

**Mark MASTERSON**

**The Emperor Julian, Salutius and the Pederastic Intertext**

Julian wrote his fourth oration, a speech of consolation (*paramuthêtikos logos*) to himself, in 358/59 C.E. because his friend Salutius had been compelled to leave his company. Salutius was his companion and advisor on campaign in Gaul where Julian, as *Caesar*, was leading the campaign against the Germans for his cousin and *Augustus*, Constantius II. Following the strategies of some recent readers of this oration but ultimately going in a different direction, I propose that we read this self-consolation as more than a consolation: it also, and perhaps primarily, functions as a meditation on friendship whose undeniable investments in pederastic homoeroticism blur the line between the homoerotic and homosocial. This blurring provides important data about how men from the educative milieu that produced Julian could image friendship between men. This blurring also suggests that our categories of "homosexual" and "homosocial" may hinder analysis of this ancient evidence more than they help it.

In recent studies, the oration has been approached in fairly straightforward ways. G. W. Bowersock interprets it as a genuine work of grieving, "an elaborate and intense discourse of regret on [Salutius'] departure" (1978, 45). Also believing the speech to be for the most part a consolation, Polymnia Athanassiadi (1981, 20) focuses on the oration's engagement with Homer and sees in this intertextuality a movement from darkness to light, which harmonizes nicely with the goal of bringing about consolation even as it demonstrates Julian's devotion to Hellenism. Rowland Smith (1995, 33; 40-41) reads the oration to understand the structure of the friendship between Julian and Salutius. Comparing the oration to Aristotle's notions of what constitutes friendship in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Smith discovers a meeting of intellectual equals (which has ramifications for Smith's arguments about the priority of Julian's philosophizing over that of Salutius).

Reading intertextually (as do Athanassiadi and Smith) and for friendship (as does Smith), I read the oration's intertextual engagements with Plato (*Charmides* 156D) at 244A, Theocritus (*Idyll* 12) at 244C, and Diogenes Laertius/Xenophon (2.49 and *Symposium* 4.12 respectively) at 246C for meaning instead of regarding them as inert and meaninglessly applied proofs of education. Truly taking the measure of the presences of a Socrates who has been overwhelmed by Charmides' beauty, of Theocritus' "inspirer" (*eispnêlos*) and "hearer" (*aitês*), and of Xenophon's or Critoboulus' words of devotion directed to Cleinias allows the reader to perceive Julian doing a number of things. In the first place, the reader will see Julian representing the strength of his devotion to Salutius through the invocation of erotic desire. Furthermore, and oddly enough, Julian is able to assert the equality of his relationship with Salutius through the fact that he sometimes seems to be the *eromenos*, while at other times Salutius does. Indeed, the representation of equality through inequality is an apt mode for representing friendship across steep status distinctions -- Julian is a *Caesar* and we are in late antiquity. Lastly, Julian's dexterous manipulation of these older representations of pederastic desire suggests that his reading of these texts is closer to James Davidson's (2001) reception of them than others' (e.g. Halperin, Foucault, et al.).