

A Feast in Carthage: Probing the Limits of ‘Secularity’ in Late Antiquity

A now-conventional model, developed by Robert Markus, sees late Roman cities as fundamentally secular landscapes. Focusing on Augustine’s sermon against a feast of the genius of Carthage (*Serm.* 62), this article argues that narratives of ‘secularity’ have neglected pagans’ own attitudes and the circumstances that drove ordinary Christians’ participation in civic rites. Behind Augustine’s charges of ‘idolatry’ lay the religious convictions of the feast’s non-Christian sponsors and, behind their expectations of Christian attendance, lay the recent destruction of a pagan shrine on church property. For Augustine’s listeners to construe the feast as religiously irrelevant was an expression not of routine social solidarity, but of fear before powerful patrons. What was ‘secular’ was open to doubt and negotiation, here as in empire-wide celebrations such as the Kalends of January, and the boundary between the ‘pagan’ and the ‘secular’ can be located only with careful attention to the diversity of opinions about each particular rite.

Keywords: secularity, Roman religion, Carthage, Augustine, paganism, religious conflict, religious identity

I THE LIMITS OF RELIGION: ROBERT MARKUS’ CONCEPT OF THE ‘SECULAR’

In a series of publications, Robert Markus painted the late Roman city as a basically ‘secular’ landscape, in which pagans and Christians shared customs, festivals and even what might once have been seen as cults.¹ As he put it in *The End of Ancient Christianity*,

Around 350 very little separated a Christian from his pagan counterpart in Roman society. Dancing, rowdy celebrations, especially those connected with cemeteries, the theatre, games, resorting to baths, a variety of magical practices and the like,

* This paper derives from work funded by the British Academy. Drafts were presented at seminars in Oxford and Cambridge; I thank the participants, and especially Conrad Leyser, Neil McLynn, Catherine Conybeare and David Lambert, for their comments, David Riggs for discussion of the sermon’s dating, and the journal’s editors and anonymous readers for incisive suggestions. Augustine’s sermons are to be read in a mass of overlapping, incomplete and sometimes solitary publications; I thus provide page numbers, at first citation, for the entirety of sermons frequently discussed, as well as the relevant page numbers of sermons cited less often.

¹ Ideas present *in nuce* in Markus 1985, elaborated in Markus 1990, with revisions in Markus 2006, Markus 2010.

often aroused suspicion and provoked denunciation by bishops; but they were part of that vast ‘shared territory’ which Christians inherited from the pagan past.²

After the emperors had banned sacrifices, civic festivals remained pagan only in the eyes of bishops. The reality, revealed in occasional acknowledgements in otherwise rigorist sermons, is that there was no substantial religious content to the festivals, which the bishops were endeavouring to ‘paganise’.³ The two centuries from Augustine to Gregory the Great saw the expansion of a specifically Christian sacred and concomitant ‘drainage of secularity’ from both Christian discourse and the surrounding world.⁴

Markus’ vision of a ‘secular’ late antiquity has exercised great influence, not least through its elaboration by Claude Lepelley and by Peter Brown, whose early work had deeply influenced Markus.⁵ By the 380s, pagan devotion had disappeared from official inscriptions erected in African cities, but Christianity remained totally absent. These trends seemed to Lepelley to confirm the religious neutrality of civic culture.⁶ Brown, in turn, has referred to the ‘massive middle ground that could hold the hearts of pagans and Christians alike. ... Sacrifice was not central to all pagan rituals ... In a late Roman city ... the venerable town hall, the Forum, the circus, and the triumphal avenues that passed beneath ancient arches could be the scene of ceremonial occasions quite as heavy with the thrill of worship as was any Christian basilica.’⁷

² Markus 1990: 27–8.

³ Markus 1997: 39, ‘De cette façon on paganisa une grande partie de ce qu’on n’avait pas contesté au paravant.’ Cf. recently Grig 2017: 245, who points to Peter Chrysologus, *Serm.* 155.5, ‘Sed dicit aliquis: non sunt haec sacrilegiorum studia, uota sunt haec iocorum.’

⁴ Markus 1990: 226.

⁵ Markus 1990: 27, n. 1, citing Brown 1961 as ‘a pioneering study to which I owe much’; the book was dedicated ‘To Peter Brown ὡς διδασκαλῶ’. Brown 2001 voices reciprocal appreciation. For general overviews of ‘secularity’ informed by recent scholarship, see Lim 2009 and the introduction to Rebillard and Sotinel 2010: 1–14.

⁶ Lepelley 2002b; cf. Lepelley 2011, a detailed survey of the epigraphic evidence.

⁷ Brown 2012: 103. On the differences between Brown’s conception (in Brown 1995: 1–26, changed only in nuances in Brown 2012) and Markus’, see the reflections of Rebillard 2013c: 10–11. For another perspective highlighting the nuances of Markus’ ‘secular’, this time by comparison with Cameron 2011, see Cooper 2014: 230–1.

Framed against proper Christian belief or practice, the idea of ‘secularity’ can both include and exclude aspects of traditional, polytheistic religion. Like ‘paganism’ itself, the ‘secular’ is, in any of its varying formulations, a modern concept that imperfectly systematises the often inchoate ways in which ancient Christians thought and talked about human beings and the world they inhabited.⁸ For Augustine, in whom Markus found both a critic of contemporary mores and a proponent of a relatively broad-minded Christian ideal, the *saeculum* was ‘the world’, often in the negative sense of 1 John 2:15 or James 4:4, or the present ‘age’.⁹ Even a career ‘in the world’, though allowed to Christians, might not be fully innocent; thus, one of Augustine’s close colleagues describes a young man, who had been working on the proconsul’s legal staff, as ‘sinking in the world’ before he entered the monastery.¹⁰ Though it did not bear connotations of the worship of ‘pagan’ gods, the *saeculum* was not a neutral sphere shared by pagans and Christians (as in *The End of Ancient Christianity*) or the present state of ‘mixture’ of the earthly and heavenly cities (as in Markus’ earlier, equally influential monograph, *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine*).¹¹ For Augustine, it was all that belonged to this world, and not the service of God. ‘Secular’ is, however, also an empirical description of a late Roman society in which traditional cult had, by the early fifth century, been extensively curtailed.¹² To study the ‘secular’ is thus to get at real social changes through the thinking of late antique authors who understood them in different terms.

In this paper, I suggest that Markus and his successors have drawn the sphere of the ‘secular’ too widely and too starkly. One consequence has been a relative neglect for the attitudes of convinced non-Christians and for the fears and ambitions that could shape

⁸ On modern systematisation of ‘paganism’ and its ancient antecedents, see Gassman 2020: 10–12, 76–106, Van Nuffelen 2011.

⁹ See Griffiths 2012: 33–4, and especially Van Oort 1991: 151–3 on the disjunction between Markus’ ‘secular’ and Augustine’s *saeculum*.

¹⁰ Evodius of Uzalis, *ap. August., Ep.* 158.1, ‘hunc iam in saeculo mergentem — nam scholastico proconsulis excipiebat’; on the licitness of a public career, see August., *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 61.8.

¹¹ Markus 1988: 69–71 (first edition 1970). In the crucial book, *De civ. D.* 19, Augustine uses *saeculum* to refer only to the present, evil or the future, blessed ‘age’.

¹² Bradbury 1995 and Cameron 2011: 65–7 focus too narrowly on blood sacrifice (cf. Schultz 2016), yet they do show real changes in inherited custom.

Christians' approaches to civic tradition. As Markus recognised in one of his last articles, his concept of 'secularity', which had taken on subtly different nuances over the years, was coherent from 'the Christian and perhaps the Jewish perspectives', but not necessarily from those of others, such as ancient polytheists.¹³ There were, after all, people who wanted to maintain the worship of the gods despite imperial hostility, and these, the remaining pagans, might, as Markus once remarked, still have taken part in 'festivities to express their own religious loyalties through them'.¹⁴

To point out this gap is not simply to suggest, with Claire Sotinel, that a 'neutral' civic space could be filled with different meanings by different actors.¹⁵ It is to challenge a growing body of scholarship that has seen the 'pagans' of Christian preaching and apologetic as rhetorical constructs, mirrors for Christian self-definition and tools by which to denigrate diverse local traditions and ordinary, but in fact Christian, behaviour.¹⁶ If (as Markus thought) there was nothing substantively 'pagan' about civic life, we can never be sure whether a reference to a thing or person as 'pagan' was not, in fact, a slur against Christians who deviated from their bishops' expectations. To deal with every aspect of a vast and ramifying scholarly literature would be impossible.¹⁷ A question nonetheless remains, even when one has called the language of the 'secular' into doubt: where did Augustine, or his interlocutors, put the boundary between pagan religion ('idolatry') and mere 'worldliness', and what do their perceptions tell us about the cultural meaning of civic rites in a Christianising Roman Empire? As I will argue through a targeted study of an Augustinian sermon, a festival that can appear, at first glance, to have been unproblematically 'secular' could still form a part of pagans' own inherited worship, of what they themselves saw as the traditional rites of their

¹³ Markus 2010: 357. Perhaps his very last: the only later work listed by *L'Année philologique* is Damien Kempf's French translation of *The End of Ancient Christianity*, published by the Presses Universitaires de Lyon in 2012. The same article confesses, at 357 n. 12, to never quite 'arriving at a satisfactory formulation', even in Markus 2006.

¹⁴ Markus 1990: 115.

¹⁵ Sotinel 2010: 322.

¹⁶ Recent examples from quite different perspectives in Kahlos 2020: 92–104, Frankfurter 2018: 7–15; cf., for a comment on Markus' ideas, Soler 2010: 274 n. 4.

¹⁷ For a brief but more general discussion, see Gassman 2020: 5–13, which adumbrates some of the points developed here. Kelly 2015 surveys Augustine's preaching on pagans.

city. To define proper Christian behaviour was at least sometimes, therefore, to demarcate it from a living, distinctively traditionalist alternative.

