THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Callimachus and Callimacheanism in the Poetry of Gregory of Nazianzus

Matthew Alexander Theris Poulos

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of the

Department of Greek and Latin

School of Arts and Sciences

Of The Catholic University of America

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Matthew Alexander Theris Poulos

Washington, D.C.

2019

Callimachus and Callimacheanism in the Poetry of Gregory of Nazianzus

Matthew Alexander Theris Poulos, PhD

Director: William McCarthy, PhD

In this study, I analyze the poetics of Gregory of Nazianzus (ca. 330–390 AD), who was one of the first Christian poets writing in Greek to leave an extensive corpus of poetry (~17,000 lines). Gregory work is striking not only for its breadth but also for its wide variety of themes and metrical schemes. As my focal point, I have chosen Gregory's reception and adaptation of the poetry and poetics of Callimachus of Cyrene (ca. 290–230 BC). Callimachus was the first poet in the western tradition to annunciate explicitly an aesthetic and came to typify for subsequent authors an approach to poetry that privileged finely-wrought, compressed, and erudite compositions. I argue that for Gregory, Callimachus' works are more than simply one more source to exploit for nice turns of phrase; rather, Callimachus pervasively shapes Gregory's entire approach to poetic composition. This is seen not only in Gregory's allusions to Callimachean works, which are numerous and occur quite frequently in programmatic contexts, but also in features of Gregory's work like *poikilia* (variety) and a strong authorial *persona* that have their best precedent in Callimachus' variegated *oeuvre*.

In chapter one, I survey Callimachus' reception in the second and third centuries AD. By examining the three most extensive works of hexametric didactic extant from this period (Dionysius' *Periegesis*, Oppian's *Halieutica*, and ps.-Oppian's *Cynegetica*), I argue that Callimachus is a uniquely useful influence for probing how later poets create their poetic *personae* and annunciate their own aesthetic. Chapters 2–5 treat Gregory's poetry. I have organized them around four traits that scholars have consistently associated with Callimachean poetry: originality, fineness (λεπτότης), erudition, and self-awareness. In chapter two, I show how Gregory adapts the untrodden path motif found in the prologue to Callimachus' *Aetia*. I contend that Gregory's

formal experimentation should be regarded as a deliberate embrace of Callimachean *polyeideia*.

Chapter three has as its subject Gregory's poetic style. I show that for Gregory, Callimachus typifies the concise and technically capable poet, as Gregory consistently advocates for concise speech through allusions to Callimachus' works. In the fourth chapter, I attend to Gregory's erudition. His self-proclaimed mastery of both pagan and Christian literature is a foundational aspect of his poetic *persona*. Though the patent didactic intent in some of Gregory's verse is at odds with Callimachus' practice, I argue that when Gregory deploys erudition for polemical and cultural ends he fits neatly within the tradition of Alexandrian didactic. In chapter five, I consider Gregory's poetic self-awareness. I argue that, following Callimachean precedent, Gregory created sequences of multiple poems thematically linked by ring-compositions and self-allusions. I conclude that Gregory edited his poems much more extensively than has previously been recognized. My work illuminates on the one hand how pervasively Callimachus shapes Gregory's approach to poetic composition. Yet I have also identified a number of significant ways in which Gregory consciously departs from his Callimachean model.

This dissertation by Matthew Alexander Theris Poulos fulfills the dissertation requirement for the doctoral degree in Greek and Latin approved by William McCarthy, PhD, as Director, and by Sarah Ferrario, PhD, and Rev. Gregory Gilbert, PhD, as Readers.

_____

William McCarthy, PhD, Director

_____

Sarah Ferrario, PhD, Reader

_____

Rev. Gregory Gilbert, PhD, Reader

Acknowledgments
ἐν παντὶ εὐχαριστεῖτε (1 Thes. 5:18)

It is with a warm heart that I discharge the duty of thanking those who have contributed to this work. I begin, as is fitting, with the professors who have most shaped my scholarly career. While I was an undergraduate at North Carolina State University, I profited enormously from the

I have profited greatly from the broader scholarly community. During 2018–19, Christos Simelidis took time away from a busy research project at Dumbarton Oaks to discuss Gregory's poetry and provided numerous corrections and suggestions on chapters two through five. Ryan Clevenger has helped me think through the broader theological and philosophical currents running through Gregory's work. I am grateful for discussions with Suzanne Abrams Rebillard and her keen sensitivity to Gregory's place within the social fabric of the fourth century AD. I have benefitted much from conversations on Gregory and Late Antique Poetry with James McDonald, Thomas Kuhn-Treichel, Matteo Agnosini, and Gianfranco Agosti, whom I met at a stimulating conference in Heidelberg in 2017.

My friends and family have been a constant source of support throughout the crucible of graduate school. I am especially grateful for my fellow parishioners and friends at the Church of the Advent, in Washington, DC, for how well they have cared for me and for my family. Will Craig, Matthew Whittemore, and Brandt Siegel in particular have helped me remember the broader significance of what I do with my mind. My parents, Matt and Tammy, have nourished my love of books from the moment I was born. Both have always sought to embody the ancient wish: πάντα πατρῶν καὶ φέρτερος εἴης. My son, Gregory, and my daughter, Alexandria, have warmed my heart and helped me learn the discipline and patience needed to see a PhD through to completion. I devote this work to the two women who have contributed most to it; first, to my sister, Cassandra, who moved to Washington, DC to help me finish this dissertation. Her support in every aspect, especially her help with our children, cannot be put into words. Finally, to my wife, Brianna. You have unflaggingly stood by my side, supporting me materially and spiritually, in body and in soul. No man could ask for a more affectionate, more steadfast, or more capable wife. I love you tenderly and pray our God rewards you richly.

Gregorio uoueo uerba haec, natoue sacroue,
  o mea Alexandra, tu quoque honores habes.
 laetus ago grates Cassandrae, quae olim in umbra,
  at ducta in luces gaudia magna tenet.
uxor, blande sinus, quo laudes inueniantur?
  hoc tibi do reuerens, omnia promeritae.

Alex Poulos
Deo gloria
Lent 2019

Table of Contents

Introduction

Gregory of Nazianzus (ca. 330–390 AD) is one of the most fascinating figures of a period marked by religious, political, and cultural transformation. Though Gregory took care to depict himself as an ascetic, his life was nevertheless full of excitement. He tells us of several vivid religious experiences; like his beloved St. Paul, Gregory endured earthquakes, shipwreck, and mob violence. During his storied three years in Constantinople, the Cappadocian endured stoning twice and was the subject of an assassination plot. Even during periods of ascetic withdrawal Gregory was engaged in the ecclesiastical and theological debates that roiled the second half of the fourth century— few of this period wielded the polemicist's pen with more deft and verve.

The Cappadocian bequeathed to posterity an extensive literary corpus: 44 orations, 245 letters, and around 17,000 lines of poetry. As sources for his life, we have also the letters and other treatises of his fellow Cappadocian bishops Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nyssa. Gregory of Nazianzus is thus one of the most well-documented historical figures of antiquity. It is customary, and rightly so, to lament the neglect of Gregory's poetry in modern scholarship. Gregory's verse, after all, is probably the earliest large corpus of classicizing Greek Christian poetry still extant.[1] And yet, we still have no complete critical edition of the entire poetic *corpus*. For many poems, the best text is still found in the Maurist edition of Caillau, subsequently reprinted in *PG* 37–38.[2] Italian is the only modern language to receive a complete translation of Gregory's poems, most of which have also yet to receive scholarly commentary. Gregory's verse requires that the reader be equally familiar with classical Greek literature and the literary traditions of early Christianity, most especially the Bible. Many scholars of early Christianity do

---

[1] Scholars in recent decades have typically followed Golega 1960 in dating the *Metaphrasis psalmorum* to the fifth century, but in a forthcoming volume Andrew Faulkner argues for a fourth-century date.

[2] Caillau 1842

not have the classical background needed to appreciate Gregory's tightly wrought, allusive and elusive verse. Most classicists, those best equipped to appreciate Gregory's literary craft, are either not interested in reading poetry written so late or do not have the requisite familiarity with the literary legacy of the early Church. The situation is happily improving. More and more poems are receiving critical editions and commentaries.[3] The historical studies of John McGuckin and Susannah Elm in particular have made Gregory and his world much more accessible to anglophone readers.[4] Gregory's varied and carefully-wrought body of poetry is finally beginning to receive the attention it deserves.

Nevertheless, much remains to be done. Literary syntheses in particular are lacking. The meticulous work of Kristoffel Demoen remains the only published monograph in English that takes the whole poetic corpus as its object of study; he nevertheless has limited the scope of his analysis to a single poetic technique: the rhetorical *exemplum*.[5] In his unpublished dissertation, Preston Edwards[6] rightly argues that Gregory participates in the same sort of allusive practices as the Alexandrian poets. Yet he only comments on a narrow sliver of Gregory's poetry (*carm.* 1.1.1 1–24 and 2.2.3, 4), and his analysis is more concerned with theological and philosophical questions than literary art.[7] Suzanne Abrams Rebillard's[8] unpublished dissertation ably elucidates a number of important themes from Gregory's autobiographical poetry; she draws our attention most especially to the central role of priestly speech in Gregory's narrations of himself.

---

[3] See the literature review below for bibliography.

[4] See McGuckin 2001 and Elm 2012.

[5] Demoen 1996

[6] Edwards 2003

[7] I concur with Simelidis 2009 24n9 that Edwards.

[8] Abrams Rebillard 2003

Yet constraints of time and space restricted the scope of her work to the poems contained in

section 2.1 of Caillau's edition, the so-called "Autobiographical Poems." Most other treatments

of Gregory's verse have come in the introductions to editions or commentaries, and are

necessarily selective. Consider, for instance, Simelidis' illuminating remarks on Gregory and

Hellenistic poetry and Thomas Kuhn-Treichel's perspicacious analysis of Gregory's figurative

speech.[9]

    I have conceived of this study as a general treatment of Gregory's poetics and have thus

privileged literary questions, rather than historical or theological issues. As my focal point, I have

chosen Gregory's reception and adaptation of the poetry and poetics of Callimachus of Cyrene

(ca. 290–230 BC).[10] This may at first seem an odd choice: why single out for such privileged

examination one strand, however influential, among the tapestry of Gregory's reading? Or if we

must choose a single author, why not consider Homeric influence, or Euripidean? Callimachus

deserves special treatment precisely because of the prominence of aesthetic concerns in his

corpus: he was the first poet in the western tradition to enunciate explicitly an aesthetic and he

came to typify for subsequent authors an approach to poetry that privileged finely-wrought,

compressed, and erudite compositions. In approaching Gregory's poetics through a

Callimachean lens, I am adapting an approach that has long been used for Latin poetry. For

poets like Catullus, Virgil, and Ovid, Callimachus was the indispensable archetype of the

---

[9] See Simelidis 2009 30–46 and Kuhn 2014 41–116.

[10] Callimachus was born in Cyrene, but spent much of his adult life in the court in Alexandria. I have used "the Alexandrian" and "the Cyrenaean" interchangeably to refer to him. Properly speaking, one should differentiate between Callimacheanism (the practice and aesthetic of Callimachus) and Alexandrianism (the practice and aesthetic principles of a broader set of Hellenistic poets, including Callimachus but also Apollonius of Rhodes, Theocritus, Aratus, and others). Yet because it was Callimachus who most came to personify the "Alexandrian" approach to poetry, I have often used "Callimachean" and "Alexandrian" synonymously.

technically skilled and erudite poet; a rich body of literary criticism has shown that Callimachus was a principal influence in shaping how each of these neoteric Roman poets narrated his poetic *persona* and aesthetic.[11] The Cyrenaean was no less influential on subsequent Greek poets than their Latin counterparts, but the Greek verse of the Imperial and Late Antique period has only within the past few decades begun to receive sustained literary analysis.[12] I argue therefore that for Gregory, Callimachus' works are more than simply one more source to exploit for nice turns of phrase; rather, Callimachus pervasively shapes Gregory's entire approach to poetic composition. In short, Gregory narrates his aesthetic in Callimachean terms. This is seen not only in Gregory's allusions to Callimachus, which are numerous and occur quite frequently in programmatic contexts,[13] but also in several striking formal features of Gregory's work that have their clearest precedent in Callimachus' variegated *oeuvre*. Gregory's preference for shorter works composed in a striking array of metrical schemes and genres should be seen as an imitation and emulation of Callimachus' famed generic variety (*polyeideia*), which the Cyrenaean defended most famously in *Iamb.* 13. Like Callimachus, Gregory gives special prominence to his poetic *persona*; both poets primarily worked in genres like elegy, didactic epic, or iambic that admitted a strong *persona*, and eschewed genres like narrative epic in which the *persona* of the poet recedes into the background. Gregory, however, is by no means a servile follower of Callimachus. The Cappadocian exploits numerous opportunities to allude irreverently to his Alexandrian model,[14]

---

[11] For Callimachus' influence in Augustan Latin poetry, the classic study is Wimmel 1960. More recently, see Asper 2016 and Barchiesi 2011.

[12] For example, see De Stefani and Magnelli 2011 for an excellent survey of Callimachus' afterlife in Greek poetry.

[13] See part one of chapter three for a discussion of several poignant examples. The most extensive list of Callimachean allusions in Gregory may be found in Wyss 1983 850–52. For allusions specifically to the prologue to the *Aetia*, see Hollis 2002.

[14] See examples in chapter two, section "*Topoi* and Allusions" and chapter 4, section "The Hymnic Hail."

and I shall argue that Gregory regards certain features of his own style, especially the cultivation of didactic elements like gnomes and proverbs, as deliberate departures from Callimachus (chapter 3). And yet even these departures from Callimachean precedent are often motivated by Gregory's (quite Callimachean) desire to tread the untrodden path, namely, to baptize the verse-forms of classical Greek poetry for orthodox, Christian use.

In the remainder of the introduction, I sketch Gregory's life before surveying the modern literary approaches to Gregory's poetry. I then review briefly the scholarly literature on Gregory's relationship to Callimachus. In chapter one, I set the stage for Gregory's appropriations of Callimachus by surveying the Alexandrian poet's reception in the second and third centuries AD. We shall see that Callimachus' popularity is well-attested in the papyrological record; and yet the Cyrenaean poet was was cited almost exclusively by poets, but ignored by rhetoricians. I argue that Callimachus came to typify a specifically poetic eloquence; Homer, by contrast, typified a more capacious literary culture that included prose and verse. By examining the three most extensive works of hexametric didactic extant from this period (Dionysius' *Periegesis*, Oppian's *Halieutica*, and ps.-Oppian's *Cynegetica*), I contend that Callimachus is a uniquely useful influence for probing how later poets create their poetic *personae* and articulate their own aesthetic. Both Dionysius and ps.-Oppian carefully depict themselves as Callimacheans by employing pointed allusions to programmatic passages of the Alexandrian's work. Oppian, by contrast, rejects many features typical of Alexandrian didactic in favor of a more narrative, "Homeric" approach. Yet even here, Callimachus functions for Oppian as an important aesthetic foil.

I have organized Chapters Two through Five around four traits that scholars have consistently associated with Callimachean poetry: originality, fineness (λεπτότης), erudition, and

self-awareness.[15] In chapter two, we see how Gregory adapts the untrodden path motif found in

the prologue to Callimachus' *Aetia*. I then consider how Gregory innovates in small and large

ways within the highly traditional genre of Greek epigram before analyzing a poem that is

generically much more innovative, the 630+ line hexametric *De rebus suis* (2.1.1). I contend that

Gregory's formal experimentation should not be regarded as a fundamental insensitivity to form,

as Keydell maintained,[16] but as a deliberate embrace of Callimachean *polyeideia*. Chapter three

has as its subject Gregory's poetic style. I show that, for Gregory, Callimachus typifies the concise

and technically capable poet, for the Cappadocian consistently advocates for concise speech in

Callimachean terms. Though in Gregory's verse we do find prosodic irregularities (or false

quantities), close analysis of his metrical practices shows that he is otherwise a careful poet

sensitive to rhythm and diction. Moreover, he adopts certain stylistic features that though present

in other poets, were especially prominent in Callimachus, such as anaphora, juxtaposed prosodic

variants, and anastrophe. I then show that Gregory considered his cultivation of didactic features

like *gnōmai* and proverbs to be the signature element of his style. This leads to a novel

interpretation of a difficult passage in Gregory's *In suos versus* (2.1.39 58–70), where I argue that

Gregory draws attention to the style, not merely the contents, of his poetry. In the fourth chapter,

I attend to Gregory's erudition. We see that Gregory's self-proclaimed mastery of both pagan

and Christian literature is a foundational aspect of his poetic *persona*. Like Callimachus and other

Hellenistic poets, Gregory attended carefully not only to prior poetry, but also to earlier prose,

---

[15] These traits are derived from programmatic statements made by Callimachus and have been mainstays of literary criticism for at least a century. They are prominent, for example, in Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1912 209–12 and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1924 169–89, esp. 177 and 181–82. More recently, Harder 2012 37–38 lists all of these traits as characteristic of Callimachus *Aetia*. For fuller recent treatments of Callimachean and Alexandrian poetics, see Hutchinson 1988 26–84, Asper 1997, Fantuzzi and Hunter 2005 and Ambühl 2005.

[16] Keydell 1953 142–43

especially philosophical literature. Though the patent didactic intent in some of Gregory's verse is at odds with Callimachus' practice, when Gregory deploys erudition for polemical and cultural ends he fits neatly within the tradition of Alexandrian didactic. In chapter five, I consider Gregory's poetic self-awareness. Though scholars have generally been disinclined to see any larger ordering in Gregory's poetic *oeuvre*, I argue that, following Callimachean precedent, Gregory created sequences of multiple poems thematically linked by ring-compositions and self-allusions. I make my case through careful attention to internal cross-references in seven elegiac poems (2.1.10, 15, 16, 45, 34a/b, and 38) and to the references within these poems to other parts of Gregory's poetic *corpus*. I conclude that Gregory edited his poems much more extensively than has previously been recognized, even if he never succeeded in fully editing his poetry into an aesthetically unified *Gesamtwerk*. Taken together, these chapters illuminate just how pervasively Callimachus shapes Gregory's approach to poetry and poetic self-presentation, but also significant ways in which Gregory consciously departs from Callimachean precedent.

Though I have not endeavored to edit the poems I treat that lack a critical edition, I have on occasion made emendations to the transmitted text or suggested a minority reading. For the convenience of editors of Gregory's verse, I have collected in an appendix these departures from the editions of reference. I have made the perhaps unusual choice of rendering citations from Gregory's verse of more than two lines into English verse.[17] I have generally not accorded other

---

[17] I have rendered Greek hexameter and elegiac couplets into iambic pentameter, since Milton's *Paradise Lost* is the primary English epic. For Greek iambic trimeter, I likewise use iambic pentameter, since Shakespeare is the most important English dramatist and iambic trimeter was the primary meter of dialogue in Greek Tragedy and Comedy. However, when rendering hexameter and elegiac couplets into English I employ more archaic diction (chiefly the now defunct second person thou), which I eschew when rendering iambic trimeter. This captures in part the greater conversational feel of iambic trimeter in Greek, while admitting archaic forms in English captures roughly the vast gulf between the diction typical of Greek hexametric poetry in any age and the contemporary speech. Though I would like in the future to

poets the (perhaps dubious) honor of translating them into verse, since poetic translations of most other poets cited exist in abundance. For Gregory, by contrast, almost no metrical translations in English exist, and I think it vital that those without the requisite Greek be able to experience him as a poet rather than through prosaic renderings that privilege accuracy over elegance. I depart from this practice only in my renderings of *carm.* 2.1.39 (*In suos versus*), where Gregory is especially elusive and hard to parse: here I opt for the clarity of prose. I intend for this work to be useful both to scholars of Greek poetry unaccustomed with Gregory and to scholars of early Christianity unfamiliar with the intricacies of Greek verse. If I have sometimes been more explicit than needed in explaining an allusion or a bit of terminology, it is in the hope that this work will be accessible to wider audience.

Gregory's Life
I am not an historian nor the son of one; a brief sketch, however, of Gregory's biography will be useful for those not familiar with our poet's tumultuous life. For more detail, I refer the reader to a number of excellent historical studies, particularly those of John McGuckin and Susannah Elm.[18] Gregory was born sometime around 330 in Nazianzus, a small town in the Roman province of Cappadocia. This places his birth in the immediate aftermath of Constantine's consolidation of control over the entire Roman empire. Gregory's mother, Nonna, came from a family that had been Christians for several generations. His father, Gregory the Elder,[19] initially

---

develop a scheme for rendering elegiac couplets into English verse that distinguishes them from hexameter, the exigencies of time have prevented this effort for now.

[18] In addition to McGuckin 2001 and Elm 2012, the articles of Neil McLynn and Brad Storin are especially helpful in elucidating Gregory's history. For Gregory's retirement, see especially McLynn 1997, McLynn 2015, and Storin 2011. More generally, see McLynn 2006. For a survey of the modern biographies of Gregory and their conceptual limitations, see Storin 2017.

[19] When referring to the father of our poet, I always make this explicit. "Gregory" without any further adjective always refers to the son and poet.

belonged to a sect called the "hypsistarians" (worshipers of God the most high). The exact nature

of their beliefs and practices is unclear; the sect was perhaps a mixture of pagan and Jewish

elements.[20] After Gregory's father converted, he became bishop of Nazianzus (celibacy was not

yet normative for bishops). Gregory had an older sister, Gorgonion, and a younger brother,

Caesarius. Our poet depicts his birth as a dramatic affair; he tells us that his conception was the

result of a vow his mother made to consecrate a son to divine service.[21]

By the fourth century AD, Cappadocia had developed a flourishing literary culture. The

region nourished not only Gregory's fellow Cappadocian fathers, Basil the Great and Gregory of

Nyssa, but also the ascetic theologian Evagrius (initially a disciple of our Gregory) and a number

of other lesser lights, like Gregory's kinsmen Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium. The literary

activity of these men make Cappadocia in the fourth century one of the most well-documented

periods and places of the ancient world.[22] Gregory's education began in Cappadocia; some

indication of the literary culture may be found in Gregory's epitaphic sequence of epigrams for

his cousin Euphemius (*AnthPal* 8.122–130). This son of a Cappadocian teacher of rhetoric

(Amphilochius) died just before his wedding, but Gregory writes that the young man had

"ascended the heights of verse composition in both Greek and Latin" (*AnthPal* 8.122–23). After

initial instruction in Cappadocian Caesarea, Gregory and his brother Caesarius studied in

Caesarea Maritima in Palestine before moving onto Alexandria. Caesarius studied medicine

there for some time, but Gregory moved on after about a year to Athens, where he spent most of

---

[20] McGuckin 2001 3

[21] Nonna's vow is described at *carm.* 2.1.45 197–201 and more extensively at *carm.* 2.1.11 68–81.

[22] For historical treatments of fourth century Cappadocia, see Van Dam 2003b, Van Dam 2003a, and Van Dam 2002.

his twenties studying rhetoric and literature in the company of his friend and fellow Cappadocian Basil.[23]

Around the age of thirty, Gregory returned home from Athens. There is some indication he worked initially as a professional rhetorician,[24] but then soon embarked on a program of ascetic experimentation with Basil. In late 361 or early 362 he was, against his will, ordained a priest by his father. In 370, Gregory's friend, Basil, was elected archbishop of Cappadocian Caesarea. This sudden reentrance of Basil into public life seems to have surprised and offended Gregory and put strains on their friendship.[25] Gregory supported Basil's bid, but with far less exuberance than Basil anticipated. In 372, Basil convinced Gregory to allow himself to be consecrated bishop of the contested backwater town of Sasima. Cappadocia had been split into two provinces and Anthemius, the metropolitan bishop of the next province, was asserting his jurisdiction over the town.[26] It was a sorry affair: after the episcopal consecration a mob more or less ran Basil, Gregory, and their entourage out of town. This furthered the rift between the two men; Gregory refused to reassert authority over the see, much to Basil's annoyance. Instead, Gregory served as an auxiliary bishop alongside his father in Nazianzus.

After the death of his father in 375, Gregory evidently had no desire to become the titular successor to his father. He entrusted the affairs of the Nazianzene church to a presbyter and went into ascetic withdrawal until 378. During this year, he was called to Constantinople to head a small congregation of Nicene Christians in a city that was predominantly homoian or Arian in its

---

[23] For student life in Athens in the fourth century, see Bernardi 1990.

[24] See McLynn 2006 220–26.

[25] In addition to McGuckin 2001 85–168, see also Rousseau 1998 233–269 for this period of Gregory's life.

[26] See Gallay 1964 61n1.

theological orientation. His three years in the capital were without a doubt the most straining and exciting of his life. Gregory led a remarkably successful preaching campaign that elicited much resentment from his theological opponents. Twice he was pelted with stones, and once was nearly assassinated. He also faced intrigue from within his own party. The Christian-Cynic philosopher Maximus initially ingratiated himself to Gregory, but later schemed to have himself anointed as archbishop of the capital. During the council of Constantinople in summer 381, which bestowed to posterity the revised form of the Nicene creed used in nearly all Christian churches, Gregory initially enjoyed significant influence. Theodosius had him designated as the next archbishop of Constantinople. After Meletios of Antioch died, Gregory took over as president of the council. But he was soon outmaneuvered on two fronts. Gregory supported an extremely unpopular solution to the episcopal succession crisis then underway in Antioch. Moreover, Gregory's whole-hearted and open assertion of the Holy Spirit's full divinity was seen as politically inconvenient at a period when Nicene Christians were not all certain about the nature of the Holy Spirit. One faction began to claim that Gregory could not be legally installed as archbishop since he was already the bishop of another see (they regarded the Gregory's consecration as bishop of Sasima still valid). Rather than ride out the criticism, Gregory retired in dramatic fashion to his home in Nazianzus.

Though he was then physically removed from the center of imperial and ecclesiastical politics in the east, Gregory remained well-connected and informed about developments in the capital. Even before returning home he embarked on an ambitious literary program to rehabilitate his reputation both at home and in Constantinople.[27] A flurry of apologetic and

---

[27] See Storin 2011.

polemical poems flew forth.[28] The following year, Gregory was invited to a council in the capital to address the growing Apollinarian crisis.[29] In reply, Gregory dispatched a bitter critique of bishops (*carm.* 2.1.13) and a series of theological letters (*ep.* 101 and 102) that quickly became received as the Orthodox reply to Apollinarianism. Gregory's correspondence bears witness to his continued contact with people in the capital during his retirement.[30] Yet ecclesiastical matters were also tense at home. Much to the chagrin of the Nazianzene church and the Cappadocian bishops, Gregory had no interest in asserting episcopal jurisdiction over his father's see in Nazianzus. Gregory probably was genuinely tired of the demands episcopal leadership, but such a move would also have given ammunition to his critics in the capital who claimed that he was already the legitimate bishop of another see. However, in 382, when a group of Apollinarians tried to claim the Nazianzene episcopacy, he finally decided to yield to his fellow bishops' pleas and reassert control; this he did with the help of the governor Olympius.[31] Within a year, however, Gregory had orchestrated a successful transfer of the see to a successor, after which he retired from public ministry for good. Throughout his retirement, Gregory worked tirelessly to collect and edit his vast literary output. In 384, Gregory sent a collection of letters to his grand-nephew Nicobulus.[32] This is the basis on the corpus transmitted by the Byzantine manuscripts.

---

[28] Most notably 2.1.11 *De vita sua*, 2.1.12 *De seipso et episcopis*, and 2.1.13 *In episcopos*.

[29] Apollinaris and his followers asserted that divine aspect of Jesus' nature, the λόγος θεοῦ, effectively erased Jesus' human mind.

[30] For instance, his correspondence with Nectarius.

[31] On this sequence of events, see McLynn 2015.

[32] See Storin 2016.

Gregory carefully sifted through his orations for publication, and, as I argue in chapter five, much of his poetry as well. Jerome tells us that he died in 389 or 390.[33]

Literary Approaches to Gregory's Poetry

I do not wish to reproduce Preston Edwards' survey of modern literary approaches to Gregory's poetry, which is particularly insightful on Gregory's reception in the 16–19th centuries.[34] Edwards has shown that Gregory enjoyed a high reputation among the Hellenists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Cappadocian's allusive play with prior literature and literary synthesis of Athens and Jerusalem were decidedly appealing to scholars working during the Renaissance, Reformation, and Counter-Reformation, like Aldus Manutius, Erasmus, and Jacques de Billy. Though Gregory is seen today primarily as a rhetorician, it was his poetry that first attracted attention in the Renaissance. Selections of his poetry were published before his orations and letters; a number of Renaissance scholars preferred Gregory's poetry to his prose.[35] The tide began to turn in the eighteenth century: in a generally sympathetic treatment of Gregory's epigrams, Ludovico Muratori felt the need to defend his choice to edit Gregory's poems.[36] The end of the eighteenth century brought the rise of Romanticism as the dominant paradigm for understanding poetry; this mode of thinking dominated approaches to Greek and Latin verse for the next century and a half. This was a mixed blessing for Gregory. On the one hand, scholars working within an essentially Romantic paradigm maintained that authentic expression of emotion was the highest end of poetry. Some scholars, especially those working in

---

[33] Jerome tells us at the end of *De viris illustribus* that he wrote the work in the fourteenth year of Theodosius (392–93 AD). Jerome places Gregory's death three years earlier (section 117).

[34] Edwards 2003 1–49.

[35] See Edwards 2003 23–43.

[36] Muratori 1709

France and Italy, thus found much to like in Gregory, since so much of his autobiographical

poetry is marked by highly emotive and intense self-scrutiny.[37] On the other hand, the Romantic

emphasis on original expression of direct experience led many scholars, especially those working

in Germany,[38] to regard allusions and other techniques of "bookish" poetry as aesthetic defects,

evidence of a degenerate obsequiousness to the past.[39] Moreover, scholars posited a fundamental

gap between true poetry (the authentic expression of emotion) and rhetoric (speech marred by

sophistic techniques). Wilamowitz's remarks, which are, if anything, sanguine for his period,

illustrate well how poetry and rhetoric were understood under this Romantic paradigm:

> "It was disastrous for Gregory that his period was so divorced from the
> naive and unknown that they only recognized the artful, stylistic aspects
> of rhetoric and that the rhetoric which he learned in Athens not only
> denied in principle the basic distinction between poetry and prose, but
> even played with it to the extreme."[40]

Even the classical Latin poets suffered from this view: Virgil fell out of favor in Germany during

the course of the nineteenth century and had to be rehabilitated at the beginning of the

twentieth.[41] Scholars of this persuasion read Gregory primarily as an instrument to reconstruct

earlier, "better" poets.[42] *Quellenforschung* became a means not for considering Gregory's creative

---

[37] In this camp belong, for example, Villemain 1874, Benoît 1876, and Pellegrino 1932.

[38] The divide between French and German valuations of Gregory was noted already by Ackermann 1903 11 at the beginning of the twentieth century.

[39] Eliot 1920 sagely analyzes the limitations of this Romantic conception of poetry which was still tacitly supreme in period between the great wars.

[40] "*Da ward ihm verhängnisvoll, daß seine Zeit, dem Naiven und Unbewußten ganz entfremdet, nur die künstliche Stilisierung der Rhetorik anerkannte, und daß die Rhetorik, die er in Athen gelernt hatte, nicht nur den Unterschied zwischen Poesie und Prosa prinzipiell negierte, sondern auch eigentlich nur Fortissimo zu spielen wußte*" Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1912 293.

[41] See Hardie 1995.

[42] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1912 294 found Gregory especially interesting because he was useful for reconstructing earlier, lost poetry.

appropriations of the literary past, but a tool for condemning Gregory's lack of originality.[43]

Gregory was typically regarded instead as essentially a rhetorician, often a bombastic one of the

Asian school, who ought not to have ventured into poetry.[44] These Romantic views of Gregory

found their culmination in the middle of the twentieth century in the work of Michele Pellegrino

on the one hand and Bernard Wyss and Roger Keydell on the other. Pellegrino saw in Gregory's

autobiographical poems authentic expressions of religious experience but held that his "lyric

impulse" was often choked out in the Cappadocian's other kinds of verse, especially didactic

poetry.[45] For Keydell, Gregory was essentially a rhetorician with no sense for poetic form

attempting to write verse. Moreover, Gregory's alleged insensitivity to literary form supposedly

mirrored the even deeper gulf between Gregory's deep Christian faith and the pagan spirit that

animated the poets of the classical past. Thus Keydell saw the chief historical significance of

Gregory's work precisely in this "turning away" from both the form and substance of the

Hellenic past.[46] Bernard Wyss was rather more sympathetic than Keydell, but similarly saw a

fundamentally irreconcilable gap between the pagan literary past and the new Christian world.

In his view, Gregory's attempt to bring pagan antiquity and Christianity into a "living unity"

(*lebendige Einheit*) was a noble but ultimately failed task. Gregory was unable to escape the literary

---

[43] Even a fairly sympathetic critic like Bernard Wyss wrote that Gregory, lacked the skill to escape the ossified poetic conventions of the fourth century: "*Aber es fehlte ihm [sc. Gregor] die schöpferische Kraft, die Konvention zu sprengen, in der die griechische Poesie erstarrt war*" Wyss 1949 203.

[44] See especially Schissel von Fleschenberg 1935, a scathing and unjust review of Pellegrino 1932.

[45] Pellegrino 1932 19

[46] "*So erscheinen die Gedichte Gregors als ein Seitenschössling am Baum der griechischen Literaturgeschichte, entsprossen aus den Wurzeln einer Persönlichkeit, in der die griechische Bildung durch innerlichtstes Christentum wieder aufgehoben wurde. Zwiespalt der Form in den einen, Zwiespalt des Inneren als Gegenstand der anderen— beides bedeutet eine Loslösung vom Antiken. Dass sie uns diese Abkehr, die ganz unfreiwillig ist, erzwungen durch die Verchristlichung des Geistes— das ist, über das Literarhistorische hinaus, die allgemeine geistesgeschichtliche Bedeutung der Gedichte Gregors*" Keydell 1953 142–43.

conventions of his period, but was "as sensitive to the cultural heritage of Greece as was possible for a Christian of his time." Though each scholar's synthesis has a different flavor, we see that in each Romantic ideals are taken axiomatically. Because in such a view poetry is essentially an expression of an identity, Gregory's Christianity takes on outsized importance, whether as a positive, innovating agent (Pellegrino), or as a hindrance in fully grasping the Hellenic *Geist* (Wyss and Keydell). For each, moreover, the Romantic binary between poetry and rhetoric obtained: Gregory's poetic efforts were marred by rhetorical impulses.

These paradigms were challenged during the middle decades of the twentieth century, especially by Giorgio Pasquali's rehabilitation of allusion as a legitimate poetic exercise,[47] whence originated a rich and varied theoretical discourse on "intertextuality."[48] Though most Classical scholars theorizing about intertextuality were interested in classical Latin poetry, the models were easily transferrable to later Greek verse, since the legitimacy and significance of allusion are central issues to both *corpora*. Antonio Salvatore was the first to apply Pasquali's notions to Gregory's verse.[49] Franca Ela Consolino has criticized Salvatore's analysis for being overly impressionistic;[50] yet even if Salvatore's analysis was imperfect, his theoretical reorientation was rightly influential, for he insisted that each allusion be analyzed on its own aesthetic merit, rather than dismissed *a priori* as an imitation.[51] Though the views of Wyss and Keydell occasionally still find proponents,[52] most scholars since the 1960s have had greater sensitivity to and sympathy

---

[47] See Pasquali 1942. For the reception of Pasquali, see Citroni 2011.

[48] For examples of particularly influential studies on intertextuality, see Conte 1986 (revisited in Conte 2014), Conte and Barchiesi 1989, and Hinds 1998.

[49] Salvatore 1960

[50] Consolino 1987 409

[51] Salvatore 1960 41

[52] *e.g.* Hose 2004

with the aesthetic opportunities presented by allusion. The Romantic dichotomy between poetry

and rhetoric has also been challenged, though more slowly.[53] Ruth Webb and Jeffrey Walker

have brought to light the complicated give-and-take between rhetoricians and poets.[54] They

observe that rhetoricians of all periods of antiquity continued to read poetry closely and often

turned to poetic texts to illustrate rhetorical principles and techniques. Rather than seeing a

fundamental opposition between rhetoric and poetry, educated men and women in antiquity

tended to regard rhetoric as a skill that enabled eloquence in both verse and prose. Scholars like

Gianfranco Agosti have thus argued that rhetoric should be viewed as a sort of toolkit

appropriate for the composition any artful speech.[55]

 The latter half of the twentieth century saw important philological advances in the study

of Gregory's poetry. The students of Bernard Wyss and Martin Sicherl produced a number of

critical editions and commentaries of individual poems.[56] Sicherl and Werhahn produced

important analyses of the textual transmission.[57] Roberto Palla and Manfred Kertsch

collaborated on several editions.[58] The first and only complete translation of Gregory's poetry

into a European vernacular also occurred during this time (Italian).[59] On the literary front,

Nicastri and Consolino have highlighted Gregory's innovating role in the history of Greek elegy

---

[53] Hose 2004 condemns Late Antique verse for failing to escape the concerns of the rhetorical school. Vertoudakis 2011 219 uses the language of tyranny to describe the ascendency of rhetoric in the fourth century.

[54] See Webb 1997 and Walker 2000.

[55] See most recently Agosti 2019.

[56] See Knecht 1972, Jungck 1974, Beuckmann 1988, Meier 1989, Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991, Sundermann 1991, Zehles and Zamora 1996, and Domiter 1999.

[57] See Sicherl, Höllger, and Werhahn 1985, Sicherl and Gertz 1986, and more recently Sicherl 2011.

[58] See Palla and Kertsch 1985 and Crimi, Kertsch, and Guirau 1995.

[59] See Moreschini et al. 1994 Crimi and Costa 1999.

and epigram respectively.[60] Claudio Moreschini and D.A. Sykes produced reevaluations of

Gregory's verse sensitive both to literary concerns and Gregory's philosophical and religious

contributions.[61] This is most evident in their edition, commentary, and English translation of the

Poemata arcana (1.1.1–5, 7–9).[62] The studies of Brooks Otis, Herbert Musurillo, and Peter Gilbert

elucidated sympathetically the theological aspects of Gregory's verse.[63]

We have seen in the opening decades of the twenty first century further progress on the

philological front. The first volume of Gregory's autobiographical verse appeared in the Budé

series.[64] Christos Simelidis has produced an excellent edition[65] of four poems from *Gedichtgruppe* 1

and has inherited the task from Martin Sicherl of producing the critical edition of the entire *oeuvre*

for *Corpus Christianorum*. A number of Italian scholars have produced editions and commentaries

of individual poems.[66] Literary treatments have tended either to focus on how Gregory skillfully

manipulated his literary past or considered Gregory among the broader backdrop of cultural and

religious transformation in Late Antiquity. In the former camp, Preston Edwards, Thomas

Kuhn-Treichel, Simelidis and Juliette Prudhomme each see Gregory as a skillful poet who brings

new life to the literary tradition, especially through the introduction of Christian themes.[67] By

contrast, Suzanne Abrams Rebillard's sensitive treatment of *carm.* 2.1.2 shows the benefit of

---

[60] See Nicastri 1981 and Consolino 1987.

[61] See Sykes 1989a Sykes 1985 Sykes 1989b Sykes 1979, Moreschini 1988 Moreschini 1997.

[62] Sykes and Moreschini 1997

[63] See Otis 1961 Musurillo 1970, Gilbert 1994, and Gilbert 2001.

[64] See Bady, Tuilier, and Bernardi 2004.

[65] Simelidis 2009

[66] For example, Moroni 2006, Ricceri 2013, and De Blasi 2018.

[67] Edwards 2003, Kuhn 2014 Simelidis 2009, and Prudhomme 2006

reading Gregory's work against contemporary political and religious disputes.[68] Similarly, Andreas Schwab has rejected an overly narrow classicizing and formalist approach to Gregory's verse, insisting instead that we read poems like Gregory's *carm.* 1.1.5 (*De providentia*) as legitimate participants in a broader philosophical and theological discourse,[69] just as Gianfranco Agosti has consistently emphasized the capacity for Christian poetry like Gregory's to produce genuine dialogue between competing religious sects.[70] Though my own study is decidedly literary in orientation, I have kept Gregory's historical context in the forefront of my thinking.

Within this broader framework, I now wish briefly to survey scholarly treatments of Gregory's debts to Callimachus. Scholars in the nineteenth century were typically interested in Gregory because he contained traces of earlier poets like Callimachus. Indeed, the influential scholar of Alexandrian poetry Augustus Ferdinand Naeke recommended the reading of Gregory precisely for this reason.[71] Wyss judged that Callimachus was the most important linguistic model for Gregory after Homer and Euripides.[72] Yet the aesthetic potential of such allusions was ignored or discounted. Wyss remarks that "the allusions to Callimachus are numerous, but without any sensitivity for the fineness of his models in tone and structure. It is a rather uncomfortable sensation, as though we were being forced to listen to a beloved piece of music on an old and scratchy record player."[73] Gregory's allusions to Callimachus have only slowly begun

---

[68] Abrams Rebillard 2013

[69] Schwab 2009 130

[70] See especially Agosti 2009.

[71] Naeke 1842 237, *cit.* Edwards 2003 9.

[72] Wyss 1949 192

[73] "*Die Nachahmungen [von Kallimachos] sind zahlreich, aber ohne Gefühl für die Feinheiten der Vorlage in Tonart und Versbau: Es ist uns etwa zumute, als müßten wir ein uns vertrautes schönes Musikstück auf einer abgenützten, kratzigen Schallplatte anhören*" Wyss 1949.

to receive closer scrutiny. A. Kambylis' brief article noted Gregory's use in *Poem. arc.* 1 of the opening to Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*. He argued, not always persuasively, that Gregory shifted Callimachus' emphasis on the visual realm to the auditory.[74] Otherwise, it was not until the beginning of the twenty first century that Gregory's interaction with the Alexandrian poets began to receive detailed scrutiny. In a perceptive article, Adrian Hollis has shown that Gregory alludes to so many different parts of the programmatic prologue to Callimachus' *Aetia* in so many different poems that it is fair to surmise he had the opening memorized.[75] Simelidis has shown in his survey of "Gregory and Hellenistic Poetry"[76] that Gregory sensitively alludes to a wide range of Hellenistic poetry, even to genres one might not expect, like pederastic epigram. In a wide-ranging study, Juliette Prudhomme profitably juxtaposes Gregory's refashioning of the literary tradition with the efforts of the Alexandrian poets;[77] Preston Edwards even dared to treat Gregory *qua* an Alexandrian poet. Though the latter's analysis of individual texts sometimes misses important features,[78] his fundamental conviction that Gregory exhibits the same allusive practices as those of the Alexandrian poets is correct. Byron MacDougall has shown moreover

---

[74] See Kambylis 1982. I am not convinced that in *carm.* 1.1.1 3 alludes to *hAp* 9, and am not sure why Kambylis considers ἀναφαίνειν ("to render visible or intelligible") to be a verb "in the acoustic realm" (*im akustischen Bereich*).

[75] Hollis 2002

[76] Simelidis 2009 30–46

[77] Prudhomme 2006 143, 180

[78] Edwards 2003 54 ably presents the Platonic resonances of the opening lines of *Poem. arc.* 1.1–3, but neglects the poetic and poetological resonances. The metrical choice (hexameter) and the opening word οἶδα ("I know") sets the poem within a tradition of didactic epic. Moreover, the juxtaposition of a "great voyage" (μακρὸν πλόον) with "tiny wings" (τυτθαῖς πτερύγεσσι) shows Gregory's poetic ambition to treat a great theme in a Callimachean manner.

that Gregory even deployed Callimachean catch-phrases in his prose, something decidedly

atypical for rhetoricians of the Imperial and Late Antique periods.[79]

The present work makes several contributions to the literary study of Gregory's poetry.

First, I consider in Gregory's work a broad range of Callimachean techniques. I naturally treat a

number of Gregory's allusions to Callimachean texts, but I also consider how Callimachus shapes

other aspects of Gregory's craft, like metrics, syntax, and verbal repetitions. Second, I connect

Gregory's Callimacheanism to issues of more general significance. I am especially interested in

how Gregory shapes of his poetic *persona* and the manner in which he narrates his aesthetic.

Prudhomme and McGuckin have both made important contributions to our understanding of

Gregory's poetics,[80] but neither has shown sufficient sensitivity to the manner in which Late

Antique poets delineated their aesthetic values. As we shall see in chapter one, it is precisely

through allusions to Callimachus' work that Imperial and Late Antique poets espoused their

poetic goals. Third, I consciously privilege aesthetic rather than religious explanations for novel

phenomena in Gregory's verse. Though the dichotomy between pagan and Christian is

elemental to understanding Gregory's poetic work, scholars have too quickly invoked Gregory's

Christianity to explain original elements in his poetry.[81] Gregory's sincere faith pervasively

shaped his work, and yet the tonal and generic variety of Gregory's poetic *oeuvre* is by no means a

straightforward requirement of his Christian faith. There were far more straightforward paths for

a Christian poet to follow. He could have written biblical epic, as did Apollinaris and Nonnus;

---

[79] MacDougall 2016

[80] See McGuckin 2006 and Prudhomme 2006.

[81] For example, Consolino 1987 Vertoudakis 2011.

hagiographic verse, as would Eudocia; or even cento.[82] Instead he composed a highly variegated

corpus of different tones, registers, genres, and metrical schemes. It is my contention that

Callimachean categories are precisely what we need to render these aesthetic decisions

intelligible and appealing.

---

[82] Though several scholars continue to maintain Gregory's authorship of the *Christus patiens* (*e.g.* Tuillier 1969, Salanitro 2003, Centanni 2007), I regard it as almost impossible that Gregory would produce a text with such haphazard attention to classical prosody, even granting that he does not always follow classical quantities. For treatments that reject Gregorian authorship, see Most 2008 and Hörander 1988.

Chapter 1: The Imperial Callimachus

Part 1: Scholastics, Sophists, and Singers

I have made the claim in the introduction that the study of Callimachus' afterlife is a particularly

fruitful avenue for exploring the aesthetic developments of later Greek verse. It is not that other

poets were unimportant: Callimachus never did match Homer or Euripides in popularity. Other

hellenistic poets like Apollonius and Theocritus were clearly much read and admired. Yet it was

Callimachus, through his strong authorial *persona*, who came to typify the "Alexandrian" way to

poetic composition. As we shall see, when subsequent poets wished to depict themselves as

erudite and skilled wordsmiths, they nearly always availed themselves of the Cyrenaean's legacy.

Before turning to Gregory in chapters 2–5, I wish to explore in further detail Callimachus'

influence in the period preceding Gregory, roughly the first two and a half centuries of the

common era. I consider first the historical evidence we have of Callimachus from the period: his

presence in the papyrological record, prose literature, and the poetry of the period. I argue that

the sophists largely ignored Callimachus in favor of earlier verse and that the Cyrenaean

correspondingly came to embody specifically poetic, rather than prosaic *technē*. In the second half,

we turn to the three most extensive poetic compositions still extent from this period: Dionysius'

Periegesis, Oppian's *Halieutica*, and ps.-Oppian's *Cynegetica*. I there argue that Callimachus was

indispensable for the creation of poetic *personae* and for delineating aesthetic principles. Even

when Callimachean poetics were rejected, as in the case of Oppian, the Cyrenaean continued to

serve as a negative aesthetic foil.

I begin the chapter by surveying Callimachus' role in the school. Most educated people

would have been introduced to Callimachus during their secondary schooling with a

grammarian. We then consider what subsequent poets had to say explicitly about Callimachus.

The primary evidence here are the Callimachean and anti-Callimachean epigrams preserved in

the *Palatine Anthology*. After the poets, we turn to the sophists, who largely ignore Callimachus. This affords the opportunity to consider briefly the relationship between poets and rhetoricians in the Imperial period.[1] With this frame in place we transition to literary analysis in the latter portion of the chapter, where I examine Callimachus' influence on the three most substantial extant poetic works from the Second Sophistic: Dionysius' *Periegesis*, Oppian's *Halieutica*, and Ps.-Oppian's *Cynegetica*. Callimachus emerges as a significant model for both Dionysius and Ps.-Oppian. By contrast, Oppian narrates his own poetics in sharply anti-Callimachean terms; yet even here, Callimachus is significant as an aesthetic foil. Considering Callimachean influence thus reveals much about the poetics of each author, even when the Cyrenaean is rejected as a model.

Callimachus in the School

Καλλίμαχον πωλῶ καὶ Πίνδαρον ἠδὲ καὶ αὐτὰς
πτώσεις γραμματικῆς πτῶσιν ἔχων πενίης.

"I'm selling my Callimachus, Pindar, and those books of declensions,
since I've suffered a case of grammatical poverty." (*AP* 9.175, Palladas,
4th. c. AD)

Like Vergil, Callimachus' works quickly became classics. P.Lille 76d dates to within a generation of the Cyrenaean's death (3rd c. BC). Its basic interpretative paraphernalia suggest that Callimachus was already being read in the school, or at least by a broad, educated audience. Evidence from the Imperial period and Late Antiquity shows that Callimachus was a common school author. In the epigram *AP* 9.175, Palladas the grammarian (4th c. AD) describes himself as selling Pindar, Callimachus, and grammar books so he can take up a different profession. We likewise possess positive evidence for several of the individual works. Atheneaus' *Deipnosophistae*

---

[1] I occasionally draw on material from Late Antiquity, but most of the material in this chapter originates from the first three centuries of the common era.

15.669c (2nd. c. AD) refers to one of Callimachus' epigrams as "those which are read by children (παῖδες)."[2] For the *Hecale*, we have the testimony of P. Rainier VI (The Vienna Tablet), which is a wooden tablet of the sort used in schools. On one side are scratched four lines of the *Hecale*, on the reverse, several lines of Euripides. The *Aetia* was Callimachus' most famous work. Several grammarians wrote commentaries on it and we find frequent citations in the grammatical treatises of the Empire.[3] None of the numerous surviving papyri have been positively identified as school fragments. Yet the broad geographical and temporal range of the papyri, the simple commentaries and summaries that survive, and the frequent imitations by later authors demonstrate its presence in the grammarian's classroom. The *Hymns* of Callimachus were not so popular as his *Aetia*, at least to judge from the surviving papyri, but several reading lists confirm their presence in the schools.[4] The paucity of school texts is surprising, but comprehensible. Papyri from school contexts are generally recognized because of their unsure penmanship. As notes, by the time students have begun reading authors like Callimachus and Pindar, their penmanship is normally indistinguishable from that of any other fully literate person.[5]

The presence of Callimachus in the sophist's classroom is harder to establish. From Libanius's *ep.* 1066, we do know that tragedies were read aloud in the classroom.[6] Libanius also mentions "Homer, Hesiod, and the other poets" in a context in *ep.* 1036 that refers to studies undertaken in his own school.[7] Callimachus, however, seems to have played little role in the

---

[2] τοῦτο γὰρ ἐν παισὶ τὰ Καλλιμάχου ἀναγινώσκων ἐπιγράμματα.

[3] Harder 2012 68–70

[4] Cribiore 2005 202

[5] Cribiore 2009 329

[6] See discussion by Cribiore 2005 227.

[7] Miguélez-Cavero 2008 230

rhetorical classroom. Dio Chyrsostom recommends that aspiring rhetors confine themselves to Homer, Euripides, and Menander.[8] Even the sophists who wrote verse seem to have written mostly traditional epics and tragedies. Scopelianus (a sophist active during the first part of the 2nd c. AD), for instance, wrote an epic entitled *Gigantias*, that would have narrated the battle between the Giants and the Olympians— hardly a Callimachean theme. Indeed, the beginning of Philostratus' life of Scopelianus mentions critics of the great sophist that sound like Callimacheans. They are "nitpickers" (λεπτολόγοι) who complain that Scopelianus was an unrestrained, incredibly prolix dithyrambode.[9] The word for prolix (πεπαχυσμένον) echoes Callimachus' own complaints about the *Lyde* of Antimachus. Even the sophists who composed verse, then, seem to have set Callimachus aside.

This is fact is all the more surprising, as students did many of their rhetorical exercises in verse, not prose.[10] We know, then, that students were composing verse at the rhetorical school. Clearly some children learned to compose poetry before starting rhetorical studies, but it is difficult to say how. Poetic competitions at festivals, which continued until the beginning of the 3rd c. AD, often had categories for παῖδες/*pueri* and ephebes.[11] One particularly striking example is the 43 line extemporaneous hexametric poem performed in 86 AD by the 11-year old Q. Sulpicius Maximus. The poem was inscribed in the boy's honor by his family because the boy died shortly after the contest.[12] It remains unclear where these young men and women were

---

[8] Bowie 1989 211–12 notes that this dictate corresponds well with the citation practices of the sophists themselves.

[9] Philostr *V S* p. 514–15

[10] Cribiore 2005 229–30

[11] See Marrou 1956 134–36, 188 and Döpp 1996 103.

[12] See Döpp 1996.

learning to compose verse. This could have been at home, or in the grammarian's classroom. It might have been at the gymnasium or from professional poets or learned amateurs who happened to be relatives or family members. But though the precise institutional nature of poetry in the early empire is unclear, we shall see that important distinctions between prose and poetry continue to obtain throughout the Imperial period, and that Callimachus is a key figure in this story. At least during the early empire, poetry is not merely subsumed entirely into the rhetorical school, as Martin Hose claims for Late Antiquity.[13]

Callimachus and the Poets

We take up now explicit references to Callimachus by subsequent poets. As we shall see, Callimachus embodied for later generations a skilled and erudite approach to poetry, one that depended on on *technē* rather than *mania*. The schoolmen were the primary torch-bearers for this picture of Callimachus: it was their research and teaching that made Callimachus accessible to students and the larger reading public.

The debate over whether poetry originated from art (*technē*) or inspiration was at least as old as Plato, who famously denied technic status to poets. Plato was not unanimously followed, of course. Indeed Callimachus represented the "technical" pole of the spectrum. Ovid famously characterized the Cyrenaean as a skillful poet utterly lacking in inspiration:

> Battiades semper toto cantabitur orbe;
>   quamvis ingenio non valet, arte valet.

> The son of Battus[14] will ever be sung throughout the world;
> though not inspired, he excelled in ars. (*Am* 1.15.13–14)

This distinction between skill and inspiration was expressed in several images, the most important of which were water and wine. Wine naturally stood for Dionysian mania; water for sober

---

[13] "*Spätgriechische Poesie, so darf man behaupten, ist ein rhetorisches Verfahren.*" Hose 2004 36

[14] i.e. Callimachus

craftsmanship.[15] Callimachus seems not to have characterized himself as a water-drinker: his self-

authored epitaph describes him as one who drank wine moderately. Yet the Cyrenaean's vivid

imagery of sacred streams gave later poets, most especially the Augustan epigrammist Antipater

of Thessalonica, opportunity to slander Callimachus and his followers as pedantic teetotalers:

> φεύγεθ᾽ ὅσοι λόκκας ἢ λοφνίδας ἢ καμασῆνας
>   ᾄδετε, ποιητῶν φῦλον ἀκανθολόγων,
> οἵ τ᾽ ἐπέων κόσμον λελυγισμένον ἀσκήσαντες,
>   κρήνης ἐξ ἱερῆς πίνετε λιτὸν ὕδωρ.
> σήμερον Ἀρχιλόχοιο καὶ ἄρσενος ἦμαρ Ὁμήρου
>   σπένδομεν· ὁ κρητὴρ οὐ δέχεθ᾽ ὑδροπότας. (*AP* 11.20)

> Out, all you who sing of burnoose, cressets, and camasene fish,
> you race of thorn-gathering poets,
> who diligently plait an arrangement of verses
> and drink the cursed water from a holy spring.
> Today, on the day of Archilochus and manly Homer,
> the cup will not allow water-drinkers to make libations.

In a *virtuoso* performance filled with Callimachean allusions, Antipater takes issue with the

Cyrenaean's penchant for recondite vocabulary and overly wrought style. Note that these poets

exert careful discipline (ἀσκήσαντες) to plait their verses into a delicate arrangement (κόσμος).

Recherchée vocabulary was not an uncommon complaint from Callimachus' detractors,

particularly as it encouraged the pedantry of the grammarians. See, for instance, *AP* 11.321

(Phillip of Thessalonica, 1st c. AD) which reworks *AP* 11.322 (Antiphanes of Macedon, 1st c.

AD):

> Γραμματικοὶ Μώμου στυγίου τέκνα, σῆτες ἀκανθῶν,
>   τελχῖνες βίβλων, Ζηνοδότου σκύλακες,
> Καλλιμάχου στρατιῶται, ὃν ὡς ὅπλον ἐκτανύσαντες,
>   οὐδ᾽ αὐτοῦ κείνου γλῶσσαν ἀποστρέφετε,
> συνδέσμων λυγρῶν θηρήτορες, οἷς τὸ „μὶν" ἢ „σφὶν"   [5]
>   εὔαδε καὶ ζητεῖν, εἰ κύνας εἶχε Κύκλωψ,

---

[15] See Knox 1985.

τρίβοισθ' εἰς αἰῶνα κατατρύζοντες ἀλιτροὶ
  ἄλλων · ἐς δ' ἡμᾶς ἰὸν ἀποσβέσατε.

O Grammarians, you children of hateful Blame, chewing away on
thorns,
Telchines of books, whelps of Zenodotus,
Soldiers of Callimachus, whom you extend like a weapon.
Not even here do you turn your attention from his diction—
you hunt obnoxious conjunctions and take pleasure
in researching *min* and *sphin* and whether the cyclops had dogs.
Wicked men, waste your time pestering others,
but stop your arrows from falling on us! (*AP* 11.321)

Γραμματικῶν περίεργα γένη, ῥιζωρύχα μούσης
  ἀλλοτρίης, ἀτυχεῖς σῆτες ἀκανθοβάται,
τῶν μεγάλων κηλῖδες, ἐπ' Ἠρίννῃ δὲ κομῶντες,
  πικροὶ καὶ ξηροὶ Καλλιμάχου πρόκυνες,
ποιητῶν λῶβαι, παισὶ σκότος ἀρχομένοισιν,   [5]
  ἔρροιτ', εὐφώνων λαθροδάκναι κόριες.

You busy-body races of grammarians, root-grubbers
of another's muse, miserable moths that leap from thorn to thorn,
you defile the greats, vaunting over Erinna,
you dry and wretched lap-dogs of Callimachus!
You mar the poets, and are utter darkness for children in their youth
Get out, you pestilential gnats who gnaw on sweet, poetic voices.

These two epigrams are not, strictly speaking, anti-Callimachean. Unlike Antipater, who clearly has the Cyrenaean in his crosshairs, Phillip and Antiphanes have in mind school teachers from whose pedantic tendencies Callimachus has suffered. Phillip's epigram notably has numerous Callimachean elements in his "take-down" of Callimachus' followers. Blame (Μῶμος) in l. 1 is a common character in Callimachus, the τελχῖνες in l. 2, κατατρύζοντες ἀλιτροί in l. 7 reminds one of the prologue to the *Aetia*, where Callimachus complains of the grumbling (ἐπιτρύζω) of the *Telchines*, and the *Hymn to Apollo* l. 2, where sinners (ἀλιτροί) are told to get out of the god's presence.

Callimachus also had his defenders. Pollianus (2nd c. AD), for instance, writes:

Τοὺς κυκλίους τούτους τοὺς „αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα" λέγοντας (1)
  μισῶ, λωποδύτας ἀλλοτρίων ἐπέων.

καὶ διὰ τοῦτ᾽ ἐλέγοις προσέχω πλέον · οὐδὲν ἔχω γὰρ
  Παρθενίου κλέπτειν ἢ πάλι Καλλιμάχου.
„θηρὶ μὲν οὐατόεντι“ γενοίμην, εἴ ποτε γράψω, [5]
  εἴκελος, „ἐκ ποταμῶν χλωρὰ χελιδόνια.“
οἱ δ᾽ οὕτως τὸν Ὅμηρον ἀναιδῶς λωποδυτοῦσιν,
  ὥστε γράφειν ἤδη „μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά.“

I detest these cyclic poets who keep saying, "but thereupon"
and filch the verses of others.
For this reason I keep to elegiacs, for then I can not
steal anything from Parthenius, or again, from Callimachus.
May I become like the "long-eared beast" if I should ever write
"yellow-green celandine from the rivers."
But those poets filch Homer just like this,
and so that they write yet again, "wrath, goddess, sing!" (*AP* 11.130)

We may assume that Pollianus had his tongue firmly in his cheek as he filched famous lines from Parthenius and Callimachus to criticize the rhapsodes who persist in stealing from Homer. In good epigrammatic fashion the poem demonstrates the tendency that Pollianus criticizes. Callimachus represents not only elegy, but a more original approach to poetry less given to stealing lines from poets of the past.

This short survey of later epigram demonstrates that Callimachus typified a skilled and erudite approach to poetic composition. He gained wide-spread acclaim for the success of his works, though some criticized the Cyrenaean as effeminate or lacking in poetic inspiration. Particularly prominent among his later followers were grammarians, who gained a reputation for ruining Callimachus' poems by tediously explaining intricate points of detail for their students. Though satire must always be used with care, there seems to have been plenty of truth in the caricature, as most of the commentaries written on Callimachean works originate from grammarians.[16]

---

[16] Harder 2012 68–70

Callimachus and the Sophists

The ubiquity of Callimachus' works in the grammatical schools and his pervasive influence in

subsequent poetry would lead one to expect that he is cited by the rhetoricians of the Second

Sophistic. This in not the case. But to understand Callimachus' lack of influence in imperial

prose we must elucidate briefly the ways in which poets and sophists interacted in later antiquity.

I argue that poets and sophists shared some canonical literary texts and a common repertoire of

techniques, but nevertheless remained distinct communities with peculiar influences and

aesthetic values. In this broader context, Callimachus came to typify specifically poetic *technē*,

rather than the general παιδεία of Homer.

In most cases, the social contexts in which one might perform a sophistic oration or a

piece of poetry were quite similar. Poetic and rhetorical competitions continue at festivals at least

into the third century AD.[17] Philostratus attests to the ongoing composition and production of

new tragedies, though productions of full tragedies seem to have waned by the beginning of the

third century crisis in favor of excerpts repacked as arias, or sung solos.[18] Prose and poetry might

both be performed at symposia or other private gatherings, which, we should recall could have

public significance if these private individuals happened to be emperors or other high officials. By

contrast, festivals contained separate events for different poetic and prosaic genres: poets did not

compete against sophists directly. Juridical and political orations in councils and courtrooms (i.e.,

practical rhetoric) continued to be prosaic. Verse was the expected medium for inscribed

---

[17] Gangloff 2010

[18] Scopelianus the sophist composed tragedies. A certain tragedian named Isagoras was a student of the sophist Chrestus of Byzantium. Heldmann 2000 is an excellent treatment of the decline of full dramatic performances in the *Kaiserzeit*.

epitaphic eloquence. By and large, then, we see considerable overlap and several key distinctions in the settings for prose and poetry.

When we turn to formal features, we again see numerous commonalities and several important distinctions. The features of prose texts that we often label "rhetorical," like isocolon, anaphora, or parallelism, might actually be better labeled "poetic," since they originated in poetry, a fact that was recognized by the ancient rhetorical theorists.[19] Certain orators had a reputation for indulging too much in these poetic tropes and figures. For example, Philostratus tells us that Hadrian the Sophist, "often fell from dignity of speech by freely employing tragic diction."[20] Lucian mocks similar tendencies in *Rhetorum praeceptor* 19–20. Curiously, the use of these "rhetorical" figures in later poetry is sometimes taken perversely as proof that later poetry is rhetorical.[21] We must remember that techniques like simile or anaphora originated in poetry, and were felt by the ancients to be so. Arguably since Gorgias, prose authors had appropriated for themselves the full range of poetic techniques. Only a few important distinctions remained. Poetry necessarily retained its regular metrical schemes. Moreover, certain types of poetry (epic, elegy, and anything in a Doric or Aeolic dialect) required a vocabulary and morphology that was quite distinct from the fourth century Attic that was the goal of the sophists. Otherwise, however, poetic and prosaic eloquence shared a common horde of tropes, figures, and conceits. Unsurprisingly, then, the sophist Maximus of Tyre claimed that his rhetorical instruction could provide everything needed for poetic composition except metrics.[22]

---

[19] So Philostratus describes Gorgias dignifying prose with poetic vocabulary (*VS* p. 492).

[20] πολλαχοῦ δὲ τῆς μεγαλοφωνίας ἐξέπεσεν ἀταμιεύτως τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ χρησάμενος. (*VS* p. 509)

[21] See Vertoudakis 2011, "ὕφος καὶ ποιητικὴ ῥητορική": 197–209, especially 198.

[22] εἴτε τις ῥητορείας ἐρᾷ, … · εἴτε τις ποιητικῆς ἐρᾷ, ἡκέτω πορισάμενος ἄλλοθεν τὰ μέτρα μόνον, τὴν δὲ ἄλλην χορηγίαν λαμβανέτω ἐντεῦθεν. (*diss.* 1.7).

A similar picture emerges when we consider the literary canons of each discipline. Sophists and poets shared a certain group of authoritative poetic authors: Homer, the tragedians, and Menander were considered indispensable for both groups. Yet, as Bowie has shown,[23] the sophists ignored almost all poetry written after Menander. Lucian cites or alludes to Callimachus only a couple of times in his voluminous corpus; the other sophists of 2nd c. AD, not at all. Instead, rhetoricians naturally focused on prose authors, especially the canonical Attic orators, but also later oratory. The poets, of course, continued to read later poetry, and thus Callimachean echoes are abundant.[24] This has implications for how we understand Callimachus' role in the literary tradition. Homer may have been the prince of poets, but he typified a broad *paideia* that encompassed all artful letters, whether in prose or in verse. For example, consider Dio Chyrsostom's advice to aspiring rhetoricians: "Homer is first, middle and last, for every child, young man, and old man. He offers to each as much as he can receive."[25] Callimachus, by contrast, embodied specifically poetic *technē*, and so we rarely find him cited in works of prose oratory.

Callimachus in Greco-Roman Literary Culture
Our consideration of Callimachus' influence highlights several important distinctions within imperial literary life. Within the poetic tradition, Callimachus continued to serve the function he had for the neoterics at Rome. He represented an approach to poetry more elegant and sophisticated than the more "traditional" stream associated with Homer and Ennius. Nearly all of the subsequent Greek poets whose works survived in medieval manuscripts positioned

---

[23] Bowie 1989

[24] See De Stefani and Magnelli 2011.

[25] Ὅμηρος δὲ καὶ πρῶτος καὶ μέσος καὶ ὕστατος παντὶ παιδὶ καὶ ἀνδρὶ καὶ γέροντι, τοσοῦτον ἀφ' αὑτοῦ διδοὺς ὅσον ἕκαστος δύναται λαβεῖν. *Or.* 18.8

themselves as Callimachean in some way. Yet we must remember that much "traditional" verse continued to be composed. Cicero's *Pro Archia poeta* testifies to the popularity of extemporaneous epic in the first century BC. The sophist Scopelianus may have been criticized for his tragic and epic verses by Callimacheans. From papyri and inscriptions we get suggestive glimpses of what this poetry "traditional" poetry was like. We see no Callimachean echoes in the extemporaneous 43 line hexameter poem mentioned above of the 11 year old Q. Sulpicius Maximus. Callimachean echoes are likewise absent from the *Visio Dorothei*, a 343 line hexameter poem from the 4th c. AD, preserved among the Bodymer papyri. This poem recounts a religious experience of its Christian narrator, Dorotheus, who appears in a dream before the throne of God, is judged for his sins, then cleansed and appointed as a doorkeeper in heaven.[26] Our poet was not particularly skilled. False quantities abound even in vowels clearly long (ω and η).[27] Pauses are found in strange locations,[28] and the narration is often unclear,[29] even though the poem is fairly well preserved.[30] It is unsurprising that such a poet should fail to imitate Callimachus,[31] but this is not due to any Christian prejudice against pagan poetry. Rather, it our poet has clearly

---

[26] See Kessels and Van der Horst 1987. For a measured consideration of the possible historical background of the poems, see Agosti 2017.

[27] For example, l. 112, λίπων (scans as a pyrrhus); l. 271 ἔφηνε scans as a dactyl. Naturally this was because the classical vowel quantities were no longer heard in pronunciation.

[28] See line 179, where a new thought begins at the beginning of the sixth foot.

[29] For instance, ll. 123-25 describe the narrator's fear as reason for leaving his appointed station. He uses a genitive absolute that apparently modifies with the subject of the sentence, ἔγω.

[30] The poet does have a few nice flourishes. When he states that God gave him a desire for "graceful" song (l. 3 ἵμερον ἐν στήθεσσι διδοὺς χαρίεσσα<ν ἐπ' οἴ>μην) we are no doubt meant to hear "elegant" and "infused with Christian grace."

[31] The only possible echo I have found is in l. 57, where φυλάξεμεν is used in the same location as φυλάσσεμεν in Call. *hZeus* 81.

attempted to imitate Homer, not Callimachus.[32] Indeed, Homer is responsible for more than just verbal borrowings, for the entire poem is imbued with a heroic, martial ethos. The Christian sentiments of the *Visio* are striking; yet otherwise the poem represents the "traditional" non-Callimachean poetry that continued to be produced well into Late Antiquity.

Callimachus also underscores the distinctions between the literary canons of the sophists and the poets. Ambitious poets were omnivorous in their reading of earlier verse. Gregory of Nazianzus not only cited archaic and classical poets, but hellenistic and early imperial poets too.[33] Ambitious sophists did the reverse: they confined themselves to classical poetry, but continued to study more recent oratory. Better than any other author Callimachus represents this distinction. He was the earliest and most important poet not to exert much influence on later oratory. Finally, Callimachus illustrates the gap between the educated and the well-educated. Anyone with a couple of years of school at the grammarian knew quite a bit of Homer, and could even, perhaps, compose a few hexameters. It was only after several years of study that a student moved to authors like Hesiod, Pindar, and Callimachus. By alluding to Callimachus, then, a poet benefits from the cachet of a difficult and elegant author. Moreover, as Callimachus was largely ignored by the sophists, Callimachean allusions allow the author to position himself specifically as a poet, rather than a generally well-educated person.

---

[32] A selection of Homeric elements include: νήδυμος ὕπνος ἔπιπτεν ἐπὶ βλεφάροισιν ἐμοῖσιν ("Sweet sleep fell upon my eyes."). *Cf. Od.* 13.79: καὶ τῷ νήδυμος ὕπνος ἐπὶ βλεφάροισιν ἔπιπτε ("And sweet sleep fell upon his eyes."). Dorotheus wishes to be an object of song for future generations (272; cf. Helen in *Il.* 6. 358). Christ stops Dorotheus' scourging so that he does not become "food for dogs and vultures" (158).

[33] See Wyss 1983 for a list of allusions. The same omnivorous attitude may be seen in Nonnus.

Part 2: Callimachus and the Poetics of Imperial Greek Didactic
In part two of this chapter, I consider how Callimachus shaped the poetic *personae* Dionysius of

Alexandria's *Periegesis*, Oppian of Cilicia's *Halieutica*, and ps.-Oppian's *Cynegetica*.[34] The recent

survey of Callimachus' afterlife in subsequent Greek poetry by Claudio De Stefani and Enrico

Magnelli[35] provides a useful starting point. They note that Dionysius and ps.-Oppian were deeply

indebted to Callimachus, while Oppian was largely indifferent to the Cyrenean poet.[36] I here

bring these observations into sharper focus by examining Callimachus' influence on these poets'

personae and programmatic statements. I shall argue that Callimachus was indispensable for the

creation of poetic *personae* and for delineating aesthetic principles. Even when Callimachean

poetics were rejected, as in the case of Oppian, the Cyrenaean continued to serve as a negative

aesthetic foil.

The Periegesis of Dionysius
Scholars have long acknowledged Callimachus' importance as a source for Dionysius. In the

middle of the nineteenth century, Karl Müller had already noted many allusions to Callimachus'

Hymns.[37] Identifications have increased as more of Callimachus has been recovered from papyri.

More recently, however, scholars have emphasized Dionysius' broader allegiance to the

Alexandrian poets instead of positing a particular debt to Callimachus.[38] Jane Lightfoot rightly

emphasizes the role that other Alexandrian poets like Apollonius of Rhodes and Aratus had in

---

[34] Unless otherwise noted, citations from the *Periegesis* come from Lightfoot 2014. I cite the *Halieutica* according to Fajen 1999 and the *Cynegetica* according to Papathomopoulos 2003. Translations are my own unless otherwise noted. Despite occasional assertions to contrary (e.g. White 2001 and Toohey 1996 199–200), it is clear to me, as it is to most other scholars, that the *Cynegetica* and the *Halieutica* were written by two different authors.

[35] De Stefani and Magnelli 2011.

[36] De Stefani and Magnelli 2011 551–52.

[37] Müller 1861 *passim*.

[38] For example, Greaves 1994 105–139.

shaping the *Periegesis*.[39] Without denying the importance of other poets, I argue here that intricate

allusions to Callimachus were a principal avenue through which Dionysius portrayed himself as a

skilled and erudite poet.

 Perieg. 706–17 is the most programmatically significant passage in the *Periegesis*. Here

Dionysius, in Hesiodic fashion, denies the importance of first-hand knowledge in favor of

inspiration from the Muses. The connections with Hes. *Op.* 646–62, where Hesiod boasted of his

his inexperience with ships, have rightly received much attention in recent scholarship.[40] Yet this

allusion to Hesiod is also a Callimachean move, for Callimachus also portrayed himself as one

who did not travel by sea, as Richard Hunter observes.[41] Though he pushed his point too far,

Ulrich Bernays was correct that Dionysius' appropriations of Hesiod were mediated through the

Alexandrians, chiefly Callimachus.[42] Dionysius' significant allusion to Callimachus comes in

Perieg. 709–710:

> **οὐ γάρ μοι** βίος ἐστὶ μελαινάων ἐπὶ νηῶν,
> οὐδέ μοι ἐμπορίη **πατρώϊος**

> For my livelihood is not from black ships, nor is trade my inherited
> occupation.[43]

---

[39] See Lightfoot 2014 35–41.

[40] Lightfoot 2014 ad loc., Amato 2002 7–15, and Kneebone 2017 216–19.

[41] R. L. Hunter 2008a 729

[42] Bernays 1905 27–32 followed an overly reductive approach, concluding that no profound interaction with Hesiod can be proven on the part of Dionysius, since Dionysius' most noteworthy parallels with Hesiod had Alexandrian precedent.

[43] I have consulted Lightfoot 2014 in preparing my translations of Dionysius' *Periegesis*.

Adrian Hollis[44] rightly notes that this is a conflation of *Hecale* fr. 41.2 (**οὐ γάρ μοι** πενίη

πατρώϊος, "penury was not my inherited state") and *Aetia* fr. 178.31–33, where an Ician sailor

named Theogenes addresses Callimachus at a symposium:

> τρισμάκαρ, ἦ παύρων ὄλβιός ἐσσι μέτα,
> ναυτιλίης εἰ νῆιν ἔχεις βίον · ἀλλ' ἐμὸς αἰὼν
> κύμασιν αἰθυίης μᾶλλον ἐσωικίσατο
>
> Thrice blessed, you are definitely among the happy few,
> if you lead a life unacquainted with seafaring; but my life
> is more at home in the waves than that of a shearwater bird.[45]

The double allusion is carefully wrought: the language derives primarily from the *Hecale*, but the

sense and context cohere well with the passage from the *Aetia*. In characterizing this as a "fleeting

reference" to the Ician seafarer, Lightfoot misses the programmatic significance of the passage in

the *Aetia*. The passage most likely stood at the opening of the second book,[46] and Callimachus has

carefully introduced the seafarer Theogenes as a sympathetic and trustworthy. Harder notes that

this sailor's dislike of large draughts of wine and a preference for the small cup (*Aet.* fr. 178.11–12,

16) recall Callimachus' own preferences.[47] Thus, Callimachus uses the *makarismos* of Theogenes

to align himself once more with Hesiod, as he had done at the beginning of the *Aetia*.[48] Through

this careful double allusion Dionysius depicts himself as a Callimachean poet in the tradition of

Hesiodic epic.

---

[44] Hollis 1990 171

[45] Translation from Harder 2012, modified.

[46] For the location of the fragment in the *Aetia*, see Harder 2012 vol. 2 956–57.

[47] Harder 2012 vol. 2 969.

[48] The relevant fragment (*Aet.* fr. 2) is poorly preserved, but we know that Callimachus connected his own poetic consecration to Hesiod's. See Ambühl 2005 365–85 and Harder 2012 ad loc. for discussion. The most extensive examination of Hesiod's influence on Callimachus remains Reinsch-Werner 1976.

Dionysius also uses intricate allusions to align himself with Callimachus in non-programmatic passages. In *Perieg.* 437–46, the Periegete draws on several Callimachean passages to depict Apollo's most famous cult-site:

> τῷ δ' ἐπὶ Φωκὶς ἄρουρα, πρὸς ἀντολίην τε καὶ ἠῶ
> ἑλκομένη βορέηνδε κατὰ στόμα Θερμοπυλάων,
> **Παρνησοῦ νιφόεντος ὑπὸ πτυχί**· τῆς διὰ μέσσης
> Κηφισοῦ μέγα χεῦμα κατερχόμενον κελαρύζει. [440]
> **τῷ πάρα Πυθῶνος θυόεν πέδον, ἧχι δράκοντος**
> **Δελφύνης τριπόδεσσι θεοῦ** παρακέκλιται ὁλκός,
> ὁλκός, ἀπειρεσίῃσιν ἐπιφρίσσων φολίδεσσι,
> νηῷ ἐν μεγάλῳ, τόθι πολλάκις αὐτὸς Ἀπόλλων
> ἱστάμενος **χρυσέης** ἀναλύεται **ἅμμα φαρέτρης**, [445]
> ἢ ἀπὸ Μιλήτοιο ἢ ἐκ Κλάρου ἄρτι βεβηκώς.

> Next is the Phocian land, to the east and south, which is drawn north
> toward the mouth of Thermopylae, under the ridge of snowy Parnassus.
> Through its midst the great flow of the Cephisus gushes and descends.
> Beside it there is the fragrant plain of Pytho, where the coils of the snake
> Delphyne surround the god's tripod, the coils that bristle with
> numberless scales in the great temple, where Apollo often stands and
> unfastens his golden quiver strap, right after returning from Miletus or
> Claros.

The mention of "Snowy Parnassus" (Παρνησοῦ νιφόεντος) at the beginning of *Perieg.* 439, the name Pytho in 441 and the Delphic tripod in 442 point to Call. *hDel* 90–93, where the still unborn Apollo foretold from the womb his victory over the great snake at Delphi. The "perfumed plane" (θυέον πέδον) in l. 441 recalls Call. *hAp* 38, where fragrant olive oil fell to the ground from Apollo's hair: αἱ δὲ κόμαι **θυόεντα πέδῳ** λείβουσιν ἔλαια ("fragrant oil drips from his head to the plain"). The golden strap of Apollo's quiver mentioned at *Perieg.* 445 evokes *hAp* 32–34, where Callimachus described Apollo's equipment:

> χρύσεα τὠπόλλωνι τό τ᾽ ἐνδυτὸν ἤ τ᾽ ἐπιπορπίς
> ἤ τε λύρη τό τ᾽ **ἄεμμα** τὸ Λύκτιον ἤ τε **φαρέτρη**,
> χρύσεα καὶ τὰ πέδιλα .[49]

> Golden are Apollo's garment and mantle, his lyre, Lyctian bow string
> and quiver, and golden too his sandals.

This last appropriation is particularly intricate. Dionysius selects for description an implement overlooked by his model, the quiver strap. He signals the appropriation by using a similar word (ἄμμα, "strap" instead of ἄεμμα, "bow string") and by also ending the line with φαρέτρης ("quiver").

Like Callimachus, Dionysius rejects the archaic derivation of the name of the plain, "Pytho," from the verb πύθω ("to rot").[50] Dionysius makes this departure much more pronounced than Callimachus by underscoring the miraculously preserved body of the snake and by explicitly calling the precinct "fragrant," (θυόεν). At Call. *hAp* 38, it was not the plain that was fragrant, but the oil dripping from Apollo's hair; at *Hom. Hymn Ap.* 372–74, the plain stunk with rotting flesh.

Dionysius sometimes alludes to Callimachus through the work of a later poet. The cluster of Callimachean echoes in *Perieg.* 439–442 suggests that when Dionysius writes "snowy Parnassus" in line 439 he has in mind Call. *hDel* 93 (Παρνησὸν νιφόεντα περιστέφει ἐννέα κύκλοις "[the snake] surrounds snowy Parnassus with its nine coils"). Yet the diction is even closer to the third line of Posidippus' *sphragis, epigr.* 118 "in the ridges of snowy Parnassus" (Παρνησοῦ νιφόεντος ἀνὰ πτύχας).[51] This epigram was in turn indebted to the prologue to Callimachus' *Aetia*, for Posidippus had asked the muses to help him bear his old age and noted

---

[49] I cite Callimachus' *Hymns* according to Stephens 2015.

[50] See *Hom. Hymn Ap.* 372–74.

[51] I cite Posidippus according to Bastianini and Austin 2002.

that Apollo had shown him favor in his youth. Through this double allusion Dionysius places

himself firmly within a tradition of Callimachean poets.

In *Perieg.* 541–48, Dionysius marshals Callimachus to correct Homer's pessimistic vision

of the afterlife:

> ἔστι δέ τις καὶ σκαιὸν ὑπὲρ πόρον Εὐξείνοιο
> ἄντα Βορυσθένεος μεγαλώνυμος εἰν ἁλὶ νῆσος
> **ἡρώων** · Λευκήν μιν ἐπωνυμίην καλέουσιν,
> οὕνεκά οἱ τάπερ ἔστι **κινώπετα** λευκὰ τέτυκται ·
> κεῖθι δ᾽ Ἀχιλλῆός τε καὶ ἡρώων φάτις ἄλλων [545]
> **ψυχὰς εἰλίσσεσθαι** ἐρημαίας ἀνὰ βήσσας ·
> τοῦτο δ᾽ ἀριστήεσσι Διὸς πάρα δῶρον ὀπηδεῖ
> **ἀντ᾽ ἀρετῆς · ἀρετὴ γὰρ ἀκήρατον ἔλλαχε τιμήν**.

> On the left side of the Black Sea, facing Borysthenes, there is a famous
> island of heroes in the sea. They call it by the name of Leuce, for all the
> wing-movers there are white. There the story is that the souls of Achilles
> and other heroes whirl through the lonely glades. This is the gift that the
> best receive from Zeus for their virtue, for virtue receives an unmixed
> reward.

The somber ἡρώων ("of heroes") at the beginning of *Perieg.* 543 and the ψυχάς ("souls" or

"shades") of the heroes from the Trojan War in *Perieg.* 545–46 evoke the Homeric epics, most

especially the iconic third and fourth lines of the *Iliad*, where Achilles sends many mighty souls of

heroes down to the house of Hades. The souls wandering about on the isle evoke the *nekyia* in *Od.*

11. The Homeric resonances affect also the rhythm. *Perieg.* 543 and 546 are highly spondaic

which gives them an archaic feel. This is all the more striking in *Perieg.* 546, where Dionysius

describes the whirling about of disembodied souls. One would expect a quick, mostly dactylic line

instead of the ponderous spondees.[52]

---

[52] Hellenistic and Imperial hexameter tended to be much more dactylic than earlier verse. See West 1982
177–78. Lines with three spondees, like l. 546, are rare in the *Periegesis*. They comprise 7% of the poem.
See Lightfoot 2014 66.

Dionysius here evokes Homer to correct the great bard's bleak picture of the afterlife. That the souls of the just should enjoy rewards in the hereafter is hardly a new notion: Dionysius would have found it in Hesiod and the Plato.[53] Yet Dionysius' lines pointedly reject Homer's afterlife, and this becomes still more striking in *Perieg.* 547–48, where the Periegete emphatically states that post-mortem beatitude is the reward of the virtuous, for *aretē* "receives an unmixed reward (ἀκήρατον τιμήν)." Here Dionysius alludes to Zeus's jars of blessing and woe, described by Homer at *Il.* 24.529. Achilles there explains that all men must bear at best a lot mixed with good and ill; Dionysius assures us by contrast that the virtuous enjoy pure beatitude.

Among these Homeric strands Dionysius weaves in a bit of Callimachus. Fittingly this occurs in an *aition* explaining the name of the island (ll. 543–44). Dionysius' use of κινώπετα recalls Call. *hZeus* 25, where the rare noun is first attested. The scholia on the *hZeus* gloss this as "snake,"[54] which it certainly does mean in Nicander, but Dionysius seems to mean bird instead. The byzantine commentator Eusthathius was right to see an etymology in play, deriving the word from κινεῖν and πτερόν (birds as "wing-movers").[55] We have an erudite elaboration of a rare noun in a passage where Dionysius, in good Alexandrian fashion, corrects Homeric notions of the afterlife.

---

[53] Hesiod mentions the "Isles of the Blest" in *Op.* 170–173. We also find a brief mention of the Isles of the Blest in *Od.* 4.561–64 that contradicts the pessimistic view of the afterlife perceptible elsewhere in Homer. For discussion, see West 1988 *ad loc.* Plato's Myth of Er in *Rep.* 10 was the probably most influential philosophical treatment of the afterlife.

[54] See Stephens 2015 ad loc.

[55] Κινώπετα δέ ἐστιν, ὦν ἡ κίνησις ἐν τῷ πέτεσθαι. "They are *kinopeta* whose movement is by flight." Eustathius, *Commentarium* 541, ed. Müller 1861. See also Lightfoot 2014 ad loc.

The Halieutica of Oppian of Cilicia

In the last fifty years, scholarship on the *Halieutica* has highlighted Oppian's surprising

indifference toward Alexandrian poetry.[56] A. W. James characterizes Oppian's revival of

neglected Homeric vocabulary as a "conscious stand" against the Alexandrians as "fastidious

stylists."[57] Enrico Rebuffat, moreover, has shown that the *Halieutica* possesses several formal

characteristics that separate it from Alexandrian didactic.[58] The teacher-student binary, what

Katarina Volk characterizes as a sort of didactic drama between teacher and student, is almost

entirely absent from the *Halieutica*.[59] Oppian almost never adopts a teaching *persona* and its

accompanying formal features like direct address, though we shall see one important

counterexample below. Instead, Oppian usually describes rather than explicitly offering

instruction.[60] Indeed, the most conspicuous feature of Oppian's style, the simile, was plentiful in

Homer but sparse in Alexandrian didactic.[61] Finally, Oppian only rarely alludes to Alexandrian

poets.[62] I argue that Oppian's preference for Homeric composition included a rejection of

Alexandrian poetics associated with Hesiod and Callimachus. This may be seen chiefly in the

programmatic *proemia*. The rare occasions where Oppian alludes to Callimachus, like *Hal.* 2.199–

---

[56] Notable exception are Effe 1977 137–73 and Whitby 2007 125. Effe's schema leads him to overemphasize Oppian's connections with Aratus. Whitby contrasts Oppian's "Callimachean proportions and aesthetics" with the 42 book *Iatrica* of Macellus of Side.

[57] James 1970 200

[58] Rebuffat 2001 37

[59] Volk 2002 37–38

[60] So the apt remark of Effe 1977 151 "*Oppian verfährt größtenteils beschreibend als Betrachter – nicht aber Lehrer – des Stoffes*."

[61] Bartley 2003 8

[62] De Stefani and Magnelli 2011 552 list several but note that most linguistic overlaps are faint echoes or ornamental borrowings– even Callimachus' "untrodden paths" are employed for nothing more than travelers wandering up a mountain road.

224, are instances where Oppian has turned temporarily from Homeric description to Hesiodic didacticism.

Oppian's independence from Callimachus is most evident in the proem to book three (*Hal.* 3.1–28), where the Cilician poet narrates his own poetic consecration in decidedly un-Callimachean terms. There are several possible Callimachean echoes,[63] and a depiction of consecration to poetry readily recalls Hesiod's *Theogony* and Callimachus' *Aetia*. But more noteworthy is the manner in which Oppian distances himself from these influential predecessors. Unlike these prior consecrations, neither Hermes nor the consecrating *daimones* speak. Oppian merely reports that they set him apart as a poet for the delight of the emperor.[64] The Cilician poet's description of Typhaon's defeat through Pan's trickery contrasts sharply with Hesiod's in *Theog.* 820–68, where Pan plays no part, and Callimachus' *hZeus*, where Zeus seizes control of Olympus by force rather than through the casting of lots. Still more significant is Oppian's choice of Hermes as divine patron. Here, several factors are likely in play. Oppian states in *Hal.* 3.26–28 that Hermes is a fitting choice because the trickster god is the patron of fishermen.[65] This is certainly relevant: this proem marks the transition from the zoological focus of the first two books to the fishing techniques of books 3–5. Regional factors also play a role. E. Rebuffat has sensitively elucidated the importance of the shrine to Hermes in Corycio in Rough Cilicia,

---

[63] *Hal.* 3.17 recalls the structure of Call. *hZeus* 4 (of Zeus): Πηλαγόνων ἐλατῆρα, δικασπόλον Οὐρανίδῃσι. The nominal phrase αὐτὸς ἄναξ *Hal.* 3.13 resembles Call. *hAp* 90 (of Apollo), though Ap. Rhod. *Arg* 1.968 is closer.

[64] σοὶ δ' ἐμὲ τερπωλήν τε καὶ ὑμνητῆρ' ἀνέηκαν
δαίμονες ἐν Κιλίκεσσιν ὑφ' Ἑρμαίοις ἀδύτοισι.
("Under the shrine of Hermes in Cilicia the gods have consecrated me to be your singer and delight.")

[65] This aspect of Hermes is not particularly well-attested, but we do have a series of epigrams in the *Anth Pal* in which fishermen dedicate their equipment to Hermes: *Anth Pal* 6.5 (Philip of Thessalonica, 1st c. BC) 6.23 (Anonymous), 28–29 (Julian the Prefect of Egypt, 6th c. AD).

suggesting that Oppian was motivated by a patriotic pride in this native shrine and an intense

religious devotion to Hermes.[66] Yet the choice also has poetological implications; I argue that

Hermes functions as an aesthetic foil to the Callimacheanism typified by Apollo.[67]

The anti-Callimachean thrust of the proem is most evident in *Hal.* 3.9–14:

> Ἑρμεία, σὺ δέ μοι πατρώϊε, φέρτατε παίδων
> Αἰγιόχου, κέρδιστον ἐν ἀθανάτοισι νόημα, (10)
> φαῖνέ τε καὶ σήμαινε καὶ ἄρχεο, νύσσαν ἀοιδῆς
> ἰθύνων · βουλὰς δὲ περισσονόων ἁλιήων
> αὐτός, **ἄναξ**, πρώτιστος ἐμήσαο καὶ τέλος ἄγρης
> παντοίης ἀνέφηνας, ἐπ' ἰχθύσι κῆρας ὑφαίνων.

> O Hermes, my ancestral god, most excellent of the children of Aegis-
> bearing Zeus, subtlest thought among the immortals, enlighten and guide
> and lead, directing me to the goal of my song. You were the first, O
> Lord, to devise the schemes of clever fishermen and bring the hunt in all
> its variety to its culmination by weaving doom for fish.[68]

Oppian has selected for Hermes the epithet ἄναξ ("lord"). Though not exclusive to Apollo, this is

a pointedly Apollonian epithet.[69] Even in the *Hom. Hymn Herm.*, it is Apollo repeatedly receives

the epithet ἄναξ ("lord"), not Hermes.[70] Moreover, Apollo is in view when Oppian calls Hermes

"most excellent (φέρτατος) of the children of aegis-bearing Zeus" (*Hal.* 3.9–10). Apollo is

normally thought to be the most exalted son of Zeus. Consider, for instance, *Hom. Hymn Ap.* 337–

39, where Hera pleads with the chthonic deities to help her give birth to a child "in no way

---

[66] Rebuffat 1997

[67] Callimachus uses Apollo to express his aesthetic most famously in the prologue to the *Aetia* and at the end of *hAp*.

[68] I have consulted Mair 1928 and Fajen 1999 in preparing my translations of Oppian's *Halieutica*.

[69] So LSJ *s.v.* A.1 "Of the gods, especially Apollo." For its use with different gods, see LfGRE *s.v.*

[70] The title ἄναξ is used six times in the *Hom. Hymn Herm.*, five times for Apollo and once for the father of Selene, who in the *Hom. Hymn Herm.* is not Hyperion but a Pallas. See Vergados 2013 313.

lacking his [Apollo's] strength, but as superior (φέρτερος) to Apollo as broad-ruling Zeus is to Cronus."[71] Oppian's invocation of Hermes is thus a rejection of Apollo and Callimacheanism.

The dichotomy between the Homeric narration and Hesiodic didacticism accounts well for the few prominent Callimachean echoes in the poem. Oppian generally prefers to compose Homerically, that is, to narrate and describe, rather than instruct. Occasionally, however, the poet's *persona* comes to the fore, either to address programmatic concerns or to draw explicit lessons from the material. It is in these passages where allusions to Callimachus tend to cluster. The most prominent example outside of the *prooemia* comes in *Hal.* 2.199–224, where Oppian describes the lazy and gluttonous "daysleeper" (ἡμεροκοίτης) fish. Unlike other parts of the poem, Oppian explicitly exhorts the audience at the end of the passage to avoid gluttony (*Hal.* 2.217–224). E. Kneebone has ably elucidated several Hesiodic elements in the passage– the very name of the fish (ἡμεροκοίτης, "daysleeper") recalls Hesiod's lazy thief in *Op.* 605, and the use of ἀέργος and its derivatives recalls Hesiod's exhortation to avoid laziness in *Op.* 302–19.[72] These Hesiodic echoes are matched by features typical in hexametric didactic but rare in the *Halieutica*: the imperative mood, "instructive" optatives, and generic uses of τις. Indeed, the use of the second person imperative φράζεο ("take notice") at *Hal.* 2.199, so prevalent in didactic authors,[73]

---

[71] αὐτοὶ νῦν μευ πάντες ἀκούσατε καὶ δότε παῖδα
νόσφι Διός, μηδέν τι βίην ἐπιδευέα κείνου ·
ἀλλ' ὅ γε φέρτερος ἔστω ὅσον Κρόνου εὐρύοπα Ζεύς.

I cite the *Hom. Hymn Ap.* according to Richardson 2010.

[72] Kneebone 2008 44–45. Bartley 2003 152–53 is more reticent than necessary in identifying Hesiod's *Works and Days* as the primary model for the passage. He points to *Od.* 24.251 as another possible model. Though it is true that Oppian's use occurs at the same location as Homer's in *Od.* 24.251, the thematic overlaps between the *Works and Days* and the *Halieutica* make it clear that Hesiod is the primary model.

[73] Hesiod uses the infinitive of command (φράζεσθαι) in *Op.* 448. In *Op.* 367, 404, and 688 the construction is ἄνωγα φράζεσθαι (I bid you consider). Aratus uses a similar construction at *Phaen.* 1149. Nicander uses the second person singular imperative φράζεο six times.

is unparalleled elsewhere in the *Halieutica*.[74] Into this Hesiodic passage Oppian incorporates

several Callimachean elements. The most prominent examples come in *Hal.* 2.206–08, where

our poet describes the insatiable hunger of the fish:

> οὐ γὰρ ἐδωδῆς
> ἢ κόρον ἠέ τι μέτρον ἐπίσταται, ἀλλ’ ἀτέλεστον [207]
> λυσσομανῆ βούβρωστιν ἀναιδέϊ γαστρὶ φυλάσσει·

> For [the daysleeper fish] understands no moderation nor how to be
> satisfied with food, but cherishes a boundless, maddening hunger in its
> shameless stomach.

Oppian’s rare word for hunger (βούβρωστις) in *Hal.* 2.208 occurs at the same line-position in

Call. *hDem* 102, where Callimachus describes the gnawing hunger of Erysichthon, an impudent

young man who had been cursed by Demeter.[75] Unlike most of the ornamental borrowings that

De Stefani and Magnelli note,[76] the Callimachean context fits nicely into Oppian’s passage:

excessive hunger leads to disaster. Line 207 ends in Callimachean fashion without invoking any

Callimachean passages. The verb ἐπίσταμαι is common in participial form before the bucolic

diaeresis in Homer, but Call. *hZeus* 95 and Op. *Hal.* 2.207 are the only places in extant

hexameter where the third person present singular (ἐπίσταται) is so used. The adjective that

concludes *Hal.* 2.207 (ἀτέλεστον) is Homeric, but Callimachus also uses it at line end in the

same narrative about Erysichthon at *hDem* 128.

Oppian perhaps alludes to Callimachus’ *Hymns* at *Hal.* 2.218, when the Cilician poet bids

the races of men to “listen to what suffering follows upon voraciousness (ἀδηφαγίῃσιν).” The

---

[74] The closest parallel is the 2nd person singular optative φράζοιο at the beginning of book 3.

[75] The noun βούβρωστις also occurs at the same metrical *sedes* in *Il.* 24.532, where Achilles makes it a characteristic of the poor who are cursed by Zeus. In Homer it seems to mean not hunger but grinding poverty. The meaning was already disputed in antiquity. For discussion, see Brügger 2017 ad loc.

[76] De Stefani and Magnelli 2011 552

noun ἀδηφαγίη is not uncommon in Imperial prose literature, particularly Plutarch, but the

significant poetic precursor is Call. *hArt* 160, where Callimachus describes the continuing voracity

of the deified Heracles. The connection is, however, more faint; the words occur at different

places in the line, and Oppian surely does not wish to suggest that gluttony results in apotheosis.

Yet the Hesiodic and Callimachean tenor of the passage suggests that Oppian had Callimachus

in mind, even if he did not wish to evoke the original context. We see then that for both

Dionysius and Oppian, Callimachus and Hesiod go together. And yet, the peculiarity of this

passage within the larger *Halieutica* actually underscores Oppian's independence from

Callimachean poetics.

> Oppian's rejection of Alexandrian poetics also manifests in *Hal.* 1.217–20:

>> θαῦμα δ' ὀλισθηρῆς ἐχενηΐδος ἐφράσσαντο
>> ναυτίλοι· οὐ μὲν δή τις ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πιστώσαιτο
>> εἰσαΐων· αἰεὶ γὰρ ἀπειρήτων νόος ἀνδρῶν
>> δύσμαχος, οὐδ' ἐθέλουσι καὶ ἀτρεκέεσσι πιθέσθαι· [220]

>> Sailors describe a marvel of the slippery Lamprey. But even after seeing
>> it, one might not believe in his soul, for the mind of unexperienced men
>> is difficult to combat; they are unwilling even to believe the truth.

The passage may be heard in both a philosophical and poetic key. As Oppian often alludes to

philosophical texts and positions,[77] we may readily take this as an attack against the Stoa's arch-

nemesis, the Skeptics, whose adherents preferred to abstain from final judgment even when proof

was available to the senses. But we may equally read it as another refutation of Callimachean

poetics, with its emphasis on the fictive power of the poet and its attendant skepticism toward the

mythological tradition. Oppian's open embrace of the miraculous departs sharply from

Callimachus, whose work emphasized the capacities of the human poet at the expense of divine

---

[77] Consider, for instance, his allusion to Plato's "Soul-Charioteer" in *Hal.* 2.217–24, or the Stoicizing hymn of *Hal.* 1.409–420.

activity. He had expressed the desire to "lie in persuasive manner" to his audience[78] and had elevated himself in *Aetia* 1–2 to a learned co-discussant with the Muses. In *Hymn* 1.4–7, the Alexandrian poet settled discordant traditions through his own judgment, not with the Muses' help. Oppian by contrast consistently stresses the dependence of humankind, and by implication of himself, on the gods.[79] This apparent piety and reverence toward the gods cohere nicely with a rejection of Alexandrian skepticism. Bartley is thus mistaken to argue that Oppian advertises human skill over divine aid, while ps.-Oppian emphasizes divine help.[80] It is the poet of the *Cynegetica* who loudly trumpets his originality and skill in weaving together varied strands of prior verse. Unlike the divinities of the *Halieutica*, the gods in the *Cynegetica* do not become part of a larger philosophical vision: as in Callimachus, they are primarily instruments of literary polemic.

The Cynegetica of Ps.-Oppian

Ps.-Oppian's fondness for Alexandrian poetry is well-established.[81] Nowhere is this more evident than in the proem to book one (*Cyn.* 1.20–40), where Artemis and Calliope instruct the poet to take an "untrodden path" in his work by singing of the hunt. W. Schmitt and S. Costanza have elucidated a number of the Callimachean elements of the proem;[82] Callimachus' influence is nevertheless more pervasive than yet recognized. I here wish to draw attention to how ps.-Oppian both creatively and audaciously reprises and reverses Callimachean motifs in his proem.

---

[78] ψευδοίμην ἀΐοντος ἅ κεν πεπίθοιεν ἀκουήν (Call. *hZeus* 65).

[79] There is one passage in the *Halieutica* that exalts humanity's princely position in the natural order (*Hal.* 5.1–20), but this is deliberately juxtaposed with the final passage of the work, which underscores the frailty of human existence.

[80] Bartley 2003 160.

[81] For treatments of ps.-Oppian's debt to the Alexandrians, see Hollis 1994, Whitby 2007, and De Stefani and Magnelli 2011 552.

[82] See Schmitt 1969 ad loc. and Costanza 1991.

Scholars have rightly noted Ps.-Oppian's dependence on Callimachus for the "untrodden

path" motif in *Cyn.* 1.20–21.[83] What has not received sufficient attention is how peculiar such a

claim to originality is in a work of epic poetry. *Contra* A. Bartley,[84] these sorts of claims are rare in

epic, for the solemnity of the hexameter normally precludes them.[85] Even in Hesiodic epic, where

the poet's *persona* is more prominent, earlier poets like Aratus and Nicander had not openly

claimed originality. Indeed, an epigram of the second century AD (*Anth. Pal.* 11.130 Pollianus)

suggests that originality was still felt associated primarily with elegy, not epic. Pollianus rejected

epic precisely because it required too much imitation of Homer. Callimachus' prologue to the

elegiac *Aetia* was probably felt to apply to his entire poetic *oeuvre*, but this does not mitigate the

peculiarity of ps.-Oppian's choice: nowhere else in Greek epic do we have such an explicit claim

to originality. Our poet has incorporated an elegiac motif into the proem of an epic poem. This

constitutes a striking instance of the generic mixing long associated with Hellenistic poetry.[86]

In the proem ps.-Oppian reprises a number of Callimachean motifs and reverses others,

but even his reversals are couched in Callimachean style. The goddess' instructions to avoid

martial themes (*Cyn* 1.28–29) recall Callimachus' distaste for martial epic expressed in *Aet.* fr. 1.3–

---

[83] Ps.-Oppian's use of ἐπάτησεν (l. 21, "tread") and ἐπιστείβωμεν ("walk upon" l. 22) recall immediately the prologue of the *Aetia* (πατέουσιν, fr. 1.25; στεί]βειν fr. 1.26). In other places, the poet has substituted synonyms for the Callimachean vocabulary: l. 20 ἀταρπόν ("road") for Callimachus' οἶμος and κέλευθος (both meaning "road", *Aet.* fr. 1.27); l. 20 τρηχεῖαν ("rugged") for Callimachus' στεινοτέρην ("more narrow," *Aet.* fr. 1.28). In this last instance, ps.-Oppian has gone back to Callimachus' model, Hesiod *Op.* 291.

See Schmitt 1969 ad loc. Costanza 1991 and Hollis 1994 157. Bartley 2003 170–71 is mistaken that Hesiod is the most important reference. Hesiod is significant, but here Hesiod has been mediated through Callimachus. Once more we see a synthesis of Callimachus and Hesiod.

[84] Bartley 2003 173–75

[85] R. L. Hunter 2008a 731–33

[86] The term "*Kreuzung der Gattungen*" originates with Kroll 1924. For more recent analyses of genre in Hellenistic poetry, see Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker 1998.

5. When the goddess instructs our poet in *Cyn.* 1.24–25 to avoid singing of Bacchic revelry, this coheres nicely with Callimachus' preference for intellectual conversation over excessive drinking.[87] Indeed, by the Imperial period Callimachus had a reputation for teetotaling.[88] Ps.-Oppian also uses his divine patron to announce his allegiance to Callimachean poetics. Artemis' appearance to ps.-Oppian in a dream so analogous to Apollo's epiphany in the *Aetia* shows that Artemis was more than simply an appropriate patron for the contents of the poem. She has become a means for Ps.-Oppian to align himself with Callimachus. Moreover, the most striking formal innovation of the proem, the dialogue form in which Artemis and Calliope converse with the poet (*Cyn.* 1.20–40), has its most important precedent in the *Aetia*.[89] In the first two books of the *Aetia*, Callimachus did not simply report the Muse's song, as had Hesiod, but emphasized his own speaking part as a learned co-discussant with the goddesses. Ps.-Oppian similarly emphasizes his own speaking role in this divine dialogue. Not only did he "hear the divine voice" (θεείης ἔκλυον ἠχῆς *Cyn.* 1.18), but he "conversed with the goddess" (καὶ θεὸν ἠμείφθην *Cyn.* 1.19). This dialogue with the Muses announces the poet's Callimachean ambitions.

Even when ps.-Oppian reverses a Callimachean motif he does so in Callimachean terms. The rejection of erotic themes in *Cyn.* 1.32–33 is surprising, as for most of the Roman Callimacheans, the Alexandrian was a poet of *eros*.[90] Yet ps.-Oppian cleverly announces this departure with an allusion to Callimachus:

---

87 For Callimachus' moderation in wine-drinking, see *epigr.* 30 (Page #30=*Anth Pal* 7.415) and *Aetia* fr. 178.15–16.

88 For Callimachus as a 'water drinker' see Antipater of Thessalonica, *Anth. Pal.* 11.20. Costanza 1991 488 wrongly characterizes the rejection of Dionysus as a departure from Callimachean precedent.

89 Costanza 1991 482 and Bartley 2003 171–72 point also to Theocritus' *Idylls* as precedents for hexametric dialogue. This is not entirely unwarranted, as our poet does frequently evoke the bucolic tradition.

90 See Acosta-Hughes 2009 238.

> Θ. Ἀμφὶ πόθοις ὀλοοῖσιν ἀκὴν ἔχε, λεῖπέ τε κεστούς .[91]
> ἐχθαίρω τὰ λέγουσιν ἀθύρματα Ποντογενείης.
>
> Keep silent about deadly passions and leave behind the girdles of love. I
> detest what they call the delights of Sea-born (*Cyn.* 1.32–33)[92]

W. Schmitt rightly notes that in line 33, ps.-Oppian alludes to Callimachus' well-known epigram

about cyclic poetry (G.P. 2) (ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν… "I detest the cyclic poem"),[93]

where Callimachus complains about a faithless *eromenos*. More significant is the manner in which

ps.-Oppian narrates his career as a poet. Twice in the proem ps.-Oppian refers to his prior

poetry. In *Cyn.* 1.27 he notes, "for quite a while I danced around Thunaean Dionysus"(δηθάκις

ἀμφεχόρευσα Θυωναίῳ Διονύσῳ) and in *Cyn* 1.31 he mentions a martial epic: "I spoke of

Ctesiphon and the woes of the Parthians" (ἐφρασάμην Πάρθων τε δύας καὶ Κτησιφόωντα). I

suspect that we should regard both of these statements as dramatic asides in which the poet wryly

confesses to the audience that he had previously written poetry of a different sort. This

preoccupation with the arc of a poetic career is Callimachean. Callimachus, however, stressed

the continuities of his work. After narrating Apollo's epiphany to him as a young man, he noted

at *Aet.* fr. 1.37 that the Muses have not forsaken him in his old age.[94] The discontinuities that ps.-

Oppian creates in his proem are closer to the approach we see in another Callimachean, Ovid,

who in his proems often commented on the course of his poetic career. The suffering lover of the

---

[91] Papathomopoulos 2003 rejects Köchly's πόθοις ("passions") in favor of the μόθοις ("sounds of battle") transmitted by the manuscripts. Yet Köchly is correct that Artemis has already told the poet to avoid war in *Cyn.* 1.28–29 and that the poet's response in *Cyn.* 1.33 makes most sense if the entire couplet refers to erotic themes. See Köchly 1881 324. The source of the reading τε is unclear; Papathomopoulos 2003 prints δέ and reports no variation, while Mair 1928 prints τε without comment. I have here followed Mair.

[92] Tr. Mair 1928, modified

[93] See Schmitt 1969 ad loc.

[94] For further discussion and bibliography, see Gutzwiller 1998 212.

Amores became the teacher of love in the *Ars amatoria*, who subsequently gained the ability to cure passion in the *Remedia amoris*.[95] At the beginning of the *Metamorphoses*, the Sulmonan poet observed that the gods had changed the nature of his poetic undertakings.[96] We thus see in the proem to the *Cynegetica* an intricate and creative appropriation of Callimachean texts and motifs.

Unlike Dionysius and Oppian, ps.-Oppian reprises Callimachus' polemical attitude toward the literary tradition. Significant examples come in *Cyn.* 1.59–80, where the Apamean poet asserts the supremacy of hunting as a theme, thereby reversing Oppian's judgment at *Hal.* 1.1.–79. Ps.-Oppian cleverly points out the inconsistency of Oppian's proem. Oppian had argued that fishing was more laborious than hunting and dismissed the latter as a nothing more than a pleasant pastime: τερπωλὴ δ' ἔπεται θήρῃ πλέον ἠέ περ ἱδρώς. ("Delight, more than effort, attends the hunt" *Hal.* 1.28). Yet later in *Hal.* 1.71–72, Oppian stressed for the emperor the delight that fishing could bring. In *Cyn.* 1.59–61, Ps.-Oppian instead asserts that fishing is the easier activity:

> τερπωλὴ δ', ὅτε χαλκὸς ὑπαὶ γενύεσσι τορήσας
> ὕψι μάλα θρώσκοντα βυθῶν ὕπερ ἀσπαίροντα [60]
> εἰνάλιον φορέῃσι δι' ἠέρος ὀρχηστῆρα.

> There is delight when the copper hook pierces the fish below its jowls
> and drags the fish up as it gasps and leaps up wildly from the depths,
> dancing through the air.[97]

---

[95] For a discussion of the course of Ovid's poetic *persona* in the amatory poems, see Conte 1989.

[96] *Met.* 1.1–2. For discussion, see Keith 2002 237–238.

[97] Though the sense is generally clear, the syntax is difficult to construe. Papathomopoulos 2003 follows the manuscripts in printing the accusative singular χαλκόν in *Cyn.* 1.59, but this yields little sense. Schmitt 1969 likewise followed the *mss*, suggesting we understand τορήσας as "*durchführen lassen*" but I have found no attestations of this meaning. Elsewhere the direct object of τορέω is the object pierced, not the instrument of piercing. Mair 1928 followed Turnebus and Bodinus by printing the conjecture χαλκοῦ and took γενύεσσι not as the jaws of the fish, but the barbs of the fishhook (v. LSJ *s.v.* II). The sense is well attested in the *Halieutica*, but it this would be its only such use in the *Cynegetica*. It seems much more likely that γενύεσσι refers to the jaws of the fish; I have emended to the nominative χαλκός and made this the

Schmitt is right to connect this passage with *Hal.* 1.71−72,[98] but the identical beginning of *Cyn.*

1.59 and *Hal.* 1.28 shows that ps.-Oppian has the entire prologue in mind.

Ps.-Oppian's polemic against his Cilician predecessor continues at *Cyn.* 1.66−76, where he

calls Oppian audacious for comparing sea creatures to land animals. I cite the opening (*Cyn* 1.67−

68):

> τίς τάδε τολμήσειεν ἀείδειν ἰσοτάλαντα;
> ἢ βασιλῆϊ λέοντι τίς αἰετὸν ἀντιβάλοιτο;

> Who would dare to sing that these are of equal import? Who would
> compare the eagle to the royal lion?

Ps.-Oppian's critique of Oppian recalls Callimachus' polemic against prior poets at *hZeus* 60−64.

The verbal resonances are only slight;[99] both poets, however, criticize their predecessors'

judgment. Ps.-Oppian implies that land animals and sea creatures are so different that they

should not be compared. Callimachus made a similar point about Olympus and Hades: the two

realms are utterly disparate. Yet ps.-Oppian does not simply criticize his predecessor's choice of

theme; he cleverly draws attention to the simile, the most conspicuous feature of Oppian's

style.[100] Ps.-Oppian's embrace of polemic is quite unlike what we saw in Dionysius and Oppian.

---

subject of the temporal clause. *Cf.* Apol. Rhod. *Arg.* 2.112−13: ὅσον δ' ἐπὶ δέρματι μοῦνον / νηδυίων ἄψαυστος ὑπὸ ζώνην **τόρε χαλκός**. This avoids the hiatus created by the genitive χαλκοῦ.

[98] Schmitt 1969 ad loc.

[99] Ps.-Oppian's ἰσοτάλαντα ("equal in weight") in *Cyn.* 1.67 may be indebted ἐπ' ἰσαίη ("on the basis of equality") at *hZeus* 63. Ps.-Oppian's indignant τίς with the optative recalls *hZeus* 62.

[100] Comparing sea creatures to land animals or birds was one of Oppian's commonest techniques; the lives of Oppian dating from the Byzantine period note his skill in similes: τυγχάνει δὲ μάλιστα ἐν ταῖς γνωμολογίαις τε καὶ παραβολαῖς. ("He particularly excelled in gnomes and comparisons.") The remark is preserved in several of the lives of the poet's life, for example the *Vita W*, which Aristide Colonna traced to the activities of John Tzetzes. For text and remarks, see Colonna 1964. For a clear summary of the various lives, see Silva Sánchez 1995 108.

They used careful allusions to position themselves within the poetic tradition. Ps.-Oppian instead aligns himself vocally with Alexandrian poetics.

Conclusions
Our survey of Imperial didactic has revealed three very different approaches to Callimachus. Though Dionysius eschewed open polemic, he nevertheless took care to align himself with Callimachus through intricate allusions in both programmatic and non-programmatic passages. Oppian instead positioned himself as an anti-Callimachean. The *Halieutica* is full of studied allusions to and reversals of Homeric scenes, but Oppian pointedly ignored Callimachus in all but rare instances. This rejection of Callimachus is most clear in the proem to book three, where Oppian invoked Hermes as a foil to Callimachus' patron Apollo. Ps.-Oppian by contrast vocally aligned himself with Callimachus, reprising Callimachus' polemical stance towards prior poets and penchant for *poikilia*. His audacity in embracing techniques uncustomary in epic, like the claim for originality, owed much to the Cyrenaean master. Callimachus is thus an invaluable touchstone for analyzing the aesthetic of later Greek poets, an especially illuminating influence for considering the poetic *personae* of Imperial poets writing in Greek. The literary analysis confirms what we may have surmised from the historical survey: Callimachus was indispensable for ambitious poets. Even when rejected, his shade was felt.

Chapter 2: ΚΕΛΕΥΘΟΙ ΑΤΡΙΠΤΟΙ. Originality

"We dwell with satisfaction upon the poet's difference from his
predecessors, especially his immediate predecessors; we endeavour to
find something that can be isolated in order to be enjoyed. Whereas if we
approach a poet without this prejudice we shall often find that not only
the best, but the most individual parts of his work may be those in which
the dead poets, his ancestors, assert their immortality most vigorously."
T.S. Eliot[1]

In this chapter I address the issue of originality. Gregory has the dubious of honor of being

criticized both for failing to throw off the shackles of a dead tradition and for lacking any

sensitivity to the literature that preceded him– He has been judged both too innovative and too

traditional.[2] I argue here that reading Gregory as fundamentally a Callimachean poet does

justice to the variety and innovative elements in the Cappadocian's work. More specifically, we

will see that Gregory adopts Callimachus' aesthetic commitment to the "untrodden path", but

places this within a larger ethical framework rooted in Christian revelation. I argue further that

Gregory innovates in both small and large ways, that is, both at the level of individual allusions

and motifs, and at the level of genre. Finally, I maintain that in creating a corpus of such variety

Gregory intentionally emulated the *polyeideia* of his Cyrenaean model. I begin by briefly reviewing

the passages where Gregory explicitly mentions originality before turning to analysis of two texts

from Gregory's *oeuvre*: his relatively traditional funerary epigrams for his father (*AnthPal* 8.13–23)

---

[1] Eliot 1920

[2] So Wyss 1949 203: "*Aber es fehlte ihm [sc. Gregor] die schöpferische Kraft, die Konvention zu sprengen, in der die griechische Poesie erstarrt war.*" Keydell 1953 142–43 by contrast sees in Gregory a fundamental break with the Hellenic past: "*So erscheinen die Gedichte Gregors als ein Seitenschössling am Baum der griechishcen Literaturgeschicte, entsprossen aus den Wurzeln einer Persönlichkeit, in der die griechische Bildung durch innerlichstes Christentum wieder aufgehoben wurde. Zwiespalt der Form in den einen, Zwiespalt des Inneren als Gegenstand der anderen – beides bedeutend eine Loslösung vom Antiken. Dass sie uns diese Abkehr von der antiken Formen– und Geisteswelt erkennen lassen, eine Abkehr, die ganz unfreiwillig ist, erzwungen durch die Verchristlichung des Geistes – das ist, über das Literarhistorische hinaus, die allgemeine geistesgeschichtliche Bedeutung der Gedichte Gregors.*"

and his long, innovative hexametric lament, 2.1.1 (*De rebus suis*). We shall see that in both types of

work Gregory takes care to "take the untrodden path."

Untrodden Paths: Gregory and Callimachus

Though Callimachus was hardly the first to assert the value of originality in poetry,[3] the prologue

to his *Aetia* became a touchstone for subsequent poets.[4]

> καὶ γὰρ ὅτ⌐ε πρ⌐ώ⌐τιστον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα
>   γούνασι⌐ν, Ἀπόλλων εἶπεν ὅ μοι Λύκιος ·
> '………. ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον
> θρέψαι, τὴ]ν Μοῦσαν δ᾽ ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην ·
> πρὸς δέ σε] καὶ τόδ᾽ ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἅμαξαι [25]
>   τὰ στείβε⌐ιν, ἑτέρων ἴχνια μὴ καθ᾽ ὁμά
> δίφρον ἐλ]ᾶν μηδ᾽ οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους
> ἀτρίπτο]υς, εἰ καὶ στε⌐ι⌐νοτέρην ἐλάσεις.'

> For when I put my writing-tablet on my knees for the first time
> Lycian Apollo said to me,
> "… poet, make your sacrificial animal as fat as possible
> but, my good man, keep your muse skinny.
> Moreover, I also urge you not to go where wagons go,
> not to conduct your chariot along the tracks of others
> nor along a wide road, but along untrodden paths
> even if you drive it along a quite narrow one." (tr. Harder, modified)

Gregory alludes to the passage on a number of occasions. The most striking lexical overlap

comes in *carm.* 2.1.68 15–20, where he caustically attacks his rivals:

> βαρὺς γὰρ αὐτοῖς, καὶ θράσους ἤμην γέμων,[5] [15]
>   τέμνων **ὁδοὺς ἀτρίπτους**,
> ἐθῶν πατρῴων καὶ νόμων διαφθορεὺς,
>   εἴπερ νόμος τὰ φαῦλα,
> πλούτου, τύφου τε, θρύψεως, φιλαρχίας,
>   τῶν νῦν ἐπικρατούντων.[20]

---

[3] Harder 2012 *ad fr. 1.25–28* points to to *Il.* 9.61 for the importance of novelty; Pi. *O.*6.22 and *P.* 4.247 as important predecessors for the "poem as road" motif; and Hes. *Op.* 286ff. for the juxtaposition of narrow and wide roads.

[4] I cite the *Aetia* according to Harder 2012.

[5] Caillau 1842 places a full-stop here but it is clear from what follows that we need a comma instead.

> I was a weight for them, audacious too
> to cut these untrod paths,
> corrupting customs and our fathers' laws;
> and so I did– the laws
> of what is now in charge: wealth and delusion,
> pleasure, and lust for power!

The vocabulary is quite close to Callimachus: Gregory has merely substituted the more common

ὁδός ("road") for the rarer κέλευθος ("road"). We see at once, however, that Gregory has

reframed Callimachus' aesthetic concerns within a larger ethical framework. In doing so,

Gregory goes back to one of Callimachus' own models, Hesiod's description of the "road of

virtue" and the "road of vice" in *Op*. 286–292 . The moral tenor of the passage also resonates

with Jesus' words in the sermon on the mount to "enter through the narrow gate."[6] The

complicated blend of Hesiod, Callimachus, and Jesus allow Gregory to depict himself as a sort of

eloquent sage on par with Jesus or Socrates, for like these he is a "corrupter" (διαφθορεύς 17) of

corrupt laws.

In *carm.* 2.1.39, Gregory alludes to the prologue of the *Aetia* in a more programmatic

context:

> Πολλοὺς ὁρῶν γράφοντας ἐν τῷ νῦν βίῳ
> λόγους ἀμέτρους, καὶ ῥέοντας εὐκόλως
> καὶ πλεῖστον ἐκτρίβοντας ἐν πόνοις χρόνον,
> ὧν κέρδος οὐδὲν ἢ κενὴ γλωσσαλγία·
> ἀλλ᾽ οὖν γράφοντας καὶ λίαν τυραννικῶς, [5]
> ὡς μεστὰ πάντα τυγχάνειν ληρημάτων,
> ψάμμου θαλασσῶν ἢ σκνιπῶν Αἰγυπτίων,
> πάντων μὲν ἂν ἥδιστα καὶ γνώμην μίαν
> ταύτην ἔδωκα πάντα ῥίψαντας λόγον
> αὐτῶν ἔχεσθαι τῶν θεοπνεύστων μόνον [10]

---

[6] Εἰσέλθατε διὰ τῆς στενῆς πύλης· ὅτι πλατεῖα ἡ πύλη καὶ εὐρύχωρος ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν καὶ πολλοί εἰσιν οἱ εἰσερχόμενοι δι᾽ αὐτῆς· 14 τί στενὴ ἡ πύλη καὶ τεθλιμμένη ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ζωὴν καὶ ὀλίγοι εἰσὶν οἱ εὑρίσκοντες αὐτήν. ("Enter through the narrow gate, for wide is the gate and broad the road that leads to destruction and many are those who enter through it. But how narrow the gate and small the road that leads to life! Few are those who enter through it." Mt 7.13–14)

ὡς τοὺς ζάλην φεύγοντας ὅρμων εὐδίων.
ἢ[7] γὰρ τοσαύτας αἱ Γραφαὶ δεδώκασι λαβὰς,
†τὸ Πνεῦμα τουτί σοι σοφώτερον †,
ὡς καὶ τόδ’ εἶναι παντὸς ὁρμητήριον
λόγου ματαίου τοῖς κακῶς ὁρμωμένοις.[15]
“Πότ’ ἂν γράφων σύ, τοῖς κάτω νοήμασιν
ἀναμφιλέκτους, ὦ ’τάν, ἐκτείναις λόγους;”
ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦτο παντελῶς ἀμήχανον,
κόσμου ῥαγέντος εἰς τόσας διαστάσεις,
πάντων τ’ ἔρεισμα τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἐκτροπῆς [20]
τούτους ἐχόντων τοὺς λόγους συμπροστάτας ·
ἄλλην μετῆλθον τῶν λόγων ταύτην ὁδὸν
εἰ μὲν καλήν γε, εἰ δὲ μή γ’ ἐμοὶ φίλην ·
μέτροις τι δοῦναι τῶν ἐμῶν πονημάτων.

When I saw many in this present life who write prosaic works, both those
who glibly pour forth speech and those who waste much time on works
whose profit is nothing more than idle talk, and yet they write with such
overwrought solemnity that their works are as full of nonsense as the sea
has sand and Egypt has flies, I would have gladly given this one piece of
advice– to throw out every work and cling only to those that are inspired
by God, like those who have fled a storm and found safe anchorage in a
harbor. And yet the scriptures provide so many opportunities for
misunderstanding that even these have become a pretext for useless
speech among those inclined toward ill. “Well when are you, my friend,
ever going to craft works that are above disputes of those with worldly
thoughts?” Since this is utterly impossible while the world is divided into
so many factions and everybody is marshaling these writings as allies for
their own inclinations, I have embarked on a different literary path; for
good or ill, at least it’s my own: I’ve given some of my literary efforts to
verse.

Gregory begins the poem by criticizing rhetoricians for their “prosaic works.” In line 2,

interpreters have pointed to the intended polyvalence of the Greek term ἄμετρους (either

“immoderate” or “prose”). Though Gregory does later develop the term in an ethical direction,

Milovanovic and Caillau were right to see the term’s principal meaning as “prose.”[8] After

---

[7] *scripsi*. The manuscripts carry εἰ but there is no apodosis to be found, and the point of the lines seems to
be that not even the scriptures are a completely safe refuge, since they provide opportunities for abuse to
heretics.

[8] Milovanovič-Barham 1997 501, 504; Caillau 1842 *ad loc.*

criticizing prose authors in general Gregory divides them into two groups (the καί…καί in 2–3

should be taken as "both…and"). The first group are glib sophists who like to speak impromptu

(ῥέοντας εὐκόλως 2). The latter prefer to perfect exquisite speeches ahead of time (καὶ

πλεῖστον ἐκτρίβοντας ἐν πόνοις χρόνον 3). We saw in chapter one that effectively all sophists

fell into one of these camps; Gregory is thus dismissing all rhetoric that is not rooted in Christian

revelation as idle nonsense (κενὴ γλωσσαλγία 4). Gregory presents himself as at first wanting to

tell these sophists to abandon secular rhetoric and cling to the scriptures alone, but he then

observes that even the scriptures have been misappropriated by heretics and become a "pretext

for vain speech."[9]

Callimachean echoes in the opening set a polemic tenor for the rest of the poem.

Cataudella has noted several appropriations of the *Aetia*.[10] The same motif "others do X, but I do

Y" opens both poems. Gregory also plainly alludes in 22–24 to the "untrodden path" of

Callimachus, for the Cappadocian poet observes that he has gone on "his own literary path"

(τῶν λόγων ταύτην ὁδὸν) by entrusting some of his literary efforts to verse (μέτροις τι δοῦναι

τῶν ἐμῶν πονημάτων).[11] Furthermore, Tim Hawkins observes a number of pointed references

to Callimachus' *Aetia*: both poets address their contemporary authors (οἳ νῦν Call. fr. 191.6; ἐν

---

[9] The past contrafactual nature of the apodosis in lines 8–9 (πάντων μὲν ἂν… ἔδωκα should be rendered "I would have gladly given them this advice") has generally been missed by interpreters. Caillau 1842 translates as an past indicative (*consilium…dedi*). Billius similarly used the perfect indicative (*stetit sententia*, *ibid.*). Abrams Rebillard 2003 *ad loc.* "I would offer them…" and Crimi and Costa 1999 *ad loc.* "nel modo più soave derei loro". *Cf.* White 1996 *ad loc.* "I gave them…" and De Blasi 2018 *ad loc.* "*Questo il più soave e il solo mio consiglio*".

[10] Cataudella 1928

[11] Interpreters have often taken πόνημα in line 24 to refer to Gregory's personal sufferings, but we should instead regard it as a literary "effort," hence, a written work. Compare *or.* 43.66.3 where it occurs in an effective *hendiadys* with συγγράμματα ("writings"): Μία καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἡ μεγίστη [τρυφή], τὰ ἐκείνου συγγράμματα καὶ πονήματα ("There is today but one great delight through this all: his [Basil's] writings and works").

τῷ νῦν βίῳ Gr. *carm.* 2.1.39 1).[12] Both poets liken their rivals to biting insects (μυῖαι "flies" and

σφῆκες "wasps", Call. fr. 191 26–27; σκνῖπες αἰγύπτιοι "Egyptian flies" Gr. *carm.* 2.1.39 7).

Finally, both depict the vain efforts of their opponents (Call. fr. 191.29–30; Gr. *carm.* 2.1.39 3).[13]

The Epigrams
Introduction
I would now like to turn to analysis of Gregory's epigrams, which are formally his most

traditional work, and thus important texts for judging Gregory's originality. The high reputation

Gregory enjoyed in Byzantium ensured that we have more epigrams from Gregory than from

any other Greek poet of antiquity. Book 8 of the *Palatine Anthology,* devoted entirely to Gregory's

work, transmits over 250 funerary epigrams, which constitute only a selection of more than 300

transmitted under his name. Of those transmitted in *AnthPal* 8, around 160 are *epitaphioi* proper.

The rest are concerned with death: meditations on death, apotropaic inscriptions against grave

robbers,[14] even poems that give voice to the complaints of robbed tombs. Gregory's

epigrammatic output thus constitutes an important witness in the story of late Greek epigram.[15]

Though a more sympathetic view has taken hold in the past two decades,[16] Gregory's epigrams

have often been dismissed as meager efforts in a low genre. I here address two striking features of

Gregory's epigrammatic *oeuvre* that have troubled critics. First, Gregory produces numerous

epigrams on single themes. *AnthPal* 8 begins with a cycle of 12 epitaphic epigrams for his friend

---

[12] I cite the *Iambi* according to Pfeiffer 1949.

[13] Hawkins 2014 148–49

[14] For analysis of the epigrams against tomb-robbers, see Floridi 2013.

[15] For an overview of Greek epigram in Late Antiquity, see Agosti 2019. I am grateful to Gianfranco Agosti for providing me a pre-publication draft of this article.

[16] Conca 2000 highlights Gregory's sensitivity to the various techniques and tropes associated with literary epigram. This artfulness is perhaps underappreciated by Criscuolo 2007 49, who finds the epigrams' "true inspiration in the uninterrupted conversation of the poet with himself."

St. Basil,[17] twelve for Gregory's father, and over 40 for his mother; remarkable too is his cycle for

the dignitary Martianus (*AnthPal* 8.104–117) the Modern interpreters have frequently seen these

as artless, rhetorical excesses instead of carefully designed arrangements.[18] Second, some of these

sequences are Christian in nature (they allude primarily to Christian scripture), and others are

definitely secular (they elaborate traditional epigrammatic *topoi* without any mention of the new

faith). Even critics sympathetic to Gregory's work have found this mixture incongruous.[19]

I argue that these features of Gregory's work make good sense when they are situated

properly within the epigrammatic tradition. Following Franca Ela Consolino, I maintain that

Gregory has produced carefully arranged epigrammatic sequences, not artless accumulations. As

a case study, I analyze the epitaphic sequence for Gregory's father (*AnthPal* 8.13–24). As we shall

see, this expansion of the epigrammatic form into full sequences is one of the key contributions of

the fourth century epigrammists.[20] I show how Gregory uses even this Christian sequence to

fashion his poetic *persona* along Callimachean lines. The careful arrangement on display in the

sequence disproves Muratori's influential assertion that Gregory "did not pursue poetic elegance"

---

[17] Although *AnthPal* 8.12 mentions twelve epigrams for Basil, the codex carries only ten. Either we are missing two epigrams or several have been combined.

[18] Muratori 1709 *pref.* posited that Gregory "did not pursue poetic elegance" in the epigrams and that most of them were not intended for publication. Waltz 1944 25 and Beckby 1965, books 7–8 446 both concur. Similarly Vertoudakis 2011 77 has suggested that Gregory's epigrammatic experiments accumulated slowly over time as the result of ascetic practice rather than authorial plan and were only collected together after his death. Hose 2004 24–25 considers them essentially rhetorical *ethopoeiae*.

[19] Consolino 1987 judges that the secular epigrams produce an inharmonious inconsistency in Gregory's epigrammatic corpus that reveals the vitality of pagan culture in the fourth century and betrays the poet's inability to fully harmonize the pagan and the Christian. Likewise Vertoudakis 2011 233 sees Gregory's chief contribution in his Christian epigrams.

[20] We see similar sequences in Palladas of Alexandria, most likely a slightly younger contemporary of Gregory. For Palladas' date and further analysis of the Late Antique expansion of the epigrammatic form, see Agosti 2019. I am grateful to Kathryn Gutzwiller for providing a pre-publication draft of her forthcoming article "Palladas: Sequences in the Greek Anthology and the Yale Papyrus."

when writing for his family and friends. I part ways with Consolino in arguing that Gregory consciously develops classical models even in his Christian epigrams, and that the thematic variety of his corpus would have been considered an aesthetic asset, not detriment.

Topoi and Allusions

Before turning to the sequence for Gregory the Elder, let us consider a few instances where Gregory turns familiar *topoi* to new ends. One common epigrammatic *topos* is the "snatch." Poets typically lament that the deceased has been snatched by Hades, especially when a young person has died.[21] In erotic epigram, by contrast, Eros (or the beloved) snatches away the heart of the poet.[22] Gregory develops the motif in several ways. In the cycles for his mother and for St. Basil, the soul of the deceased is snatched by the Trinity, or by an angel.[23] In *AnthPal* 8.145, a deceased husband snatches his wife up to paradise shortly after his death. In these instances, though the general pattern is the same (a divine entity snatches a person), the emotional tenor is reversed. Traditionally the "snatching of Hades" is a violent act to be mourned. In a new Christian setting, by contrast, human mourning is overshadowed by the hopefulness of the divine grasp. In *AnthPal* 8.3 for Basil, the human suffering caused by Basil's death is juxtaposed with the delight of the angelic host as they receive a distinguished soul.

Gregory develops the motif in other ways. One particularly inventive innovation occurs in *AnthPal* 8.103:

> Κτῆσιν ἑὴν σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα πάντ' ἀναθεῖσα
> Γοργόνιον Χριστῷ μοῦνον ἀφῆκε πόσιν·
> οὐ μὰν οὐδὲ πόσιν δηρὸν χρόνον, ἀλλ' ἄρα καὶ τὸν
> ἥρπασεν ἐξαπίνης κύδιμον Ἀλύπιον.

---

[21] See *e.g. AnthPal* 7.170, 221, 308.

[22] See, *e.g.*, Call. G.-P. #4=*AnthPal* 12.73, and Meleager, G.-P. #81=*A.P.* 12.52.

[23] For Basil snatched by the Trinity, see *AnthPal* 8.3. For Gregory's mother being "snatched", see *A.P.* 53, 54, and 69.

ὄλβιε ὀλβίστης ἀλόχου πόσι · τοῖς ῥα λοετροῖς [5]
  λύματ' ἀπωσάμενοι ζῆτε παλιγγενέες.

She offered up her goods, her flesh, her bones;
Gorgonion hath left only her husband.
But even he was not left out for long,
for sudd'nly hath she snatched Alupios.
O happy man of happy wife, with washing
you both do rise, now cleansed to live again.

Here Gregory's sister, Gorgonion, snatches her husband from spiritual death and prevails upon

him to become a Christian. Gregory has combined the erotic snatch of the beloved with a

reversal of the snatch of Hades: Gorgonion's grasp restores her husband from spiritual death to

life.

In other instances, Gregory reworks an extended portion of prior epigram. Perhaps the

most striking is Gregory's reworking of Call. G.-P. 29 (=*AnthPal* 7.525) in *AnthPal* 8.188.

Compare:

Ὅστις ἐμὸν παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδα, Καλλιμάχου με
  ἴσθι Κυρηναίου παῖδά τε καὶ γενετήν.
εἰδείης δ' ἄμφω κεν· ὃ μέν κοτε πατρίδος ὅπλων
  ἦρξεν, ὃ δ' ἤεισεν κρέσσονα βασκανίης·
οὐ νέμεσις· Μοῦσαι γὰρ ὅσους ἴδον ὄμματι παῖδας [5]
  μὴ λοξῶι, πολιοὺς οὐκ ἀπέθεντο φίλους. (Call. G.-P. 29=*AnthPal*
7.525)[24]

Whosoever should bear his foot beside my tomb, know that I am the son
and father of a Callimachus from Cyrene. You may well know them
both. The one led his homeland in war and the other sang songs

---

[24] Page has bracketed the last couplet and printed ἄχρι βίου in lieu of μὴ λοξῶι (μὴ λοξῶι is taken from the scholia to Hesiod). Gutzwiller suggests by contrast that Callimachus here intentionally refers to the beginning of the *Aetia*, which I find persuasive. For various solutions to the problem, see Gutzwiller 1998 213.

I cite Callimachus according to Page (1976) = G.-P., with departures noted. Only in another epigram does Callimachus supply his father's name (G.-P. 30=*AnthPal* 7.415) and so these probably belong in a cycle. Gutzwiller 1998 202, 211–213 has argued persuasively that these two were place at the end of Callimachus' collection of epigrams, and function as a coda to his entire oeuvre.

surpassing envy. There is no cause for ill-will: for whosoever the Muses
look upon favorably as children, they do not reject when old.

Ὅστις ἐμὸν παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδα, ἴσθι με ταῦτα
  τοῦ νεοκληρονόμου χερσὶ παθόντ᾽ ἀδίκως·
οὐ γὰρ ἔχον χρυσόν τε καὶ ἄργυρον, ἀλλ᾽ ἐδοκήθην,
  κάλλεϊ μαρμαίρων τοσσατίῳ λαγόνων. (*AnthPal* 8.188)

O thou that bringst thy foot beside my tomb,
do know that I have suffered greedy ill,
for nought I had of gold, but only seemed
when I did gleam with, O, so lovely pillars.[25]

Here a tomb complains that it has been defaced needlessly, since it had no gold within. In commenting on this epigram, Vertoudakis notes that Gregory does not normally reprise prior lines so extensively. He suggests that this is a literary riddle or wink of the eye to the reader.[26] I would expand further. The sincerity of many of Gregory's epigrams sometimes makes it difficult to appreciate Gregory's playful and satirical humor when it surfaces.[27] The context of the epigram reveals Gregory's tone. Two epigrams prior Gregory has signaled that wealthy tombs invite their own destruction (*AnthPal* 8.186). In *AnthPal* 8.188, Gregory in good Aristophanic fashion pushes the somber Callimachean opening to an ironic and humorous extreme. This sort of tonal shift and play is a hallmark of Callimachean epigram.[28] Gregory here nods to his master as he adapts Callimachus' lines for a new, satirical setting.

---

[25] More literally, "Whosoever should bear his foot beside my tomb, know that I have suffered injustice at the hands of a 'new heir.' For I did not have gold and silver, but was merely thought to, as I gleamed with such brilliant beauty on my sides."

[26] Vertoudakis 2011 164

[27] Panagiotis, for instance, misses Gregory's humor in her short summary of his style. See Panagiotis 2011 16–17.

[28] See Gutzwiller 1998 190–96 for the variety of approaches that Callimachus adopts in his dedicatory epigrams.

The Sequence for Gregory the Elder

Gregory's sequence of epigrams for his father, Gregory the Elder, (*AnthPal* 8.12–23) consists of

twelve epigrams varying in length from 2 to 6 lines.[29] Gregory's father was not a Christian from

birth. He belonged initially to a sect called the Hypsistarians, which his son characterizes in *or.* 18

as a mixture of pagan and Jewish elements. The father converted at the age of sixty and then

presided over Nazianzus as bishop for forty years, living apparently to 100 years of age. In

addition to the epigrams, Gregory also wrote a funeral oration for his father (*Or.* 18). Other works

in Gregory's corpus suggest that Gregory had a difficult relationship with his father. In his long

iambic poem *De vita sua* (2.1.11) he professes great respect for his father, but also presents the

Elder as a τύραννος, who ordained Gregory against his will (336–356). Internal and external

evidence show that the epigrams form a unified sequence. They appear in the same order in the

chief witnesses *H*, *Am*, and *L*.[30] Individual epigrams within the sequence (*e.g.* 8.15–16) depend on

the surrounding epigrams to inform us of the speaker. In all but two of the epigrams Gregory the

Elder is the speaker.[31] In the others (8.14 and 8.23), the narrator is unnamed, though we are to

imagine that Gregory the son is narrator.

---

[29] Milo 2005 has analyzed several of these poems, though she does not treat 8.22. Her analysis is generally sound; I differ in that I emphasize the poetological features of the epigrams and explicitly demonstrate the development over the course of the sequence. I am also more reticent than her about many of the parallels she mentions. Gregory does reprise numerous terms and *formulae* from older authors, especially Homer, but generally he does this for the grandeur of the language, not with any allusive intention.

[30] I cite the text of *AnthPal* 8 from Beckby 1965, with departures noted. As Beckby does not assign *sigla* for manuscripts other than Heidelberg, gr. 23 (the Palatine Anthology), I have taken them from Sicherl 2011. The principal witnesses are: Heidelberg gr. 23 (10th c.) *H* Ambrosianus gr. 433 (11th c.) *Am* Laurentianus plut. 7.10 (11th c.) *L*

No manuscript transmits the same poems in the same order, that is, the place in which a given sequence falls is not consistent from codex to codex. Order within a sequence, however, is much more consistent. For more detail, see Waltz 1944 1–8.

[31] For the sake of clarity, I refer to Gregory's father as "the Elder" or "the Father" throughout. When I say simply "Gregory," I mean the son and poet.

The first poem in the sequence (8.12) provides much of the basic information: the name, occupation, and age of the deceased, along with a request to care for the tomb. We learn that the Elder was one hundred years old at his death and had spent forty years as a bishop and Christian. The next poem (8.13) reports what was left implicit in the prior epigram: the Elder's conversion. God called him from of wild olive tree (*v.* Rom. 9:17–24) and appointed (θῆκε, l. 2) him as chief shepherd of the flock. His wife is now introduced, as is Gregory himself, labeled as an eloquent priest (ἱρὸς ἐμῶν τεκέων ἀγανώτατος[32] l. 5). The epigram concludes with the Elder shrugging off his death: εἰ δὲ τελευτὴν ἔτλην Γρηγόριος, οὐ μέγα · θνητὸς ἔην ("If I underwent an end, it is no great thing: I was mortal").

The following epigram (8.14) develops the earlier themes in several ways. Gregory describes now the manner of his father's conversion by likening it to Moses' vision of God on Mt. Sinai. The Elder is called not just leader of the flock, but God appoints him high priest (ἀρχιερῆα / θήκατο in 3–4 recall ἡγεμόνα θῆκε in the second line of the previous poem). This seems at first like mere repetition, but Gregory provides salient development. He suggests that his father is in some ways superior to Moses because the Elder had both the mystical revelation of Moses and the high-priestly duties of Aaron.[33] Gregory concludes the epigram by asserting that his father, though once far away, is now near his beloved Trinity (alluding to Ephesians 2:16–18).

---

[32] Beckby translates "*Priester wurde mein Sohn, der mildeste aller.*" and Waltz "*le plus doux de mes enfants est prêtre*" which are both accurate enough— Gregory probably wants us to hear the Christian virtue of meekness. These renderings do, however, miss the connotations of ἀγανός that pertain to speech. Ἀγανός is generally paired with ἔπος in Homer and was glossed not only as πραΰς (meek) or προσηνής (mild) but ἡδύς and ὑδύλογος (see *LfGRE s.v*).

[33] Aaron is called a high-priest (ἀρχιερεύς in the Septuagint) in Joshua 22:13. Milo 2005 449 does not treat this poem but notes the same competitive tendency in *AnthPal* 8.18 where Gregory the Elder enters vineyard later than the other workers, but gains an even greater reward. *Cf.* Mt. 20:1–16, where the workers who start at different time are given the same reward.

The following three epigrams (8.15–17) bring Gregory himself to the forefront. *AnthPal* 8.15 is worth citing in full (Gregory the Elder is speaker):

> Αὐτὸς νηὸν ἔρεψα Θεῷ καὶ δῶχ' ἱερῆα
>   Γρηγόριον καθαρῇ λαμπόμενον Τριάδι,
> ἄγγελον ἀτρεκίης ἐριηχέα, ποιμένα λαῶν,
>   ἠίθεον σοφίης ἀμφοτέρης πρύτανιν.
>
> A temple I have wrought for God and given
> my Gregory to be its priest, who shines
> purely for the resplendent trinity,
> as herald of truth and shepherd to the peoples,
> a young man skilled in both branches of wisdom.

The poem is of poetological significance for the son. Through the Homeric cadences Gregory stresses his function as an eloquent expositor of truth (ἄγγελον ἀτρεκίης ἐριηχέα) and a shepherd of his flock (ποίμενα λαῶν). In addition to the Homeric echoes and the scriptural imagery associated with shepherds, we are also meant to remember that in both classical and scriptural sources shepherds sing in verse.[34] In the final line, Gregory underscores his ambition to master both pagan and Christian literature.

Gregory here ably weaves together different genres. Into an epitaphic sequence he inserts a votive epigram with himself as the living sacrifice, thereby combining traditional and Christian themes.[35] Callimachus enjoyed this sort of play with generic expectations, though it was, of course, by no means exclusive to him. And yet, the poem certainly contains un-Callimachean elements. When Gregory describes himself as ἐριήχης ("loud-sounding") we may easily think of

---

[34] Theocritus' bucolic and King David are the two most important examples. Milo 2005 ably notes the Homeric and scriptural echoes but does not mention the bucolic subtext, made certain, I think, by *AnthPal* 8.22, discussed below.

[35] For the Christian as a "living sacrifice" (θυσίαν ζῶσαν) see Rom. 12:1.

Callimachus leaving "thundering" to Zeus. Moreover "shepherd of the peoples" (ποιμένα λαῶν) is a common Homeric tag.[36]

These sorts of connections between poems in the sequence may be seen throughout; I will not, however, belabor the point. Instead, I note two particularly noteworthy epigrams from the second half of the sequence. In *AnthPal* 8.21, Gregory praises his father's congregation in strongly Callimachean terms:

> Τυτθὴ μάργαρός ἐστιν, ἀτὰρ λιθάκεσσιν ἀνάσσει·
>   τυτθὴ καὶ Βηθλέμ, ἔμπα δὲ χριστοφόρος.
> ὣς δ᾽ ὀλίγην μὲν ἐγὼ ποίμνην λάχον, ἀλλὰ φερίστην
>   Γρηγόριος, τὴν σύ, παῖ φίλε, λίσσομ᾽ ἄγοις.

> Small is the pearl, but queen of precious stones.
> Small too is Bethlehem, but she bears Christ.
> Just so, my portion was a tiny flock,
> but best! I pray thee, son, to lead it well.[37]

The preference for the slight but excellent surely evokes Callimachus' preference for shorter, finely crafted poems (λεπτότης).[38] The anaphora of a Callimachean keyword (τυτθὴ … τυτθὴ) and the bucolic dieresis in line 3 only reinforce the Callimacheanism.[39]

Though not specifically Callimachean, Gregory's play with the bucolic tradition in *AnthPal* 8.22 is also striking:

---

[36] TODO: fill in refs

[37] More literally, "Small is the pearl, but she is the queen of precious stones. Small too is Bethlehem, but she bears Christ. Just so, I, Gregory, inherited a small but excellent flock, which I beg you lead, my dear child."

[38] For the theme of λεπτότης in the epigrams, see Callimachus, G.-P. 56-57 (G.-P. = Page 1976), which praise the λεπταί ῥήσιες of Aratus and the "pure road" (καθαρή ὁδός) of Theaetetus. For τυτθός as an ironic aesthetic keyword, see *Aetia* Book 1 fr. 1.5, ἔπος δ᾽ ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἐλίσσω. For Callimachus' stylistic metaphors, see Asper 1997 156–98.

[39] For anaphora, see *e.g.* G.-P. 63, where the first two couplets begin οὕτως ὑπνώσαις. For Callimachus' use of the bucolic dieresis, see Stephens 2015 31 and Sens 2010 lxxxv. Mention of stones naturally leads one to think of Posidippus, though I have yet to find any allusions.

Ποιμενίην σύριγγα τεαῖς ἐν χερσὶν ἔθηκα
  Γρηγόριος· σὺ δέ μοι, τέκνον, ἐπισταμένως
σημαίνειν· ζωῆς δὲ θύρας πετάσειας ἅπασιν,
  ἐς δὲ τάφον πατέρος ὥριος ἀντιάσαις.

I've placed within thine hands the shepherd's reed;
my child, with skill expound on my behalf.
Do open up the doors of life for all,
and come at proper time unto my grave.

Waltz states that the *syrinx* in question does not evoke the panpipes,[40] but Gregory would not use such a striking phrase (ποιμενίην σύρριγγα) without being attuned to the resonances from bucolic poetry.[41] I propose rather that we have here an instance of *Kontrastimitation*. Pan, the patron of bucolic song, was readily associated with licentiousness and with "inspired" verse (as opposed to poetry based on *technê*). In good Callimachean fashion, Gregory rejects this approach to life and verse in favor of one rooted in *paideia* and *technê*. The enjambment of ἐπισταμένως ("skillfully") with the somber molossus (- - -) σημαίνεν ("exposit" or "expound") only underscores this further. Given the context, Gregory may also be punning on Pan's name in line 3 (ἅπασιν).[42]

Gregory and the Epigrammatic Tradition
In the preceding section I have argued that Gregory's epitaphic sequence for his father displays evidence of careful sequential arrangement and aesthetic ambition. Even in a Christian sequence, Gregory shows himself alert to the classical past. I now turn to more general questions. Since

---

[40] Waltz 1944 41n1

[41] See Agosti 2013 for an analysis of bucolic themes in Late Antique epigrams. This passage is discussed on p. 241.

[42] The ancients naturally associated Pan's name with πᾶς, πᾶσα, πᾶν. See, for example, *h.Hom.* 19.47: Πᾶνα δέ μιν καλέεσκον, ὅτι φρένα πᾶσιν ἔτερψεν ("They call him 'Pan' because he gladdens the heart of all").

Muratori, scholars have argued that Gregory's remarkable number of epigrams on single themes

was due to filial or familiar piety.[43] They point to *AnthPal* 8.30:

> Γρηγόριον βοόωσα παρ' ἀνθοκόμοισιν ἀλωαῖς
> ἤντεο, μῆτερ ἐμή, ξείνης ἄπο νισσομένοισι,
> χεῖρας δ' ἀμπετάσασα φίλας τεκέεσσι φίλοισι,
> Γρηγόριον βοόωσα· τὸ δ' ἔζεεν αἷμα τεκούσης
> ἀμφοτέροις ἐπὶ παισί, μάλιστα δὲ θρέμματι θηλῆς· [5]
> **τοὔνεκα καὶ σὲ τόσοις ἐπιγράμμασι, μῆτερ, ἔτισα.**

> "My Gregory" thou criedst amongst the meadows
> when thou didst meet thy sons returning from
> abroad, embracing them with tenderness,
> "My Gregory" crying. A mother's blood
> ran warm for both her sons, but most for th' one
> that from thine own dear breast did nurse; and so,
> with many epigrams I've honored thee.

I see no reason to doubt that Gregory saw his epigrams as tokens of familial and amicable

affection. Yet when scholars invoke familial piety they typically imply that no aesthetic design is

perceptible in the sequences. Instead we are left to imagine that in accumulating dozens of

epigrams for his mother Gregory forsook aesthetic sense. Vertoudakis suggests that Gregory's

abundance is an ascetic exercise, analogous to the anchorite's ceaseless repetition of the Jesus

prayer. Yet there is a qualitative difference between the repetition of a simple, prosaic prayer and

the fertile invention at work in Gregory's epigrams. I have no doubt that Gregory viewed his art

as *askesis* (as did Callimachus, *in suo modo*). Indeed, we shall see in chapter five that Gregory

carefully synthesizes ascetic and aesthetic concerns. Yet such psychological explanations are

wanting if not combined with careful formal analysis. The sequence for Gregory the Elder

reveals a poet carefully creating a Callimachean *persona*. This is not the action of a poet who has

forsaken poetic elegance. Sincere familial feeling need not preclude poetic ambition.

---

[43] Muratori 1709 *pref.*; Waltz 1944 25–27 and Vertoudakis 2011 79–81, 221–234 accept this but also
points to the rhetoric as a decisive influence.

Gregory's ambitions are better appreciated when considered alongside other epigrammatic productions of the Imperial and Late Antique periods. The care Gregory spends in creating a *persona* contrasts sharply with the numerous anonymous epigrams inscribed on stone. Gregory's poems are also different from the epigrams of other rhetoricians, like Herodes Atticus, who occasionally played at the epigrammatic game.[44] Unlike these authors, Gregory has created both a large number of epigrams and taken the care to arrange at least some of them into coherent sequences. The closest analogs are thus poets like Callimachus, Posidippus, and Meleager, who authored entire epigrammatic collections.

Scholars have frequently pointed to Gregory's rhetorical training to explain features of his poetry. Generally, Gregory has been held to be at core a rhetorician, whose poetry is marred by the importation of rhetorical techniques.[45] Rhetoric has been used to explain a variety of phenomena. Pellegrino considered many of Gregory's epigrams rather poor in quality, and hence posited that they were school-exercises. In doing so, he missed that most of Gregory's epitaphic poems were written for people that died well after Gregory's school days.[46] Hose sees Gregory's numerous epigrams on single themes as an adaptation of *ethopoiia*, a rhetorical exercise.[47] Vertoudakis follows Pellegrino in considering a rhetoricity fundamental to Gregory's style.[48]

---

[44] For potential epigrammatic compositions by Herodes Atticus, the second century sophist, see Bowie 1989 231–36.

[45] *e.g.* Keydell 1953 138–39

[46] Pellegrino 1932 97–102

[47] Hose 2004 24–25

[48] Vertoudakis 2011 219–34

It would be foolish to assert that Gregory's rhetorical training in no way influenced his poetic work. Gregory's education certainly shapes his approach to poetic composition. Moreover, as we saw in chapter one, Imperial and Late Antique rhetorical theorists conceived of poetry and rhetoric as closely related phenomena, not fundamental opposites, as moderns have frequently regarded them since the Romantic period.[49] For instance, when describing various tropes and figures of speech instructors of rhetoric were just as likely to cite an example from verse as from prose.[50] We do more justice to the late antique conception if we regard rhetoric as a toolbox for creating eloquent speech, whether in verse or in prose.[51] If, however, we too quickly look to prose analogues to explain Gregory's epigrams we badly misrepresent his place in the poetic tradition against which he intended his works to be judged. For all the kinship between the two forms of eloquence, we saw in chapter one that poetry and rhetoric remained distinct traditions, which retained overlapping but distinct canons.[52] It is clear, then, that when rhetors like Scopelianus or Gregory produced extensive poetic *corpora*, they wanted these to be read as poetry, that is, first against their poetic antecedents, and not as versified prose.

The epigrammatic tradition in fact provides much precedent for many of the features of Gregory's verse that have vexed scholars. Gregory's epigrammatic sequences, a technique shared with Palladas, probably grew out of erotic cycles like those found in Meleager, where the poet would return repeatedly to a given *eromenos* or *hetaira*. For instance, Meleager G.-P 39 and 40 both

---

[49] For a revisionist history of rhetoric that stresses the kinship between the two forms of eloquence, see Walker 2000. Similarly, see Webb 1997 for an analysis of the complicated interplay between poetry and rhetorical prose in later Greek and Latin literature.

[50] Menander Rhetor, for instance, considers Homer the inventor of the speech of lament (monody). See Russell and Wilson 1981 202–203.

[51] I am grateful for several conversations with Gianfranco Agosti on this point. See most recently his remarks on the symbiotic relationship between the school and literature in Agosti 2019.

[52] On the relationship between prose and poetry under the Empire, see Bowie 1989 210–14.

explain how the Graces, Eros, and Aphrodite have adorned the *hetaira* Zenophila; G.-P. 101–102 both take the threat of Zeus abducting Meleager's *eromenos* Muiscus as the starting point.[53] Gregory's organization of his epigrams into sequences is also paralleled by his younger contemporary Palladas. We have seen in the sequence for Gregory the Elder many of the formal features that Gutzwiller has identified in Palladas' sequences: repetitions of key-words, thematic development, and a strong *persona*.[54] I suspect Gregory's abundance would look less remarkable if other epigrammatic collections of single authors survived. Nevertheless, Palladas' sequences in the *AnthPal* are sufficient to demonstrate that this expansion of the epigrammatic form was a feature of Late Antique epigram.

The epigrammatic tradition is the primary and proper context in which to judge Gregory's style. Though Vertoudakis' list of "rhetorical" figures is exceedingly useful, he is mistaken to consider features like polyptoton, anaphora, and alliteration as traits that show "the decisive influence of rhetoric."[55] None of these features are exclusive to prose. In fact, the ancients generally regarded these figures as poetic features that rhetoric had inherited from poetry.[56] What is most important for us is how Gregory uses these figures to position himself within the epigrammatic tradition. Gregory employs certain features of Callimachean style quite

---

[53] Not all the Zenophila poems (G.-P. 29–40) appear beside one another in the *AnthPal*, but they do tend to appear in groups. This suggests that they appeared together in Meleager's *Garland* and perhaps also in his original collections. For instance, G.-P. 39 and 40 (on the Graces and Zenophila) appear next to one another in the *AnthPal* (5.196 and 5.196). See Cameron 1993 1–18 on Melager's *Garland*.

[54] See Gutzwiller's forthcoming article, "Palladas Sequences in the Greek Anthology and the Yale Papyrus."

[55] See Vertoudakis 2011, "ύφος και ποιητική ρητορική": 197–209, especially 198 "Το πόσο η ρητορική έχει ασκήσει αποφασιστική επίδραση στην ποιητική γραφή του Γρηγορίου μαρτυρείται και από την πληθύ των σχημάτων λόγου."

[56] Walker 2000 65–66 recounts several ancient discussions of the relationship between poetry and rhetoric.

readily: anaphora, clever play with generic expectation, and sprawling enjambment.[57] In other respects, he departs. Gregory generally avoids Doric forms, employs fewer metrical schemes, and admits more Homeric *formulae*. Other aspects of Gregory's style show more similarity with Meleager and other later epigrammists. Both enjoy heaping up adjectives in apposition, and both are at times daring wordsmiths.[58]

Finally, the organizing principles of epigrammatic collections also explain the mix of Christian and secular themes. Perhaps more than in any other genre, pleasing variety (ποικιλία) was the ambition of the epigrammist. Gregory's facility for writing epigrams of different sorts (epitaphic, satirical, secular, and Christian) would have been viewed as an aesthetic asset. The unity of the Gregory's epigrammatic corpus is in the *persona* that Gregory creates, not the subject material; the same holds true in the epigrammatic *corpora* of Callimachus and Meleager, which though impartially preserved, are even more variety in subject matter than Gregory's.

My treatment of Gregory's epigrams limited in scope. I have not examined the epitaphic sequence for Gregory's mother, which is by far the longest of its type, nor have I considered the secular sequences or the numerous epigrams against tomb-robbers.[59] And yet, we see that even in this "humble genre" Gregory shows himself to be a skillful author within the Callimachean tradition of epigram. Gregory's formal developments and thematic variety should not be subsumed into Christian *askesis* or familial piety, nor reduced to rhetoric. He consciously develops

---

[57] For more detailed analysis of Gregory's style and its relationship to Callimachus', see chapter three, below.

[58] For an analysis Meleager's style and a list of coined words, see Gow and Page 1965 593. Vertoudakis 2011 134–139 ably treats Gregory's coinages and gives Gregory the memorable appellation of τολμηρὸς λεξιπλάστης (2011: 134).

[59] The epigrams against tomb-robbers have a particularly complicated textual tradition, for which see Palla 2013.

the epigrammatic tradition both formally and thematically, and it is by this tradition that we must first judge his work.

De rebus suis (2.1.1)

We now turn to a formally innovative poem, Gregory's *De rebus suis* (2.1.1). This extended hexametric work runs to 635 lines in Tuilier's edition.[60] The poem has a hymnic frame, into which Gregory inserts laments, narrative vignettes, and pleas for divine aid. It is one of the most programmatically important of Gregory's works. Not only is it Gregory's lengthiest effort in hexameter, but it stands first in the manuscripts of *Gedichtgruppe* 1, which transmits most of Gregory's hexametric and elegiac verse.[61] Moreover, the poem is also transmitted at the head of Gregory's orations, making it the only poem to be transmitted among Gregory's verse and prose.[62] In part, then, this poem is the introduction to Gregory's poetic persona. *De rebus suis* is an exceedingly varied poem and this variety has elicited scholarly disagreement on its generic status. I argue below that Gregory consciously combined several different genres into something new. I provide here an outline to illustrate the various strands of the poem's fabric:

- Prooemic Prayer (1–104)
    - Catalog of biblical people whom Christ has helped (1–20)
    - Plea for help with enemies (21–36)
    - Description of Good and Evil Ways of Life (37–62)
    - Description of G's Innocent Way of Life (63–103)
- Body: Lament and Prayer (105–546)
    - Announcement of Theme: ὀίζυς (104–116)
    - Lament
        - Establishing ἤθη of G's parents and their troubles (117–163)

---

[60] For *De rebus suis* I cite Bady, Tuilier, and Bernardi 2004 unless otherwise noted. The poem has been translated into English by Meehan 1987.

[61] Bady, Tuilier, and Bernardi 2004 LXXIII argues that the arrangement of the poems in the 6th century archetype goes back in part to Gregory, but this seems doubtful to me, for the ordering of the Greek archetype is not reflected in the earliest Syriac translations. See Sicherl 2011 3.

[62] Sicherl 2011 4

- - Narration and Lament for G's brother Caesarius, who recently died (164–234)
  - – Interlude: Addressing the Audience (235–253)
    - Christians will understand my woe
    - Others will scoff
  - – Lament Renewed (254–350)
    - Present Troubles and Past Successes: The glories of my past monastic seclusion (261–293)
    - Present Troubles and Past Troubles: Present troubles worse than… (294–350)
      - – Shipwreck
      - – Earthquake
      - – Disease
  - – Interlude: Let my woe be instructive to others (351–359)
  - – Lament Renewed: Scriptural Juxtapositions (360–415)
    - I am like the poor man helped by the Samaritan (367–413)
    - I am like the publican (393–414)
  - – Prayer: Help me for my parents sake (415–466)
    - Inset narrative: G's birth compared to Hannah and Samuel (422–466)
  - – Lament: Fragility of All Life (467–546)
- Concluding Prayers (547–634)
  - – Prayer to Christ (547–621)
    - Restore me to former vitality (547–575)
    - Help me, for I am like… (576–595):
      - – The Rich Man and Lazarus
      - – The Woman Hemorrhaging Blood
      - – The Gessarene Demoniac
      - – The Hungry Crowd
      - – The Disciples Tossed about on the Sea
      - – Lazarus Dead in the Tomb
    - Christ is G's only Source of Aid (596–615)
  - – Prayer to Trinity (622–634)

De rebus suis is commonly called an autobiography, but this appellation is somewhat misleading. Gregory devotes only about 230 lines of a 635 line poem to narrative proper. The majority of the poem is a mixture of lament, prayer, and ethical reflection. Scholars have characterized it variously. Roger Keydell has arged that the piece was formally a hymn but adds the qualification that the work had "escaped its form," a sign that Gregory had no inherited form for

autobiographical verse of this sort.[63] Jean Bernardi calls it a prayer,[64] and most recently Cilica

Milovanovic has argued that the work fits into the genre of didactic epic.[65] I argue that only a

synthesis of these views can adequately accommodate the variety of the poem.

Though initially appealing Keydell's characterization of the work as a hymn quickly runs

into problems. The poem does open with an invocation of the deity (Χριστέ, ἄναξ) and Gregory

then uses a series of relative clauses to enumerate various significant "salvations" in the scriptures

(Daniel from the Lion's Den, Shadrach Meshach Abednego, *et al.*). The relative clauses culminate

in a prayer for Christ to come to the narrator and extend to him also salvation. The work

likewise closes with prayer, first to Christ and then to the entire Trinity. The accumulation of

vocative epithets in the conclusion (*e.g.* 627–29) is again characteristic of the hymnic style, and we

have a reference to future hymns in the concluding line.[66] Yet the ending is different from those

of other narrative hymns in key details. First, Gregory's *envoi* is rather more lengthy than those of

the Homeric or Callimachean hymns, which are typically five lines are fewer. More importantly,

Gregory's opening and conclusion lack the characteristic salutation and farewell for the divinity

(one nearly always encounters the imperative χαῖρε). Gregory's promise of future hymns,

---

[63] "*Formal ist es ein Hymnus an Christus, das zeigt der Anfang und der Schluss. Aber die Form ist gesprengt, ein Zeichen, dass Gregor die Form für diese bekennende Autobiographie sich erst schaffen musste.*" Keydell 1953 141

[64] " *Le poème intitulé* Περὶ τῶν καθ᾽ ἑαυτὸν *est une longue prière de 634 hexamètres que le poète adresse à Dieu dans son désanoi pour lui confier son chagrin et lui demander son aide.*" Bady, Tuilier, and Bernardi 2004 LI. Casanova 1999 has analyzed the prayers in the poem.

[65] Milovanovic 2008

[66] See 633f. ἐνθάδε καὶ μετέπειτα ὅλῃ θεότητι μιγέντα, / γηθυσύνως ὕμνοις σε διηνεκέεσσι γεραίρειν. ("where after being mixed in with the entire godhead you will exult gladly in continual hymns"). *Cf.* the end of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, l. 546: αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ᾽ ἀοιδῆς ("But I will also remember you in another hymn").

I cannot help but note Gregory's use of the pregnant phrase "continuous hymns" (ὕμνοις…διηνεκέεσσι) in the final line of *De rebus suis*, which surely is meant to reverse Callimachus' rejection of "continuous songs" in the prologue to the *Aetia.* The beatific vision has shattered the aesthetic categories that presently obtain.

reminiscent of the end of the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo* , on closer inspection actually reveals a distinction between Gregory's current mode of singing (woe), and his future hope (joyful hymn). The most significant difficulties with a hymnic characterization, however, pertain to the body of the poem. In short, we have no sustained narration of sacred history. Instead, Gregory alternates between lament and prayer. If Gregory had intended the work to be received as a hymn proper, he would have signaled this, as he does in the *Hymn to Virginity*.[67] The hymnic elements of *De rebus suis*, like second person address of a divinity, should instead be understood as elements within the broader category of prayer (εὐχή), or as hymnic elements that have been incorporated into a more complicated work, such as we have in the *Poemata arcana*.[68]

Bernardi's characterization of the poem as prayer is more accurate, but only to a point. After all, when the narrator speaks in the second person, it is nearly always to Christ or the Trinity. The work opens with prayer to Christ, concludes with prayers to Christ and the Trinity, and there are still other pleas inserted throughout the poem. Prayer also accounts well for the autobiographical episodes, for prayers often include narratives elucidating the suppliant's worthiness and cause of misfortune. The whole of the poem, however, cannot quite be characterized as such. Sometimes the narrator turns from God to address others. The most poignant example is Gregory's address of his recently deceased brother, Caesarius (lines 177–78). Occasionally he addresses the audience with a first-person plural (though not in the second person). For instance, in line 518, he exhorts his audience, "let us fear the eye of God" (ὄμμα μέγα τρομέωμεν). In short, though prayer is a prominent strand, it is not the only genre present in the work.

---

[67] See my analysis of this work (1.2.1a) in chapter four.

[68] See Daley 2006 29 and Faulkner 2010 for discussion of the hymnic elements in the *Poemata arcana.*

Milovanovic's wrongly considers *De rebus suis* a didactic work in the vein of Hesiod's *Works and Days*.[69] Though several of Milovanovic's observations are useful, they generally reveal a misapprehension of the nature of poetic genre and composition. She is correct that *De rebus suis* is about right in terms of length and meter for a didactic poem, but these are not sufficient indicators. Hexameter hymns could sometimes stretch to over 500 lines (*v.* the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo*), as could many *epyllia*. Complicated similes are by no means characteristic of didactic poetry, as she avers.[70] As we saw in chapter one, this feature is characteristic of Homeric, not Hesiodic poetry. Of the didactic poets before Gregory, only Oppian developed the simile extensively and this was rooted precisely in a rejection of the Alexandrian didactic tradition. Other features she points out, like Gregory's apostrophe to his dead brother Caesarius, are poignant, but do not function as generic markers. Others, like the "illusion of simultaneity" to which she points are too fuzzy to be of any heuristic use. She claims that Gregory's *periphrases* of certain technical Christian vocabulary further demonstrate that Gregory's poem is didactic (*ibid.* 54–55), but this again is a feature of hexametric style more generally. She fails to appreciate properly the strict demands of the hexameter: most of the *periphrases* she notes are required by meter. Even were this not the case, this sort of circumlocution is standard and desirable for most hexametric poetry, and most especially within the elusive style practiced by Gregory. Sometimes the missteps are particularly puzzling, such as when she asserts that the poem exhibits the metaphrastic tendency of didactic epic after Aratus.[71] I think she is correct that Gregory intends

---

[69] Milovanovic 2008

[70] Milovanovic 2008 50

[71] Didactic poets from Aratus onward typically used a scientific prose treatise as the basis for their poetic efforts. For this tendency to hold in this poem, we would need to suppose a prose *Urtext* of Gregory's own life. This tendency is at work in other poems of Gregory's, most especially the *Poemata arcana*, where

the poem to be instructive, but we must take care to distinguish between the didactic genre and didactic intent. The two often go together, they are not linked by necessity. Many scholars doubt that Nicander's *Theriaca*, though written in the didactic mode of which Hesiod's *Works and Days* was the model, was ever intended to be useful for victims of snake bites.[72] On the other hand, Homer was held by most in antiquity to be a supreme teacher of virtue, even though his poetry was narrative in nature.[73] Close examination of *De rebus suis* shows that most of the features of the didactic genre are absent. Gregory sets forth no fixed body of knowledge;[74] the exhortations in the poem are nearly always directed inward, toward his own soul, rather than outward; the sorts of formal features that abound in didactic epic, like the imperative, are largely absent. The second-person addressee of the poem is nearly always God. The audience is, by contrast, never addressed directly in the second person. Most importantly, Gregory characterizes the work not as teaching, but as lament. The announcement of the them comes in lines 104–05: ἐξερέω δ' ἀναφανδὸν ἐμὴν πάντεσσιν ὀϊζύν · / ὥς κέν τις σκολιοῖο νοήματα θηρὸς ἀλύξῃ. ("I will declare openly my woe to all, so that some may escape the schemes of the crooked-minded beast"). The theme is reprised at 253–54: ἐγώ γε μὲν οὔτι γόοιο / λήξω, πρὶν στονόεσσαν ὑπεκφυγέειν κακότητα ("I shall in no way cease from my lament until I escape completely from mournful woe"). Gregory does express the hope in lines 351–59 that his woe will be instructive to others, but his didactic intent has found expression in a threnic mode.

---

certain passages follow closely, *mutatis mutandis*, his efforts in the Theological Orations. There, we have the special case in which the prose author and the poet are identical.

[72] Most recently, see Overduin 2014 for a reading of Nicander that privileges the formal aspects of the work.

[73] See *e.g.* Basil *De legendis gentilium libris* 5.6: πᾶσα μὲν ἡ ποίησις τῷ Ὁμήρῳ ἀρετῆς ἐστιν ