters by bishops of Rome. While the late antique papal *scrinium* preserved the letters, Bronwen Neil demonstrates that it was the medieval collators and collectors who crafted the collection for the specific purposes of addressing religious controversy and clerical discipline. The same holds true, it seems, for Theodoret's two surviving collections, which Adam Schor suggests were drawn from a larger archive that may have coalesced in Constantinople, and for Paulinus's collection, which Dennis Trout shows was scrounged up by medieval editors. Stefanie Kennell draws attention to the near obscurity into which Ennodius's letters fell, before a series of early medieval editors, attracted to his orthodoxy and support for papal authority two centuries after he wrote the letters, began to circulate multiple manuscripts of them. These are collections whose creation spans centuries and whose authors are quite distinct from the figures who penned the letters on which they are based. How far we have come from the direct exercise of authorship by epistolographer-collectors.

What about Augustine? Simply put, Augustine of Hippo's collection simultaneously encapsulates and resists all these notions of authorship. Augustine himself may have acted as epistolographer-collector by beginning the process of publishing letters, or at least keeping his archives under tight control. It is probably not coincidental, after all, that his correspondence conveniently picks up where the *Confessions* leaves off in the chronology of his life. At the same time, it is clear that an editor-collector—perhaps Possidius or some other admirer—exerted influence over the shape of his collection by formalizing a relatively small collection of Augustine's letters that would circulate widely in the sixth century. Later editors had more to add. Medieval scribes, early modern philologists, and modern scholars all discovered and continue to discover new Augustinian letters that get added to an ever-developing collection.

The case of Augustine introduces the thorny issue of epistolary accretion and diminution. This process complicates claims that one can recover and understand the original collection's content and organization. Some late antique collections, especially Latin ones, solidified rather early in their transmission history, occasionally as early as the initial publication by the epistolographer-collector. This is not true of most late antique collections, however. Later editors subjected the collections to expansion (by adding new content) or contraction (by reattributing individual letters to other epistolographers or simply extracting them from the collection). The complexity of such editorial processes can cast doubt on claims of original structure, content, and organization. While sometimes an author's epistolary remains will be far less than he originally intended—Aeneas of Gaza's collection features only twenty-five letters!—at other times one might see something of a snowball effect at work. As in the case of Augustine, the collections roll down the slope of history with scribes adding letters here and there, producing a far more bloated text than perhaps originally conceived. Authorship as it relates to late antique letter collections is an expansive concept with diverse application. It covers a diverse set of acts that range from the original epistolographer's self-compilation to a later admirer's editorial activity to a medieval scribe's or modern scholar's careful search through archives for more materials that could be added. All of these are the acts of an author, but they require us to approach the resulting text somewhat differently.

With a few exceptions, the process of crafting an epistolographer's collection (by the epistolographer himself or by a later editor) indeed began in late antiquity. The remarkable explosion of epistolary collections forces us to consider what about late antiquity encouraged the production and preservation of so many diverse collections of letters. The tools offered in the essays in this volume permit us to cautiously suggest that a series of specific developments converged in late antiquity to create conditions favorable to the assembly and preservation of epistolary collections.

The dramatic expansion of the civilian and military bureaucracy in the later Roman Empire under the tetrarchy and Constantinian dynasty likely favored the dissemination of literary letter collections. Peter Heather estimates that, by 400, some 6,000 senior administration positions were available per generation with another 17,500 bureaucrats on the staff of the prefects, vicars, and governors at any one time.¹⁴ Military officials' staffs may have

experienced similar growth.¹⁵ This bureaucratic expansion had a number of important consequences for cultured elites. For the first time, leading provincial elites could access the honors and wealth associated with running the imperial administration. What had previously been the preserve of a narrow group of Roman senators now became the responsibility of a wider imperial aristocracy involving people from all over the empire. Fourth-century elites from various regions turned to epistolary collections to cultivate public personae like those created by the letter collections of the second-century senators Pliny and Herodes Atticus.¹⁶

The fourth century also offered a more expansive pool of social competitors who wanted to show themselves able to influence imperial decision-makers. Consequently, these new provincial elites engaged in some of the same epistolary behaviors as earlier generations of Roman power brokers. This context produced collections like the group of letters dating to the last years of the life of Libanius, which served as a veritable advertisement of the Antiochene sophist's close connections with Eastern and Western prefects, consuls, and other high imperial officials.¹⁷ The production and dissemination of such a dossier made far more sense for an Antiochene in the fourth century than it would have in the first century, when fewer provincials were deeply involved in imperial administration. Such a collection also would have found a wider audience among elites across the empire who now aspired to the same sort of extensive influence that Libanius so carefully advertised.

The fourth-century emergence of highly educated, well-placed, and politically experienced Christian bishops like Ambrose also facilitated the assembly of Christian epistolary collections. As Christopher Jones notes, Christians had used letters to assert spiritual authority since at least the time of the apostle Paul. The letter collections of bishops like Gregory Nazianzen and Theodoret of Cyrrhus still served this purpose, but they also highlighted the personal relationships with cultured notables that these highly educated bishops enjoyed. In ways that would have a confessional and literary resonance, these collections defined the epistolographers as both Christian leaders and members of the late antique cultural elite.

If the political and cultural conditions of the fourth and early fifth centuries encouraged the production and dissemination of literary letter collections, those of the subsequent centuries helped ensure their continued appeal. As texts like Macrobius's *Saturnalia* show, the political, social, and religious changes in the West at the turn of the fifth century could generate nostalgia for the world of the fourth-century Roman aristocracy.¹⁸ For instance, the letter collection of the fourth-century senator Symmachus offered Cassiodorus and Sidonius Apollinarius a window into this lost age. They in turn evoked this old aristocratic model to frame their own careers.¹⁹ Other collections pull away from the earlier models. Ruricius's and Avitus's respective collections, for instance, highlight instead the epistolographer's specific Gallic heritage and context.²⁰ Neither Ruricius nor Avitus (nor their Italian contemporary Ennodius) had the extensive social network of a Libanius or even a Sidonius, but their legacies still resonated as representations of the elite ecclesiastical ideal in a post-Roman world that had experienced a dramatic narrowing of elite horizons.

The Greek East in the fifth and sixth centuries experienced much less social and political disruption than the Latin West. Perhaps because the basic architecture of elite life changed much more slowly in the East, Greek authors treated fourth-century letter collections as templates rather than time capsules. The sophists Aeneas and Procopius of Gaza, for example, likely took inspiration from Libanius's collections and engaged in the same combination of name-dropping and rhetorical play that the Libanian corpus displayed so prominently.²¹ Similarly, the reputation management of Gregory Nazianzen after his deposition in 381 found an echo in Theodoret of Cyrrhus's use of his epistolary collection to defend his orthodoxy.²² Even the idiosyncratic sixth-century collection of the Gazan abbots Barsanuphius and John reflects a late antique intersection of literary culture and Christian ascetic practice seen earlier in the collected letters of figures like Evagrius and Isidore of Pelusium.²³

One could be forgiven for imagining that part of the reason that the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries produced so many surviving letter collections is that late antiquity was seen by later Byzantines and people in the medieval West as an age of cultural and religious superheroes. Late antiquity was the moment when fathers of the church and ascetic pioneers rubbed elbows with the last generations of Roman elites whose social world spanned the entire Mediterranean. It was also the time in which Gallic and Italian bishops like Avitus, Ruricius, and Ennodius first modeled the regionalized episcopal behaviors that would help define the ways in which their successors functioned. In the divided and diminished Greek and Latin Christian worlds of the Middle Ages, the power and possibilities that late antique figures enjoyed could seem unimaginably vast. And nothing better captured the personalities of these figures and the possibilities of their worlds than the collections of letters that defined and reinforced the very personal characteristics of these men that later audiences found so fascinating. Later audiences understood that epistolary collections functioned primarily as vehicles of self-representation (figures ranging from Einhard to Psellus would use epistolary collections in exactly this way), but they enjoyed viewing the portraits of power and influence the men of late antiquity had painted. They also clearly appreciated both the literary models and the insight into a lost world these collections offered.

These factors helped to ensure that late antique epistolographers feature heavily among the letter collections that currently survive from the premodern periods, but they do not tell the full story. One wonders, for example, how much the rise of the codex—a material change that made late antique letter collections more usable and durable than the scrolls that held earlier collected letters—may be responsible for the greater survival of collections of letters by late antique epistolographers. Nevertheless, only a fraction of the letter collections assembled in late antiquity survive to the present day. It is remarkable, for example, that no fourth- or fifth-century literary letter collections are known to have been put together in Spain or Greece despite the fact that both regions remained centers of cultural and literary production for most of late antiquity. We cannot know what has been lost, but one suspects that figures like Himerius may have kept their letters with an eye toward eventual collection and dissemination.²⁴ In other cases, we are able to see what has been lost (or almost lost). A collection of letters written by the Constantinopolitan philosopher and prefect Themistius, for

example, evidently survived into the middle Byzantine period. All traces of it (save for one short letter copied in the margins of a Libanian epistolary anthology) have now perished.²⁵ The collection of Aeneas of Gaza, which was once likely much larger, now survives as a microcollection whose fragments were fortuitously preserved by an eighth- or ninth-century anthologist.²⁶ Even parts of the extremely popular collection of Libanius had moments where their survival was quite tenuous. The letters numbered 1113–1542 in the modern collection of Libanius, for example, are found together in only one manuscript that once sustained severe damage.²⁷ Fortunately, the damage was primarily in the early folios of the manuscript, and multiple later scribes were able to reconstruct their contents through comparison with other manuscripts. Had the damage occurred at the end of the manuscript in letters not found elsewhere in the manuscript tradition, it is possible that these letters of Libanius might now be lost.

In sum, our bounty of late antique letter collections can only be partially explained. Late antiquity created conditions that facilitated the production of literary letter collections, and circumstances in the Middle Ages encouraged the later use and reproduction of these works. The survival of many of these late antique letter collections today is, as with so many other texts from the period, often more about the accidents of manuscript preservation than the conditions or quality of an original composition. This sobering thought should not, however, dissuade us from appreciating both the remarkable letter collections from late antiquity that survive and the conditions that fostered their production and reproduction.

NOTES

1. Michael B. Trapp, ed., *Greek and Latin Letters: An Anthology with a Translation*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
2. Jacques Derrida, *The Post-Card: From Socrates to Freud and Beyond*, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 48.
3. Adolf Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Greco-Roman World*, trans. Lionel R. M. Strachan, 4th ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1965), 228–30.
4. Abraham J. Malherbe, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*, Sources for Biblical Study 19 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).
5. Joseph Farrell, “Classical Genre in Theory and Practice,” *New Literary History* 34 (2003): 383–408.
6. Erik Gunderson, “S.V.B.; E.V.,” *CA* 26 (2007): 4.
7. Stanley K. Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, Library of Early Christianity 5 (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986), 23.
8. Mary Beard, “Ciceronian Correspondences: Making a Book out of Letters,” in *Classics in Progress: Essays on Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. T. P. Wiseman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 103–44.
9. See Owen Hodkinson, “Better than Speech: Some Advantages of the Letter in the Second Sophistic,” in *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography*, ed. Ruth Morello and A. D. Morrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 283–300.
10. Hodkinson, “Better than Speech,” 288.

11. See Roy Gibson, "On the Nature of Ancient Letter Collections," *JRS* 102 (2012): 56–78, esp. 62–63.
12. As a recent contribution points out, the notion of macrotextuality "originated within the literary semiotics of the seventies but does not seem to have found any resonance within the study of ancient literature" until now. For a history of the notion and its usefulness as a hermeneutical tool, see Marco Formisano, "Reading Dismemberment: Dinocrates and the Macrotext," *Arethusa* 49 (2016): 145–59.
13. Johannes Sykutris, "Epistolographie," in *Realencyclopädie der classischen Alterumwissenschaft*, Supplement 5 (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche, 1924), cols. 185–220.
14. Peter Heather, "New Men for New Constantines?," in *New Constantines: The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium, 4th–13th Centuries: Papers from the Twenty-Sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, St. Andrews, March 1992*, ed. Paul Magdalino (Aldershot, UK: Variorum, 1994), 18–21.
15. For the number of military officials and their staffs, see A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602: A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964), 597–601.
16. On this, see Salzman's and Jones's essays in this volume.
17. For this collection, see Van Hoof's essay in this volume. For this characterization of the chronologically latest batch of Libanian letters, see Edward J. Watts, *The Final Pagan Generation, Transformation of the Classical Heritage* 53 (Oakland: University of California Press, 2015), 213–20.
18. On this, see Alan Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 231–72.
19. See Bjornlie's and Mratschek's respective essays on Cassiodorus and Sidonius.
20. See Mathisen's and McCarthy's respective essays on Ruricius and Avitus.
21. See Watts's and Westberg's respective essays on Aeneas and Procopius.
22. See Storin and Schor's respective essays on Gregory Nazianzen and Theodoret in this volume, as well as Adam M. Schor, *Theodoret's People: Social Networks and Religious Conflict in Late Roman Syria*, *Transformation of the Classical Heritage* 48 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).
23. See Hevelone-Harper's essay on Barsanuphius and John, as well as Jennifer L. Hevelone-Harper, *Disciples of the Desert: Monks, Laity, and Spiritual Authority in Sixth-Century Gaza* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005).
24. In Himerius's case, this was done with his orations, many of which have subsequently been lost. For what survives, see Aristide Colonna, *Himerii Declamationes et orationes cum deperditarum fragmentis* (Rome: Typis Publicae Officinae Polygraphicae, 1951); and Robert J. Penella, *Man and the Word: The Orations of Himerius*, *Transformation of the Classical Heritage* 43 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007).
25. This scholion is found alongside the Libanian letter now numbered 241 in Berolinensis gr. qu. 3, a manuscript that contains selections from the larger collection of Libanian letters. For discussion, see A. F. Norman's introduction in *Libanius: Autobiography and Selected Letters*, vol. 1, ed. and trans. A. F. Norman, LCL 478 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992).
26. See Watts's essay on Aeneas.
27. See Van Hoof's essay on Libanius.