II 'IT'S NOT A GOD, BECAUSE IT'S THE GENIUS OF CARTHAGE' (*SERMO* 62.1–16)

In a sermon delivered before a feast of the genius of Carthage, Augustine gives his most sustained homiletic treatment of the dangers of civic 'idolatry'.¹⁸ He also sketches a layman's perspective that seems, at first glance, to approximate to the 'secularity' Markus thought typical of ordinary Christians. Placed in April 399, just after an imperial ban on idolatry at Carthage, *Sermo* 62 stood at a vital juncture in Markus' narrative of changing Christian attitudes toward the secular.¹⁹ 'A masterpiece of crowd management', in which Augustine defused mounting tensions within the congregation, it marked the point at which Augustine began (or so Markus thought) to take a newly hard line against festivals he had once tolerated.²⁰ Denouncing a feast that had 'lost most of its religious associations',²¹ the sermon showed Augustine, who had once articulated something near to Markus' 'secular' regard for civic life, both acknowledging the 'secular' mentality of many Christians and turning toward a lastingly rigorist attitude.

The narrative is compelling, but does not withstand scrutiny of the underlying chronology or of the sermon's content. The dating to April 399 is little more than an educated guess. Scholars have ordinarily put *Sermo* 62 in 398 or 399, depending on whether they think it must predate or soon follow the arrival of the imperial *comites* Gaudentius and Jovius in Carthage on 19 March 399 to 'overthrow the temples and break the images'.²² Augustine,

¹⁸ As I explain below, Augustine in fact said 'genium', not 'genius', in this sermon, for reasons now obscure. To write *genium* would be pedantic, as the neuter holds no obvious significance, but *genius* (in italics) comes too close to implying that that form is to be found in the Latin of *Serm.* 62. I compromise by ordinarily writing 'genius', in Roman type.

¹⁹ Text at *CCSL* 41Aa: 296–314.

²⁰ Markus 1990: 112–14.

²¹ Markus 1990: 131 (comparing the Lupercalia, as celebrated in Gelasius' Rome, with the feast. See now McLynn 2008 on this later rite).

²² *De civ. D.* 18.54. Before the new measures: Künzelmann 1930, 493–4; also Franz Weihreich in *CSEL* 43: vi. The early dating has recently been revived, with new arguments, by Rebillard 2013b, who rightly questions the scope of the *comites*' actions. In 399: Perler

however, only insinuates in passing that sacrificing might take place during the feast,²³ and, though cult-images were supposed to be removed after 399 and temples closed, he acknowledges that the genius could be considered a civic ‘ornament’.²⁴ That could have spared the image of the Carthaginian genius from destruction, since the emperors approved of statues’ ‘ornamental’ quality and were favourable to feasts.²⁵ The concluding sections presuppose landholders’ control over shrines on their own estates; a plausible, but not a certain, *terminus ante quem* is thus a law, posted in Carthage on 5 June 408, that commanded every altar to be destroyed.²⁶

Even more importantly, the sermon is unrepresentative of Augustine’s preaching, either before or after 399 (some 800 sermons in total, though still only a fraction of those preached).²⁷ Though Augustine often condemns as demonic or idolatrous the consultation of diviners, astrologers, and other magical specialists, he still distinguishes such acts from the worship of idols in pagan temples.²⁸ They may all be idolatrous, but they do not present the same problem. Civic festivals, by contrast, he may call ‘pagan’ or criticise for their worldliness, but (as we will see in a few particularly revealing examples below) he almost never suggests that they are meant to honour pagan gods.²⁹ Even in a sermon on John, for example, where he warns against participation in a traditional rite whose focus on blood bears a (to him) suspicious resemblance to Christian teaching on Christ, his chief worry is about

and Maier 1969: 225–6; La Bonnardière 1965: 162–3; cf. B. Coppieters ’t Wallant, L. De Coninck and R. Demeulenaere in *CCSL* 41Aa: 292–4.

²³ Augustine speaks only of ‘wanting’ to sacrifice (‘ut non tantum ibi manducare sed et sacrificare desiderent’, *Serm.* 62.7), and he could make balder insinuations as late as 408 (‘cum his uictimam immolant’, *Ep.* 91.5). I thus doubt, *pace* Rebillard 2013b: 61, that the reference points to a date before 399.

²⁴ *Cod. Theod.* 16.10.18; *Serm.* 62.10.

²⁵ Lepelley 1994; *Cod. Theod.* 16.10.17.

²⁶ *Constitutiones Sirmondianae* 12, excerpted in *Cod. Theod.* 16.10.19.

²⁷ Drobner 2000: 98–99 estimates loss of around ninety percent of the sermons delivered. For those on pagans, see especially Kelly 2015.

²⁸ See especially August., *In Evang. Iohan.* 6.17, *De doctrina christiana* 2.20.30, 23.35. For a survey of Augustine’s condemnations of magic and its practitioners, see Dolbeau 2003.

²⁹ This rule has held true even after the discovery of several new or expanded sermons, the most noteworthy gathered in Dolbeau 1996.

divination.³⁰ In *Sermo* 62, by contrast, he frames the feast—and only the feast—as an act of worship for a pagan divinity.

Sermo 62 was the second element in a homiletic campaign of at least two parts. Augustine had come from Hippo Regius to Carthage and preached at the Mappalia, the church located at the burial-site of St Cyprian.³¹ Evidently a blast against idolatry, this sermon, now lost, had centred on a text that he quotes, with imprecision, from Deuteronomy: *When the land has been given into your power, you will destroy their altars, cut down their groves and break up all their epitaphs.*³² Later, in another church at which some of the same congregants were present, he delivered *Sermo* 62, which, though it began with what seems a routine exhortation to humility (*Sermo* 62.1–6), turned soon to idolatry. Some of the Christians of Carthage have been invited to attend a feast in honour of the city’s genius, and Augustine is intent to dissuade them (*Sermo* 62.7–16). This, he warns his listeners, is what St Paul had in mind when he warned against ‘reclining at an idol’ in 1 Cor. 8:10–11. In a fictive dialogue, Augustine rebuts the arguments that might encourage Christians to attend, above all, that they are only trying to please their superiors and do not mean to worship anything. Finally, he turns, in a sudden about-face, to pagan anxieties over Christian hostility toward their cult-images, citing the Deuteronomic text on which he had preached at the Mappalia and warning the congregation against destroying the idols of those who have not yet converted (*Sermo* 62.17–18). Now, he reveals that the church of Carthage had, in fact, destroyed a shrine on a recently donated estate, unnerving local pagans.

The line of argument that Augustine’s sermon appears to be following thus shifts twice. The first shift is smoothly orchestrated, the second abrupt. Similar manoeuvres occur in other sermons that blend topical exhortation with devotional and theological edification. It

³⁰ *In Evang. Iohan.* 7.6-8; discussion in Sanzo 2017.

³¹ For which, Ennabli 1997: 21–4.

³² The sermon is mentioned at *Serm.* 62.17. The text, ‘cum data uobis fuerit terra in potestatem, aras eorum destruetis, lucos eorum comminuetis et omnes titulos eorum confringetis’, is a loose blending of Deut. 7:1–2 (quoted more accurately at *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum* 7.21.2) and a shortened and imprecise quotation of Deut. 7:5 (cf. the identical Ex. 34:13, quoted more accurately at *Serm.* Dolbeau 24.11, Dolbeau 1996: 52). *In potestatem*, which Augustine repeats for emphasis, represents *in manus*, as at *Locutiones in Heptateuchum* 1.145. *Titulos*, which I have rendered ‘epitaphs’, represents *στήλας* in the Septuagint, properly ‘pillars’ (Muraoka 2002: 523, s.v. *στήλη*).

was, perhaps, an attempt to conciliate an audience before hard words, but also a mark of Augustine's improvisational method.³³ Augustine's listeners, aware of local politics, might have anticipated both shifts. To the modern reader, they are more startling.

For the first third of the sermon (62.1–6), Augustine expounds the intertwined needs to have humility and a heart receptive to Christ. Neither his opening words ('We heard, when the Gospel was read, that our faith is praised in humility') nor the day's text—Matt. 8:5–13, the pericope of the centurion and his servant, to which Augustine adds the parallel Luke 7:1–10 and surrounding passages—hints at the feast or the problem of idolatry.³⁴ They do, however, introduce the theme of proper *potestas*, which will recur throughout the sermon, and allow Augustine to introduce an idea programmatic for his exhortation against idolatry: only those who have made proper room for Christ, by humble submission to him, will be saved. In the centurion and the woman with the flow of blood, who was healed when she touched the fringe of Christ's garment (Luke 8:43–8; cf. Matt. 9:19–22), Augustine finds a type of the gentile church. He also marks another, more troubling divide. 'For the faith of the few touches it [that is, Christ's body], the crowd of the many presses it. That the body of Christ is the church, its sons, so to speak, you have heard and know; and, if you will, you yourselves are they.'³⁵ Augustine's listeners are the gentile church, those summoned 'from east and west' to the table of Abraham, but they must guard their humility and will to obey God.³⁶

'Pay attention therefore, brothers!' Augustine says.³⁷ To touch the fringe and be healed—from the 'flux', that is, 'of carnal pleasures'—is to heed the words of 'the newest and least' of apostles: *For if someone sees him, who has knowledge, reclining at an idol, will his conscience, since it is infirm, not be built up for eating things sacrificed to idols? And, brother, the infirm, for whom Christ died, will perish in your knowledge* (1 Cor. 8:10–11). In

³³ For which, see Harmless 2012. Cf. *Serm. Denis* 17 (= 301A, *Misc. Ag.* 1: 81–9), discussed below, or 302 (Migne, *PL* 38: 1385–93), which moves from the contrast between love of the earthly life and of eternal life to the violent murder of a corrupt local official (Magalhães de Oliveira 2004).

³⁴ *Serm.* 62.1. The only Gospel passage in this sermon not from Luke 7–9 or Matt. 8–9 is Luke 19:1–10, the story of Zacchaeus.

³⁵ *Serm.* 62.5.

³⁶ *Serm.* 62.6.

³⁷ *Serm.* 62.7.

the words of Paul, Augustine finds a starkly literal, present-day referent, as he turns at last to the feast of the genius. ‘How’, asks Augustine, ‘do you think that men can be deceived by images, which they think are honoured by Christians? But, says someone, “God knows my heart.”’ It is the answer one would expect, after Augustine’s preparation, and of course he has a reply: ‘But your brother does not know your heart!’ The danger, he warns, is grave, as the ‘infirm’ brother will be led to want ‘not just to eat there, but also to sacrifice’.³⁸ Those who fail to heed Augustine’s words and, after reclining at an idol, return to the church, will destroy the faith of their fellow-Christians. ““But I am afraid”, you will say, “to offend a superior”, a *maior*.³⁹ Augustine approves the principle: ‘Certainly, do not offend a superior; this rule is laid on you.’ But, he says, one must consider the hierarchy of superiors. Your parents are your first *maiores*, but God is still greater, and so, even, is your *patria*. He hints, therefore, at the feast’s purpose—celebration of the greatness of the city of Carthage—but shies away before naming it.

The danger, Augustine suggests, is not just to fellow-Christians. ‘We want the remaining pagans to be gathered up; you are stones in their path; wishing to come, they stumble and go back. After all, they say in their hearts: “Why should we leave behind our gods, whom the Christians themselves worship with us?”’⁴⁰ But, Augustine acknowledges, his listeners are not actually worshipping a pagan divinity. ““Far be it from me”, Augustine imagines one saying, “to worship the gods of the nations. I know, I understand, I believe.”’⁴¹ Yet, Augustine answers again, the ‘infirm’ person does not. Before, the *infirmus* was the feast-goer’s Christian *frater*. Now, Augustine applies the language to the pagans who would, absent the heedlessness of the Christian listeners, be converted. The weak would-be Christian and the weak Christian blend together, in Augustine’s rhetoric as for a long tradition of

³⁸ *Serm.* 62.7, ‘ut non tantum ibi manducare sed et sacrificare desiderent’.

³⁹ *Serm.* 62.8, “Sed timeo”, inquires, “ne offendam maiorem.” For this sense of *maior*, *TLL*, s.v. *magnus*, 8:131.62–132.19; none of the evidence collected suggests reference to a more precise office.

⁴⁰ *Serm.* 62.9. For the sentiment cf. *Serm.* Dolbeau 25.28 (Dolbeau 1996: 267).

⁴¹ *Serm.* 62.9, “Absit a me”, inquit, “ut ego deos gentium colam! Noui, intellego, credo.” The final words may belong instead to Augustine’s own voice, as Rebillard 2010: 174–5, n. 103, suggests.

scholarship that has sought to explain the behaviour of half-converted pagans or semi-pagan Christians, or whichever categories seem most apt.⁴²

Having blurred the lines, Augustine now draws them more sharply again: ‘Do you dare to deny that Christ is God? Do you learn anything else, when you recline at an idol? Their teaching does not admit the teaching of Christ. Ask where you have learned that Christ is not God: pagans are accustomed to say this.’ The feast-goers will, Augustine asserts, hear their fellow-attendees talking about idols and questioning Christ’s deity, in a scene not unlike the dinner-party depicted in the famous letter sent, after Alaric’s sack of Rome, by the pagan aristocrat Volusianus to Augustine. There, a nameless friend questioned whether Christ’s deity was compatible with his incarnation as a baby, in the womb of a virgin left intact by the birth.⁴³ Augustine’s imagined pagan party-goers are blunter, pointing to the crucifixion to deny Christ’s deity at its (to human eyes) weakest moment.⁴⁴ To go and ‘learn this from pagans’ is to ‘lose salvation’; the cure, to ‘touch the fringe in this situation also’.

Augustine repeats the Christian feast-goer’s response: “‘It is not a god”, he says, “because it is the genius of Carthage.””⁴⁵ Here we have slight puzzle. Throughout the sermon, Augustine uses the neuter ‘genium’, a form attested on rare occasion from the first century onward. When rebutting Varro’s theological ideas in *City of God*, however, he uses the ordinary ‘genius’.⁴⁶ Why he adopts the neuter here, he does not explain, and such parallels as there are shed no light.⁴⁷ It is, however, noteworthy that the first instance is in the voice of the

⁴² Guignebert 1923 is foundational; see also Bonner 1984, and other permutations in Kahlos 2007: 31 (*incerti*), a concept cast into doubt by Kahlos 2020: 99–100; see also the criticisms of Rebillard 2012: 94–5) and Cameron 2011: 176–7.

⁴³ August., *Ep.* 135.2–3. On the social context of the letter, see McLynn 1999.

⁴⁴ On pagan theologising at banquets, see further Rebillard 2015: 287–8; Clark 2009: 131 is right, however, to see “‘heavy irony”” in *Ep.* 91.5, the one text that appears to suggest that such talk ever developed into anything even loosely analogous to Christian preaching. For pagan critiques in Augustine’s works, see still the impressively thorough catalogue by Courcelle 1958.

⁴⁵ *Serm.* 62.10, “‘Non est”, inquit, “deus, quia genium est Carthaginis.””

⁴⁶ *De civ. D.* 7.13.

⁴⁷ Citations, collated in *TLL*, s.v. *genius*, 6/2: 1827.5–16, include coins of Agrippina the Elder and Vespasian (Cohen 1880–1892, 1: 232, no. 8, 382, no. 200), one inscription (*CIL* 3.4401), and a few instances in grammarians and, most relevant to Augustine, in later Christian

Carthaginian layman. Perhaps the neuter acknowledges the ordinary Christian's desire to downplay the divinity's personality; perhaps it makes clearer, for a general audience, the learned bishop's identification of the genius with a (neuter) *daemonium*;⁴⁸ perhaps, more simply, it reflects current colloquialism in Carthage. Whatever nuance the unusual gender imparts (if any) must be slight, as Augustine does not mark the form as salient. The key point would hold good, whether Augustine had spoken of a 'genius' or a 'genium': the Christian conviction that the city's guardian spirit is not a god does not mean that others do not think it a god. 'As if', Augustine exclaims, 'if it were Mars or Mercury, it would be a god!' He hones in on the practical sociology of pagan cult: 'But pay attention to how they consider it, not to what it is. For I also know, with you, that it is a stone. If the genius is a kind of ornament, let the citizens of Carthage live well, and they themselves will be the genius of Carthage! If, however, it is a demon, you have also heard there, *What the nations sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to God*' (1 Cor. 10:20).⁴⁹

If Augustine were offering a learned critique of pagan beliefs, as in *City of God*, he might have extrapolated from Apuleius' identification of a human's mind, his *genius*, as a *daemon* to an identification of the city's spirit as a similarly demonic power.⁵⁰ If Augustine were a modern historian searching for a contemporary parallel, he might have quoted Symmachus' defence of the Roman priesthoods in *Relatio* 3, sent to Valentinian II at Milan in 384: 'the divine mind has distributed to the cities various guardians, their cults; as souls to those being born, so the genii of destiny are imparted to peoples.'⁵¹ Augustine was a preacher, seeking an argument persuasive to a general audience, and so he pointed, as Honorius would in the law promulgated in Africa in June 408, to the statue's cultic setting.⁵² Augustine says:

authors (Venantius Fortunatus, *Carm.*, 2.9.18, 5.15.3, and manuscripts of Cassiodorus, *Var.*, 6.5.4, 8.10.1).

⁴⁸ Cf. *TLL*, s.v. *genius*, 6/2: 1827.5.

⁴⁹ *Serm.* 62.10.

⁵⁰ Apul., *De deo Soc.* 15.150.

⁵¹ Symm., *Relat.* 3.8.

⁵² *Constitutio Sirmondiana* 12 (excerpted in *Cod. Theod.* 16.10.19), 'Simulacra, si qua etiamnunc in templis fanisque consistunt et quae aliquem ritum uel acceperunt uel accipiunt paganorum, suis sedibus reuellantur, cum hoc repetita sciamus saepius sanctione decretum.'

That, after all, these people consider it a divinity and take that statue for a divinity, the altar testifies. What would that altar be doing there, if the genius were not taken for a divinity? Let no one say to me, ‘It is not a divinity, it is not a god!’ I have already said: would that they all knew this, as we all know it! But what they consider it, for what manner of thing they take it, what they do there, that altar testifies.⁵³

‘What they do there’: *quid ibi faciant*. Augustine has already suggested that a weak Christian might be tempted not just to eat, but to sacrifice. This is the closest he comes to making the same accusation a second time. The altar, and pagan talk, are all that he points to with any conviction. The danger, one infers, lies not in a particular practice, since sacrificing is probably absent and moderate dining not a problem in itself, but in the commitments and beliefs attendance would express. To go is to accept (or at least seem to accept) that the genius is indeed, as the pagan sponsors think it, a divinity. ‘Would, brothers, that the body of Christ were to be pressed by pagans, by whom it is used to being pressed; let Christians not press the body of Christ!’⁵⁴ *Pressura*, by which Augustine elsewhere denotes the strain brought by the many disasters of the early fifth-century Roman world, refers here to the religious ‘pressuring’ of Christians.⁵⁵ To convert the pagans, he says, ‘desert their festivals, desert their trifles; and, if they do not agree with our truth, let them blush at how few they are’.

It is a hopeful thought, in the mouth of a Christian bishop.⁵⁶ Augustine does not dwell on it. ‘If the one who is over you is good, he is your nourisher; if he is bad, he is your tempter.’⁵⁷ The Christians, he says, are to be like gold in the fire, not chaff that burns away;

⁵³ *Serm.* 62.10, ‘Nam et illi quod numen habeant et pro numine accipiant illam statuum, ara testatur. quid illic faciat ara, si illud non habetur pro numine? Nemo mihi dicat: “Non est numen, non est deus!” Iam dixi: utinam sic ipsi norint hoc, quomodo nouimus omnes nos! Sed quid habeant, pro qua re habeant, quid ibi faciant, ara illa testatur.’

⁵⁴ *Serm.* 62.11.

⁵⁵ For example, *Serm.* 81.7–8 (Migne, *PL* 38: 503–4), after the sack of Rome.

⁵⁶ Cf., for example, *Serm.* Dolbeau 26.9 (text at Dolbeau 1996: 366–417), Denis 17.7 (there, however, pointing to the many Jews and pagans of Carthage to shame the Christian majority of Bulla Regia).

⁵⁷ *Serm.* 62.12.

to be rich from God, in the age to come. Now he works his way back around to the problem that sparked off the imagined dialogue: the Christian's duty to his *maior*.⁵⁸ It is not pride, he says, that he is counselling, a contempt for rightful *potestas*, but rather a proper appreciation for the hierarchy of powers: one does not obey a *curator* over a proconsul, or a proconsul over an emperor, and God is to be obeyed above all.

'But a powerful man plots against you ... he has sharpened his razor, to shave your hair, not to cut off your head.'⁵⁹ An allusion to the day's Psalm (51:4 LXX), it is also a recognition that no one was going to die for resisting modern-day pagans. The danger, which Augustine elaborates at length, is that the angered *maior* will destroy the Christian's financial well-being. 'He removed your poverty; does he also remove your riches?' The martyrs, Augustine reminds his listeners, held even this present life 'superfluous'. Shall Christians really 'fear the injuries of Christian times'? The pagan's wiles are now indirect. 'He does not say openly, "Come to an idol." He does not say openly, "Come to my altars; feast there."' Nor, when the Christian has refused, does he put his real complaint into a lawsuit: "'He was unwilling to come to my altars, he was unwilling to come to the temple which I venerate.'"⁶⁰ No, says Augustine, no one 'dares to say this'; instead, 'he works other things deceitfully'. But what of it? A thief, a burglar, a brigand, a fever, a scorpion, a poisonous mushroom—all of them can bring a person's life to an end. Why fear a powerful man, therefore? Those tempted by the feast have gained their money 'with great labour'; coming to 'eternal life' will also require 'great labour', and, if they find their earthly possessions dear, how much more the life that will last forever?⁶¹

One could make more observations about the fine details of Augustine's arguments. It is the overall tenor of the sermon that is most striking, especially when it is set alongside the sermon that has become, since publication of its full text in 1994, Augustine's most famous homiletic critique of pagan thought and Christian misbehaviour. Delivered in opposition to the ongoing New Year's celebrations of, most likely, the year 404, the massive *Sermo* Dolbeau 26 begins, after a brief address to the congregation, with a full-bore assault on the

⁵⁸ *Serm.* 62.13.

⁵⁹ *Serm.* 62.14.

⁶⁰ *Serm.* 62.15, 'Non dicit aperte: "Veni ad idolum"; non dicit aperte: "Veni ad aras meas, ibi conuiuare." Et, si dixerit et nolueris, hoc conqueratur, hoc in postulationem, hoc in quarimoniam deponat: "Noluit uenire ad aras meas, noluit uenire ad templum quod ueneror."'

⁶¹ *Serm.* 62.16.

ongoing festival of the Kalends of January.⁶² Again and again, Augustine bids that congregation—Carthaginians again, probably—be separate from the *gentes*.⁶³ ‘You are going to celebrate gift-giving today with a pagan, you are going to play dice with a pagan, you are going to get yourself drunk with a pagan: how do you believe something else, hope for something else, love something else?’⁶⁴ In its vigorous rebukes, *Sermo* Dolbeau 26 resembles those sermons in which Augustine attacks the immoralities of his listeners or of absent ‘bad Christians’, which form as high a barrier to their salvation as does the worship of demons or idols.⁶⁵ Illustrative examples include *Sermo* Denis 17, delivered at Bulla Regia to oppose a theatrical performance that featured mimes and prostitutes, and *Sermo* 9, which exhorts the men of Chusa to leave behind their habitual adultery and fornication.⁶⁶ All of these sermons show the preoccupation with a worldly sinfulness that is typical of Augustine’s criticism of civic life.⁶⁷ Not so *Sermo* 62, where the only hint of moral impropriety comes in a few bland allusions to ‘carnal pleasures’ and sinful ‘luxuries’.⁶⁸ In other expositions of the story of the woman with the flow of blood, Augustine finds vices, alone or together with the religious errors of the gentiles before their calling by Paul.⁶⁹ In *Sermo* 62, by contrast, Augustine focuses on one particular, present festival at Carthage, eschewing general accusations of both immorality and idolatry.

⁶² Greatly expanded from its previous publication, in Migne, *PL* 38: 1024–6, as *Serm.* 198, the text may be found at Dolbeau 1996: 366–417. On the festival, see Scheid 1998.

⁶³ *Serm.* Dolbeau 26.1–2, invoking the Psalm for the day (105:47 LXX): ‘Salua nos, Domine Deus noster, et congrega nos de gentibus, ut confiteamur nomini sancto tuo’. Carthage: Dolbeau 1996: 352.

⁶⁴ *Serm.* Dolbeau 26.2.

⁶⁵ Cf. the shrewd remarks of Sotinel 2010: 348.

⁶⁶ *Serm.* Denis 17 (= 301A, *Misc. Ag.* 1: 81–9), *Serm.* 9 (*CCSL* 41: 104–51). Chusa is unknown; Duval 1998: 173 suggests La Kessera.

⁶⁷ In the theatrical performance attacked by *Serm.* Denis 17, there is, *pace* Kahlos 2020: 98, no hint of paganism; the suggestion of Hugoniot 1994: 135–7 that the target was the Floralia was shaky, and has been ruled out by the chronological revisions of Hugoniot 2002: 2072–3.

⁶⁸ The church, or the Christian, is healed from ‘carnalium uoluptatum fluxu’ (*Serm.* 62.7) and from ‘luxurias et pannos peccatorum’ (62.8).

⁶⁹ *Serm.* Morin 7.3 (= 63B.3, *CCSL* 41Aa: 346), Mai 25.2–3 (= 63A.2–3, *CCSL* 41Aa: 337–8).

Not even the exhortation against idolatry at the opening of the great sermon on the Kalends offers a real parallel for what Augustine is doing in *Sermo* 62. Leaving behind the celebrations that preachers such as Peter Chrysologus found a pageant of idolatry,⁷⁰ he dwells on a philosophical paganism that seeks another mediator with God than Christ.⁷¹ Though he associates the Kalends festival with pagans, he does not make it an occasion for worship, except in a transferred sense. He glosses Paul's saying, *What the nations sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to God; I do not want you to be associates of demons* (1 Cor. 10:20), as a condemnation of the raucous excitement and partisan rivalries of the theatre, the circus and the amphitheatre. 'Those who do these things offer incense, so to speak, to the demons from their hearts'—not, signally, on actual altars.⁷² Even that accusation is a solitary deviation from his ordinary practice.⁷³ He had left the spectacles of theatre, amphitheatre and circus out of the 'arts marked by trifling or noxious superstition' in *De doctrina christiana*, treating the theatre, with mythology, as one of the 'superfluous and luxurious' institutions of mankind.⁷⁴ In his sermons, he treats absorption in beast-fighting or chariot-racing as disordered *amor saeculi*: damning, yet not worship in any ordinary sense.⁷⁵ Though he might remind converts in passing, as he does in his instructions for the deacon-catechist Deogratias, that the theatrical *ludi* took place on pagan holidays, and could say that spectacles made their

⁷⁰ Peter Chrysologus, *Serm.* 155–155bis; cf. Catarinella 2014: 510–11.

⁷¹ Improper forms of Christian veneration are also important: *Serm.* Dolbeau 26.10–13 (Dolbeau 1996: 97–101), with Brown 1998. The Kalends appear briefly at *Serm.* Dolbeau 26.43, and the concluding paragraph makes a nod, though they are now absorbed into generalised 'fallaces uanitatis illecebras' (*Serm.* Dolbeau 26.63). Christ's mediation: Dodaro 1998, Pépin 1998.

⁷² *Serm.* Dolbeau 26.3, 'Quae enim immolant, inquit, gentes, daemoniis immolant et non deo. Nolo uos fieri socios daemoniorum. ... ista facientes quasi tura ponunt daemonibus de cordibus suis.'

⁷³ Weismann 1972: 167, n. 280, Rebillard 2015: 289, 'Only two sermons associate spectacles and religion in very general terms.' One is *Serm.* Dolbeau 26; the other, *Serm.* 51.2 (*CCSL* 41Aa: 12), makes a bland reference to the Devil as a *uenator*, and might be excluded as in fact too general.

⁷⁴ *De doctrina christiana* 2.23.36, 2.25.38–9, with Markus 1990: 112, 121.

⁷⁵ For example, *Serm.* Dolbeau 11.9–11 (Dolbeau 1996: 64–6), *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 33/2.6.

watchers ‘similar to demons’, he ordinarily did not place the theatre within pagan religion proper, as he would in *De ciuitate dei* 2.⁷⁶ In *Sermo* 62, by contrast, Augustine quotes 1 Cor. 10:20, the same passage he had used in *Sermo* Dolbeau 26, to prove that the genius, whose statue is still accompanied by an altar, is in fact a demonic power to which the pagans are offering their worship.⁷⁷

The difference from the regular pattern of the sermons is a serious problem for a ‘secular’ interpretation of *Sermo* 62. By Markus’ reading, Augustine’s views were hardening at precisely this moment. Even if one calls the dating into question, a scholar suspicious of bishops’ rhetoric, as many have been, might still see the charge of ‘idolatry’ as a tool of control or (more positively) of moral suasion, a way to ‘paganise’ the worldly living of their congregations and so render it unacceptable. Augustine does make accusations of idolatry regarding divination and ‘magical’ rites. He does not normally do so when warning lay Christians against the moral dangers of civic festivals. A different conclusion is therefore possible: that this feast, if not others, was still a rite of what the pagan grandees of Carthage saw, and practised, as their ancestral *religio*.

III PAGANS, PATRONAGE, AND THE DESTRUCTION OF A LOCAL SHRINE (*SERMO* 62.17–18)

Even if the feast had religious overtones, ‘pagan’ was (virtually) no one’s self-description. In worrying about the hostility of ‘pagans’, was Augustine simply warning against a rhetorical bogeyman? Scepticism about the durability and importance of pagan devotion extends beyond the ‘secularity’ model, and has endured even in the most thoroughgoing critique of ‘secularity’ to emerge in recent scholarship. Drawing on sociological studies of ethnicity, Éric Rebillard has argued that ordinary Christians in antiquity had many overlapping identities, and sometimes ‘activated’, sometimes switched off, their ‘Christianness’. By this view, Christians and pagans wished to express their civic allegiance and mutual respect by attending the feast, which, if not necessarily ‘secular’, need not have had much to do with

⁷⁶ *De catechizandis rudibus* 25.48, 16.25. To *De civ. D.* 2, cf. the briefer and earlier *De consensu euangelistarum* 1.33.51, *Ep.* 91.5: polemic differs, perhaps, from intra-Christian exhortation. For comments, see Lugaresi 2008: 629, 647.

⁷⁷ *Serm.* 62.9.

religion.⁷⁸ Rebillard's emphasis on the flexibility of individual attitudes and the possibility of inconsistent behaviour are an important refinement to Markus' ideas.⁷⁹ He nonetheless reads against the grain of Augustine's rhetoric in much the same way that Markus does. For Markus, the Christian feast-goer has a clear conscience, and 'might ... plead that the festivities are harmless'; for Rebillard, he may not view the feast as 'a secular event', but is nevertheless unconcerned about God or gods, wishing chiefly to celebrate his city.⁸⁰ The bishop, Augustine himself, remains the protagonist, the laymen are active chiefly in their resistance to his entreaties, and the opinions of the third party, the great pagan men of Carthage, are either pushed to the side or assumed to be innocuous to ordinary Christian sensibilities.

This is not quite right, I think. Augustine, by referring to 'pagans' without further qualification, is glossing over important differences among non-Christians.⁸¹ Under other circumstances, those differences could be more salient even for him. In *City of God*, for example, he draws a programmatic distinction between people who worship the gods for temporal success and people who worship them for immortal blessing.⁸² Still, it is clear from his correspondence that there were devoutly non-Christian, even anti-Christian, traditionalists to be found in the cities of North Africa. Maximus, the grammarian from Madauros who extolled the public sacrifices and insulted the martyrs, is a case in point.⁸³ Longinianus, the only man to call himself *paganus homo*, is another. Priest, theurgist and worshipper of gods he identifies with Christians' angels, he was confident in his traditions but laudatory of Augustine himself as a man on the path to the Creator.⁸⁴ We can, therefore, imagine many shades of conviction, or flexibility, behind Augustine's undifferentiated *pagani*. However, the really important question, in matters like the feast, is not religious 'identity', the sense of belonging to one group of worshippers or another. It is whether the actions of particular persons were motivated by what they thought about God or the gods (or their desire to

⁷⁸ Rebillard 2012: 76–7, with 1–5 on 'identities' and 'activation'.

⁷⁹ For criticism of the language of the 'secular', see Rebillard 2012: 95–6.

⁸⁰ Markus 1990: 113; Rebillard 2012: 76–7.

⁸¹ A persistent problem in ancient Christian talk of 'pagans'; see the remarks of McLynn 2009: 573.

⁸² See, for example, *De civ. D.* 6.1.

⁸³ *Ep.* 16–17, with Gassman 2018.

⁸⁴ *Ep.* 233–5; on this exchange, see Tornau 2016.

worship them and see them worshipped). To apply Rebillard's framework to sentiments, rather than identities: at the feast of the genius, were the pagans 'activating' a piety that fused the civic and the religious, as traditional piety long had?

It is a problem in two parts. First, is Augustine's construal of the feast as an occasion for worship of a pagan divinity, a *numen*, coherent with what we know about contemporary polytheistic religion, and, second, are his insinuations of pagan hostility plausible? The first question is easier to answer. The crucial moment comes in section 10, where Augustine imagines the laymen saying, 'It is not a god, because it is the genius of Carthage.' They were wrong. As I have already noted, one of the few Latin works by a late antique pagan on his own religion, Symmachus' *Relatio* 3, identifies the worship of genii with the inherited polytheistic religion of the world's many cities. Though we know little about the *genius Carthaginis*, it must have been worshipped since the re-foundation of the city as *colonia Iulia Carthago*. Abundant inscriptions attest to the worship of civic genii in Africa, and to their identification with great gods such as Hercules, Mercury and Caelestis.⁸⁵ Augustine does not suggest such an identification here, but, as he objects, it would not matter for his purpose anyway: Mars and Mercury are not gods from a Christian perspective, either.⁸⁶ One inscription, from a city to the south of Carthage, records the establishment of a fund that would disburse interest to the city's decurions on the 'birthday' of the genius (that is, the anniversary of the colony's founding).⁸⁷ That city was the *colonia* of Sufes and its genius, the god Hercules. In roughly the same period in which Augustine delivered this sermon, its rioting citizens would, to the acclaim of its city council, massacre sixty Christians for destroying the god's statue.⁸⁸

In early fifth-century North Africa, therefore, pagans did rank genii among the gods of their cities. The worship of all such gods, however, was being confined within narrow limits. As I suggested when discussing the sermon's dating, both the genius of Carthage and this particular feast fell into a legal grey area. In August 399, Honorius reiterated long-standing provisions authorising civic festivals, including feasts, so long as they did not

⁸⁵ Lepelley 2001b gathers and discusses the evidence.

⁸⁶ The Carthaginian genius was perhaps an Apollo: see Gros and Lepelley, as n. 105, below.

⁸⁷ *CIL* 8.11430, with Lepelley 2001b: 46–7.

⁸⁸ A strange event known only through Augustine's furious letter to the city's leaders, *Ep.* 50; an attempt at reconstruction in Gaddis 2005: 118–19. The date is usually given as 399, but only to synchronise with the imperial measures in that year.

involve sacrifices or *superstitio*.⁸⁹ ‘Superstition’, however, meant more to a Christian such as Augustine than just sacrifice: it was, as the apologist Lactantius had put it nine decades before, ‘worship of the false’, in all its permutations.⁹⁰ How Augustine’s pagan contemporaries reshaped their religious beliefs, let alone their practice, to suit the new situation is less clear. The core claim of *Sermo* 62 is simply that pagans did want to see one of their gods honoured in this particular festival. An altar and image were symbols and, perhaps, objects of their devotion in what might, to evade laws against temples, have been an open-air precinct.⁹¹ The incident at Sufes and a parallel, less violent, conflict over a statue of Hercules at Carthage confirm pagan regard for statues in an Africa where sacrifices, at least those held in public, were disappearing.⁹²

While it is clear, therefore, that there was a distinctly non-Christian devotion to the gods (especially, but not exclusively, the divine personifications) of North African cities, the ritual outworking of that devotion can no longer be seen. What is in occasion evident, as at Sufes, is the potential for pagan attachment to the symbol and guardian of a city to harden into overtly anti-Christian fervour.⁹³ In *Sermo* 62, Augustine suggests that it could do so, in a more muted way, if his listeners did not attend the feast of the genius of Carthage. Is it plausible, however, for him to assume that the feasts’ sponsors would construe Christian failure to participate as an insult against their gods, and not just themselves? The vengeance he imagines them taking is at least within the politically possible, unlike the martyrdom he envisions in a sermon on Ps. 96 (LXX).⁹⁴ In *Sermo* 62, he hints only at veiled enmities, a

⁸⁹ *Cod. Theod.* 16.10.17.

⁹⁰ Lactant., *Div. inst.* 4.28.11; cf. August., *Ep.* 102.18.

⁹¹ Lepelley 2001: 51; Augustine does speak, in general terms, of the *templa idolorum* in *Serm.* 62.7

⁹² *Serm.* 24, on which Kelly 2015: 155–61 offers a circumspect discussion, with prior literature. For the decline of public sacrifices, see *De diuinatione daemonum* 2.5, of c. 406–410 (den Boeft 1999: 519).

⁹³ That such hardening is only occasional is rightly stressed by Rebillard 2012: 86–91.

⁹⁴ *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 96.16–17, which contains no convincing link to *Serm.* 62, *pace* La Bonnardière 1965: 162–3.

career-ending rupture in the bonds of *amicitia* that enabled capable but ill connected men, like his younger self, to rise in the world.⁹⁵

In these enmities, historians have been reluctant to believe. Alan Cameron is blunt: bishops' assertions 'that Christians were "forced" to take part' in civic banquets were 'absurd'.⁹⁶ Granted, not all laymen will have welcomed Augustine's strictures. Yet if one did agree with the visiting bishop, he might well have seen his patron's invitation to the feast as a burden on his piety toward God. Every indication is that Augustine is speaking to men of substance, but less wealthy than the feast's sponsors. They are *maiores*, the Christians lesser men, clients who owe their elevation out of *paupertas*—a condition, like that of Augustine's own father, more genteel than 'poverty'—into real wealth.⁹⁷ Even if the meal was restricted, as Lepelley has suggested, to the decurions of Carthage, the distance of status among them is unambiguous,⁹⁸ and the Christians are thus in a delicate position between bishop and non-Christian betters. A devout pagan, after all, might not be expected to have much liking for a bishop (nor, one supposes, for the Christians who followed a bishop's strictures too religiously). Thus Symmachus notes, in a letter to his brother, the *pontifex* Celsinus Titianus, that Celsinus might be surprised to find him recommending a bishop, but he has done so out of respect for the man's patriotism, not his religion.⁹⁹ The question is not, then, whether a Christian would feel under unwanted pressure to go, but whether Augustine is right in making that pressure an expression of pagan devotion, rather than an innocently non-cultic expression of ordinary civic pride.

⁹⁵ Late antique *amicitia*: Brown 2012: 100–3, Matthews 1974, on Symmachus, with the moving thanks for Augustine's own former patron at *C. acad.* 2.2.3.

⁹⁶ Cameron 2011: 785, referring to *Registri ecclesiae Carthaginensis excerpta* 60 (from the synod of 16 June 401, *CCSL* 149: 196–7).

⁹⁷ Cf. Chadwick 1985: 8, n. 12 (it goes too far, however, to infer that the *pagani* were senators). On Augustine's background, *C. acad.* 2.2.3 and *Conf.* 2.3.5, with Shaw 1987: esp. 8–9, Lepelley 2001a. Augustine's pronounced insistence on the poverty of his background in the late *Serm.* 355.2, 356.13 (Migne, *PL* 39: 1570, 1580), may reflect church affairs at Hippo at the time of his semi-retirement in 426 (Leyser 2005; cf. Shaw 1987: 9, n. 12).

⁹⁸ Lepelley 2001b: 51.

⁹⁹ *Ep.* 1.64, 'commendari a me episcopum forte mireris. causa istud mihi, non secta persuasit.'

The final two sections may hold the key. ‘Do not believe their words’, Augustine says, ‘do not be afraid. They call us enemies of their idols. If only God would offer and give all of them into our power, as he gave what was broken!’¹⁰⁰ He exhorts the congregation not to take the destruction of more shrines into their own hands, as the ‘crazy circumcellions’ do, but reminds them of his sermon on Deuteronomy at the Mappalia and bids them only act when they have the proper *potestas*. ‘We act first’, he says, ‘to break the idols in their hearts. When they themselves have also been made Christians, either they invite us to so good a work or they anticipate us. Now, we need to pray for them, not get angry at them.’

Augustine portrays an unholy ‘unity’ of ‘heretics, Jews and pagans’ standing against the ‘unity’ of the Church, in their shared anger over the laws that have been advanced against them.¹⁰¹ But ‘we’, the Christians, are not to break the idols, though ‘the places are before us, in which they are ... because God has not given them into our power’. Idols were standing, he says, on a property belonging to the church (*in re ecclesiae*). ‘Brothers, behold what displeases the pagans. It is too little for them that we do not remove them from their villas, that we do not break them; they want them to be preserved in our villas, too! Against idols we preach, from their hearts we lift them; we are persecutors of idols, we profess it.’

The transition is abrupt. But *potestas*, appearing in slightly different guises across the sermon, gives its superficially disparate subsections a deep thematic unity.¹⁰² Read as a genuine conclusion to the first sixteen paragraphs, the final two help to explain Augustine’s approach to the intertwined issues of the feast and of Christian duty. Not only has he tiptoed, over the first third of the sermon, toward the feast of the genius, he has avoided mentioning, until he has done his best to persuade his listeners to do what he sees as their duty toward God, just what might have given a Christian cause to fear the wrath of a powerful pagan, were he not to show up at the feast. If Augustine really is speaking in the aftermath of the destruction of a pagan shrine—or at least of the images held within the shrine, as ‘idols’, not a building, seem to be the main concern—then the leading pagan men of the city have received a stark reminder of the vulnerability of the traditions they held dear.¹⁰³ ‘They call

¹⁰⁰ *Serm.* 62.17.

¹⁰¹ *Serm.* 62.18. For a few instances of such “unity” working in practice, see Bradbury 1996: 56.

¹⁰² *Serm.* 62.4, 13, 17–18; *pace* Riggs 302, n. 18, who suggests that the conclusion originally came from another sermon.

¹⁰³ Cf. Rebillard 2013a: 63.

us’, Augustine says, ‘enemies of their idols’: not, presumably, in those words, any more than they were going to complain in like terms of a Christian who refused an invitation to a grand meal, but it would still be clear, in the pressure of the moment, who had taken which side. Whether planned for the purpose or not, the feast of the genius—unambiguously divine, yet no easier for a Christian to attack openly than the personified *Victoria* had been in Symmachus’ Italy in the turbulent early 380s—was an excellent opportunity to make those sides apparent.

I use the language of confessional opposition, but that implies too neat a symmetry between Christianity, which required formal religious adherence through enrolment in the catechumenate and, eventually, baptism, and the varied devotion to the gods of city, family, empire and personal predilection that modern scholars often, and ancient Christians only rarely, call ‘paganism’. Some pagans might have been understanding. The key point, and for Augustine’s laymen the overriding worry, was that some were not. Indeed, the proportion of such people among the feast’s sponsors is secondary: the inflexible conviction of a few can often draw the less rigorist after them, as ancient bishops knew so well.¹⁰⁴ The feast was an opportunity for good civic men to see whether Christians, whose bishops and scriptures commanded them to place something else above city and tradition, would prove themselves, as Symmachus once said of a bishop, ‘praiseworthy in the estimation of all sects’.¹⁰⁵ Augustine’s prototypical Christian listener, then, is under pressure, not simply to make his neighbours happy by proving himself a good sport, as at the Kalends, but to show that he is the kind of person who can live and let live, who is willing to let old traditions be his own, whatever a bishop might say, and who will nod when a cultured man muses about the incongruities of Christian doctrine, beneath the handsome face of the city’s divine ornament.¹⁰⁶ The Christian’s participation is not, as John North has said of the offering of sacrifices under Decius, ‘an act of pagan profession’, but a recognition that ties to patron and

¹⁰⁴ Witness, for example, Augustine’s exhortation to *patres familias* to encourage their friends, scold their wives, and beat their maids into staying sober at celebrations of the martyrs (*In Evang. Johan.* 10.9).

¹⁰⁵ *Ep.* 7.51, ‘fratrem meum Seuerum episcopum omnium sectarum adtestatione laudabilem’.

¹⁰⁶ For the bust of the genius of Carthage identified by Gros 1997: 343–4, see Lepelley 2001b: 53, with a photograph on the collection’s frontispiece.

patria—ties still bound up, for the pagan, with his ancestral forms of worship—mattered as much as the claims of the Christian’s God, in whose name a shrine had just been destroyed.¹⁰⁷

What Augustine is doing, therefore, is not denying the obvious, accepted ‘secularity’ of the feast, but denying that his Christian hearers are acting responsibly in treating it as ‘secular’ (the term, as always, is ours, not his or theirs). It has religious meaning, not for them or for him, but for the pagans and, Augustine suggests, for many other Christians. The laymen’s desire to participate is not a sign that they simply found their Christian adherence irrelevant to participation in the feast (as Rebillard, for example, suggests despite his criticisms of ‘secularity’), or so Augustine’s prolonged exhortation to resist the fear of powerful pagans makes it clear that he believed.¹⁰⁸ Rather, the laymen were caught in a web of social obligations that bound them to please their social superiors by honouring the city’s spirit, in a feast still marked by the material inheritance of the genius’s ancient, now-restricted worship. To adapt Rebillard’s language again, they were ‘activating’ their civic piety not innocently, as an allegiance alternative and parallel to their Christianity, but under duress.¹⁰⁹ The feast’s non-Christian organisers would have agreed with Augustine that it honoured a superhuman power. Whether or not the destruction of the shrine motivated their invitation to their Christian subordinates, it had disturbed them enough that those subordinates’ absence from the feast could well seem a declaration of hostility toward the traditions, and the gods, that they venerated.

IV BEYOND SECULARITY?

An exceptional sermon cannot offer a new vision of late Roman culture as a whole, nor do I suggest it should. However, it does allow us to calibrate our sense of the ‘secular’ against Augustine’s sense, only implicit in most sermons, of what was and was not idolatrous. Revealing how both pagans and Christian laymen thought about an inherited custom of one of the Empire’s great cities, it allows us to move closer to re-capturing the fine gradations of local, even individual, experiences of religious change. As Markus recognised, the task of the historian of late Roman religion is not just to gauge the grand-scale transformation, across

¹⁰⁷ North 2010: 44.

¹⁰⁸ Rebillard 2012: 77.

¹⁰⁹ I would thus extend to Augustine the critique advanced for Rebillard’s treatment of Tertullian and Cyprian by Clarke 2013: 771–2.

two centuries, in the religious climate of Roman society and politics, but also to chart the ever-shifting microclimates of belief and practice, of which that transformation was woven.¹¹⁰ Augustine himself had come to see ordinary civic festivals as distinct from pagan religion. To call his default conception of Roman society ‘secular’ is fair, though he did not use the word in quite Markus’ sense. To generalise from Augustine’s example would, however, be a mistake: as he reminded his Carthaginian laymen, they knew the gods to be nothing, but others did not. As a bishop, he can be found not just trying to convince Christian laymen to acknowledge the spiritual dangers of a pagan feast, but also counselling a rural landholder not to worry too much about the spiritual dangers of pagan sacrifices that he has no power to stop.¹¹¹

A similar diversity of attitudes can be glimpsed in the empire-spanning ceremonies that are the main focus of the ‘secularisation’ narrative. Famously condemned by pre-Nicene apologists for their connection with the worship of the gods, the public *ludi* are criticised by later Christians chiefly for encouraging vice and distracting from the worship of God.¹¹² The difference need not involve a change over time: that implies that the ‘real’ problem underlying the apologists’ attacks was sacrifice, when they were concerned about the games’ names and origins, as well. The learned were still aware of both. In 342, a law of Constans referred to an otherwise unattested connection between public festivals and the temples outside the walls of Rome;¹¹³ and a calendar commissioned by a Roman senator for 354 listed

¹¹⁰ Markus 1990: 110, calling for ‘searching investigation of what exactly the celebration of such traditional festivals involved, and what those – pagans as well as Christians – who took part in them thought they were doing, and what those who tried to prohibit participation in them accused them of doing’.

¹¹¹ *Ep.* 46–7 to Publicola, on which see Bodin 2012–2013, Lepelley 2002a. The diversity of Christian attitudes is brought to the fore by Frankfurter 2018: 18, Kahlos 2020: 177; cf. Rebillard 2010: 176. I would, however, discard the assumption that (in Kahlos’ words) ordinary Christians ‘would have had no scruples if bishops had left them to continue their celebrations in peace’.

¹¹² Tert., *De spect.*, Novatian, *De spect.*, Lactant., *Div. inst.* 6.20.34–6, with Hugoniot 1994: 127–9, Lim 2009: 498–502, Sotinel 2010: 327–8.

¹¹³ *Cod. Theod.* 16.10.3, with Behrwald 2009: 63, 107.

an abundance of pagan holidays.¹¹⁴ Even in the 440s, the two perspectives can appear side by side. In his account of the sins for which God brought the barbarians upon the Roman world, Salvian of Marseille refers first to the offering of games as the *uetus mos* of the pagans, who ‘used to believe’ them pleasing to their gods, then accuses Christians of offering superstitious honours to the gods in whose ‘festivities’ they participate.¹¹⁵ Decades before, Augustine himself had, when apologetic strategy demanded, departed from his ordinary homiletic practice to underscore the historical connection between theatrical *ludi* and Roman religion.¹¹⁶ That does not overthrow the basic ‘secularity’ of his approach, since the contention of *City of God 2* is not that the theatre has to do with paganism and is therefore evil, but the reverse. Only wicked, demonic gods could demand something so corrupt.¹¹⁷ It is doubtful, therefore, whether we can trace any arc of evolution, across the fourth century or across Augustine’s career, in Roman attitudes toward the games. Nevertheless, those who ignored the games’ religious associations had better cause. In the multitude of letters by which Symmachus arranged his son’s games, he showed himself concerned chiefly (as Alan Cameron put it) ‘to make a splash’.¹¹⁸ Symmachus, a *pontifex* who left letters on the operations of his college, including sacrifices, a public festival and the oversight of the Vestal virgins, did not treat the games as an act of worship.¹¹⁹

The Kalends of January offer a contrasting example. Enfolded, with wide swaths of ancient life, in the sin of idolatry by Tertullian, they were denounced by a host of later Christian writers.¹²⁰ Peter Chrysologus, for example, condemned the mummers’ parades as a continuation, by Christians, of an idolatry that ought to have died out long-since. He recognised, however, that his congregants did not mean to engage in pagan worship, while Augustine, as we have seen, locates the festival’s danger in love of the world, figured as inner

¹¹⁴ This section of the so-called Chronograph of 354 may be found in *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2: 237–62. For discussion, see Burgess 2012 and Salzman 1990.

¹¹⁵ *De gubernatione dei* 6.22, 59–61.

¹¹⁶ See n. 74, above.

¹¹⁷ Esp. *De civ. D.* 2.29.

¹¹⁸ Cameron 2011: 790.

¹¹⁹ *Ep.* 1.46, 1.49, 2.36, 9.147–8.

¹²⁰ Tert., *De idololatria* 14.4. Surveys in Grig 2017: 238–9, Catarinella 2014 (483–93 on Augustine), Meslin 1970: 95–118.

worship of demons.¹²¹ In turn, the orator Libanius, who saw no more religion in the games than Symmachus did, praised the Kalends in terms congruent with Markus' vision of a 'secular' civic culture: through gift-giving and relaxation, they bring happiness and harmony to all.¹²² However, Libanius' oration begins by calling the Kalends the 'festival of the great *daemon*'—possibly a reference to the emperor, but in decidedly un-Christian terms—and ends by recounting, wistfully, how the sacrifices, now-banned, had once joined the gods, too, in celebration.¹²³ The Kalends were not, for Libanius and presumably also for other pagans, devoid of religious meaning, even if the full ritual enactment of that meaning was now and for the foreseeable future a memory.

Sermo 62, which has helped to frame the narrative of 'secularisation' and episcopal efforts at 'de-secularisation', is in fact a particularly vivid testimony to the malleability and contingency of the 'secular', as well as the durability of religious conviction, in late antiquity. Some festivals were now devoid of religious freight for most people, most of the time. Others, such as the feast of the genius of Carthage, held more ambiguous connotations, which could be 'activated' (to adapt Rebillard's language again) both by rhetorical effort and by the pressure of contingent circumstances, for example the expectations of bishops, friends and patrons or the concerns of ordinary Christians anxious to know what was pagan and what was not. Christian laity and devout traditionalists were not simply resting, confident, in their shared culture. They, like the bishops, were negotiating what that culture would mean, for themselves and for others, and had to reckon both with the inheritance of ancient, polytheistic religion and with opinions still vigorously opposed to their own.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Misc. Ag. 1 = G. Morin (ed.), *Sancti Augustini Sermones post Maurinos reperti*, Miscellanea Agostiniana 1, Rome, 1930.

RE = A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, and W. Kroll (eds), *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart, 1893–.

TLL = *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Munich, 1900–.

¹²¹ Peter Chrysologus, *Serm.* 155.5, 155bis.2; Catarinella 2014: 510.

¹²² *Or.* 9. On the 'secularity' of the games at Antioch, see Hahn 2018.

¹²³ *Or.* 9.1, 18. Graf 2012: 178: 'the 'mighty daimon,' ... could be either Jupiter or the emperor or both at the same time'.

- Behrwald, R. 2009: *Die Stadt als Museum? Die Wahrnehmung der Monumente Roms in der Spätantike*, Klio Beihefte, n.s. 12, Berlin.
- Bodin, A. 2012–2013: ‘Le Problème de la contagion païenne: les questions de Publicola à Augustin (Lettre 46)’, *Revue des études tardo-antiques* 2, 175–201.
- Bonner, G. 1984: ‘The Extinction of Paganism and the Church Historian’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 35, 339–57.
- Bradbury, S. 1995: ‘Julian’s Pagan Revival and the Decline of Blood Sacrifice’, *Phoenix* 49, 331–56.
- Bradbury, S. 1996: *Severus of Minorca: Letter on the Conversion of the Jews*, Oxford.
- Brown, P. 1961: ‘Aspects of the Christianization of the Roman Aristocracy’, *The Journal of Roman Studies* 51, 1–11.
- Brown, P. 1995: *Authority and the Sacred: Aspects of the Christianisation of the Roman World*, Cambridge.
- Brown, P. 1998: ‘Augustine and a practice of the *imperiti*’, in Madec 1998, 367–75.
- Brown, P. 2001: ‘Introducing Robert Markus’, *Augustinian Studies* 32.2: 181–7.
- Brown, P. 2012: *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350-550 AD*, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Burgess, R. W. 2012: ‘The Chronograph of 354: Its Manuscripts, Contents, and History’, *Journal of Late Antiquity* 5, 354–96.
- Cameron, A. 2011: *The Last Pagans of Rome*, Oxford.
- Catarinella, M. F. 2014: ‘La condanna delle *Kalendae Ianuariae* nell’omiletica latina tra IV e VI secolo. Con un esempio di “catena”’, in M. Marin and M. F. Catarinella (eds), *Forme della polemica nell’omiletica latina di IV-VI secolo*, Auctores nostri 14, Bari, 477–512.
- Chadwick, H. 1985: ‘The Ascetic Ideal in the History of the Church’, *Studies in Church History* 22, 1–24.
- Clark, G. 2009: ‘Augustine, Porphyry and the Universal Way of Salvation,’ in G. Karamanolis and A. Sheppard (eds), *Studies on Porphyry*, Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement 98, London, 127–40.
- Clarke, G. 2013: Review of Rebillard 2012, *The Catholic Historical Review* 99, 770–2.
- Cooper, K. 2014: ‘The Long Shadow of Constantine’, *The Journal of Roman Studies* 94, 226–38.

- Courcelle, P. 1958: 'Propos antichrétiens rapportés par saint Augustin', *Recherches Augustiniennes et Patristiques* 1, 149–86.
- den Boeft, J. 1999: 'Diuinatione daemonum (De –)', in C. Mayer (ed.), *Augustinus-Lexicon*, Vol. 2.3-4: *Deus–Donatistas (Contra–)*, Basel, 519–24.
- Dodaro, R. 1998: 'Christus sacerdos: Augustine's Preaching Against Pagan Priests in Light of S. Dolbeau 26 and 23', in Madec 1998: 377–93.
- Dolbeau, F. 1996: *Vingt-six sermons au peuple d'Afrique*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série Antiquité 147, Paris.
- Dolbeau, F. 2003. 'Le combat pastoral d'Augustin contre les astrologues, les devins et les guérisseurs', in P.-Y. Fux, O. Wermelinger and J.-M. Roessli (eds), *Augustinus After: Saint Augustin: africanité et universalité. Actes du colloque international Alger-Annaba, 1-7 April 2001*, Paradosis 45/1–2, Fribourg, Switzerland, 1: 167–82.
- Drobner, H. R. 2012: 'The Transmission of Augustine's Sermons. A Critical Assessment', in A. Dupont, G. Partoens and M. Lamberigts (eds), *Tractatio Scripturarum: Philological, Exegetical, Rhetorical and Theological Studies on Augustine's Sermons*, Ministerium Sermonis 2 = Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia 65, Brepols, 97–117.
- Duval, N. 1998: 'Commentaire topographique et archéologique de sept dossiers des nouveaux sermons', in Madec 1998, 171–214.
- Ennabli, L. 1997: *Carthage, une métropole chrétienne du IVe à la fin du VIIe siècle*, Études d'Antiquités africaines, Paris.
- Frankfurter, D. 2018: *Christianizing Egypt: Syncretism and Local Worlds in Late Antiquity*, Princeton.
- Gaddis, M. 2005: *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ: Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire*, The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 39, Berkeley.
- Gassman, M. 2018: 'Debating Traditional Religion in Late Fourth-Century Africa', *Journal of Late Antiquity* 11: 83–110.
- Gassman, M. 2020: *Worshippers of the Gods: Debating Paganism in the Fourth-Century Roman West*, Oxford Studies in Late Antiquity, Oxford.
- Graf, F. 2012: 'Fights about Festivals: Libanius and John Chrysostom on the *Kalendae Ianuariae* in Antioch', *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 13, 175–86.
- Griffiths, P. J. 2012: 'Secularity and the *Saeculum*', in J. Wetzel (ed.), *Augustine's City of God: A Critical Guide*, Cambridge, 33–54.
- Grig, L. 2017: 'Interpreting the Kalends of January: A Case Study for Late Antique Popular Culture?' in L. Grig (ed.), *Popular Culture in the Ancient World*, Cambridge, 237–56.

- Gros, Pierre. 1997: 'Les Bâtiments administratifs de la Carthage romaine: Problèmes d'identification et de localisation', *Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung* 104, 341–50.
- Guignebert, C. 1923: 'Les demi-chrétiens et leur place dans l'église antique', *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 88, 65–102.
- Hahn, J. 2018: 'Metropolis, Emperors, and Games: The Secularization of the Antiochene Olympics in Late Antiquity', in S.-P. Bergjan and S. Elm (eds), *Antioch II: The Many Faces of Antioch: Intellectual Exchange and Religious Diversity, CE 350–450*, *Civitas Orbis Mediterranei Studia* 3, Tübingen, 53–71.
- Harmless, W. 2012: 'A Love Supreme: Augustine's "Jazz" of Theology', *Augustinian Studies* 43, 149–77.
- Hugoniot, C. 1994: 'La critique de l'idolâtrie des jeux scéniques dans le *De civitate Dei*: Destinataires et enjeux', *European Review of History* 1, 127–41.
- Hugoniot, C. 2002: 'Les légats du proconsul d'Afrique à la fin du IV^e siècle et au début du V^e ap. J.-C. à la lumière des sermons et lettres d'Augustin', in M. Khanoussi, P. Ruggeri, C. Vismara (eds.), *L'Africa romana: Lo spazio marittimo del Mediterraneo occidentale: geografia storica ed economica. Atti del 14. Convegno di studio, Sassari, 7-10 dicembre 2000*, Collana del Dipartimento di Storia dell'Università degli Studi di Sassari, n.s. 13, 3: 2067–87.
- Kahlos, M. 2007: *Debate and Dialogue: Christian and Pagan Cultures C. 360–430*, Ashgate New Critical Thinking in Religion, Theology and Biblical Studies, Aldershot.
- Kahlos, M. 2020. *Religious Dissent in Late Antiquity, 350–450*, Oxford Studies in Late Antiquity, Oxford.
- Kelly, C. 2015: 'Narratives of Violence: Confronting Pagans', in A. Papaconstantinou, with N. McLynn and D. L. Schwartz (eds), *Conversion in Late Antiquity: Christianity, Islam, and Beyond. Papers from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Sawyer Seminar, University of Oxford, 2009–2010*, Farnham, 143–61.
- Künzelmann, A. 1931: 'Die Chronologie der Sermones des hl. Augustinus', *Miscellanea Agostiniana* 2, Rome, 417–520.
- La Bonnardière, A.-M. 1965: *Recherches de chronologie augustiniennes*. Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 23, Paris.
- Lepelley, C. 1994: 'Le musée des statues divines: la volonté de sauvegarder le patrimoine artistique païen à l'époque théodosienne', *Cahiers archéologiques* 42, 5–15

- Lepelley, C. 2001a. 'Spes saeculi: le milieu social d'Augustin et ses ambitions séculières avant sa conversion', in *Aspects de l'Afrique romaine: Les Cités, la vie rurale, le christianisme*, Munera 15, Bari, 329–44.
- Lepelley, C. 2001b: 'Une forme religieuse du patriotisme municipal: le culte du Génie de la cité dans l'Afrique romaine', in *Aspects de l'Afrique romaine*, 39–53.
- Lepelley, C. 2002a: 'La diabolisation du paganisme et ses conséquences psychologiques: les angoisses de Publicola, correspondant de saint Augustin', in L. Mary and M. Sot (eds), *Impies et païens entre Antiquité et Moyen Âge*, Paris, 81–96.
- Lepelley, C. 2002b: 'Le lieu des valeurs communes: la cité terrain neutre entre païens et chrétiens dans l'Afrique romaine tardive', in H. Inglebert (ed.), *Idéologies et valeurs civiques dans le Monde Romain: Hommage à Claude Lepelley*, Paris, 271–85.
- Lepelley, C. 2011: 'De la réaction païenne à la sécularisation: le témoignage d'inscriptions municipales romano-africaines tardives', in P. Brown and R. Lizzi Testa (eds), *Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire: The Breaking of a Dialogue (IVth–VIth Century A.D.). Proceedings of the International Conference at the Monastery of Bose (October 2008)*, Christianity and History. Series of the John XXIII Foundation for Religious Studies in Bologna 9, Berlin, 273–89.
- Leyser, C. 2005: '*Homo pauper, de pauperibus natus*: Augustine, Church Property, and the Cult of Stephen', *Augustinian Studies* 36, 229–37.
- Lim, R. 2009: 'Christianization, Secularization, and the Transformation of Public Life', in P. Rousseau (ed.), with the assistance of Jutta Raithel, *A Companion to Late Antiquity*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, Chichester, 497–511.
- Lugaresi, L. 2008: *Il teatro di Dio: Il problema degli spettacoli nel cristianesimo antico (II–IV secolo)*, Supplementi Adamantius 1, Brescia.
- Madec, G. 1998: *Augustin prédicateur (395-411): Actes du Colloque International de Chantilly (5-7 septembre 1996)*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 159, Paris.
- Magalhães de Oliveira, J. C. 2004: 'Le "pouvoir du peuple": Une émeute à Hippone au début du V^e siècle connue par le sermon 302 de saint Augustin pour la fête de saint Laurent', *Antiquité tardive* 12, 209–24.
- Markus, R. A. 1985: 'The Sacred and the Secular: From Augustine to Gregory the Great', *Journal of Theological Studies* ns 36, 84–96.
- Markus, R. A. 1988: *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine*, revised edn, Cambridge.

- Markus, R. A. 1990: *The End of Ancient Christianity*, Cambridge.
- Markus, R. A. 1997: 'L'autorité épiscopale et la définition de la chrétienté', *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 58, 37–43.
- Markus, R. A. 2006: *Christianity and the Secular*, Blessed Pope John XXIII Lecture Series in Theology and Culture, Notre Dame, Indiana.
- Markus, R. A. 2010: 'The Secular in Late Antiquity', in Rebillard and Sotinel 2010, 353–61.
- Matthews, J. F. 1974: 'The Letters of Symmachus', in J. W. Binns, *Latin Literature of the Fourth Century*, Greek and Latin Studies: Classical Literature and Its Influence, London, 58–99.
- McLynn, N. B. 1999: 'Augustine's Roman Empire', *Augustinian Studies* 30/2, 29–44.
- McLynn, N. B. 2008: 'Crying Wolf: The Pope and the Lupercalia', *The Journal of Roman Studies* 98, 161–75.
- McLynn, N. B. 2009. 'Pagans in a Christian Empire', in P. Rousseau (ed.), with the assistance of Jutta Raithel, *A Companion to Late Antiquity*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, Chichester, 572–87.
- Meslin, M. 1970: *La fête des kalendes de janvier dans l'empire romain: Étude d'un rituel de Nouvel An*, Collection Latomus 115, Brussels.
- Muraoka, T. 2002: *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets*, Leuven.
- North, J. 2010: 'Pagan Ritual and Monotheism', in S. Mitchell and P. Van Nuffelen (eds), *One God: Pagan Monotheism in the Roman Empire*, Cambridge, 34–52.
- Pépin, J. 1998: 'Falsi mediatores duo. Aspects de la médiation dans le sermon d'Augustin *Contra paganos* (S. Dolbeau 26)', in Madec 1998, 395–417.
- Perler, O., with J.-L. Maier. 1969: *Les Voyages de Saint Augustin*, Paris.
- Rebillard, É. 2010: "'Vivre avec les païens, mais non mourir avec eux": le problème de la commensalité des chrétiens et des non-chrétiens (I^{er}-V^e siècles)', in Rebillard and Sotinel 2010, 151–76.
- Rebillard, É. 2012: *Christians and Their Many Identities in Late Antiquity, North Africa, 200–450 CE*, Ithaca, New York.
- Rebillard, É. 2013a: 'Augustine and the Cult of Statues', in *Transformations of Religious Practices in Late Antiquity*, Variorum Collected Studies, Farnham, 47–71.
- Rebillard, É. 2013b: 'The Christian Mob and the Destruction of Pagan Statues: The Case of North Africa in the Age of Augustine', in *Transformations of Religious Practices in Late Antiquity*, Variorum Collected Studies, Farnham, 73–87.

- Rebillard, É. 2013c: ‘The “Conversion” of the Empire According to Peter Brown’, in *Transformations of Religious Practices in Late Antiquity*, Variorum Collected Studies, Farnham, 1–14.
- Rebillard, É. 2015: ‘Dialogue or Conflict? Augustine on Roman Religion’, in C. Müller, with R. Dodaro and A. D. Fitzgerald (eds), *Kampf oder Dialog? – Conflict/Dialogue?: Begegnung von Kulturen im Horizont von Augustins De ciuitate dei – Augustine’s Engagement with Cultures in “De ciuitate dei”*. Internationales Symposium/International Symposium Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, Roma, 25.–29. September 2012, Cassiciacum 39, Würzburg, 279–91.
- Rebillard, É. and C. Sotinel. 2010: *Les Frontières du profane dans l’antiquité tardive*, Collection de l’École Française de Rome 428, Rome.
- Riggs, D. 2006: ‘Christianizing the Rural Communities of Late Roman Africa: A Process of Coercion or Persuasion?’ in H.A. Drake (ed.), *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Practices*, Aldershot, 297–308.
- Salzman, M. R. 1990: *On Roman Time: The Codex-Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity*, The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 17, Berkeley.
- Sanzo, J. E. 2017: ‘Magic and Communal Boundaries: The Problems with Amulets in Chrysostom, *Adv. Iud.* 8, and Augustine, *In Io. Tra.* 7’, *Henoch* 39: 227–46.
- Scheid, J. 1998: ‘Les réjouissances des calendes de janvier d’après le *sermon* Dolbeau 26. Nouvelles lumières sur une fête mal connue’, in Madec 1998, 353–65.
- Schultz, C. 2016: ‘Roman Sacrifice, Inside and Out’, *The Journal of Roman Studies* 106, 58–76.
- Shaw, B. D. 1987: ‘The Family in Late Antiquity: The Experience of Augustine’, *Past and Present* 115, 3–51.
- Soler, E. 2010: ‘Sacralité et partage du temps et de l’espace festifs à Antioche au IV^e siècle’, in Rebillard and Sotinel 2010, 273–86.
- Sotinel, C. 2010: ‘La sphère profane dans l’espace urbain’, in Rebillard and Sotinel 2010, 319–49.
- Tornau, C. 2016: ‘Der Bischof und der Priester: Elemente einer Kommentierung von Augustins Briefwechsel mit Longinianus (*ep.* 233-235)’, *Revue d’études augustiniennes et patristiques* 62, 153–82

- Van Nuffelen, P. 2011: 'Eusebius of Caesarea and the Concept of Paganism', in L. Lavan and M. Mulryan (eds), *The Archaeology of Late Antique 'Paganism'*, *Late Antique Archaeology* 7, Leiden, 89–109.
- Van Oort, J. 1991: *Jerusalem and Babylon: A Study into Augustine's City of God and the Sources of His Doctrine of the Two Cities*, *Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* 14, Leiden, 1991.
- Weismann, W. 1972: *Kirche und Schauspiele: Die Schauspiele im Urteil der lateinischen Kirchenväter unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Augustin*, *Cassiciacum* 27, Würzburg.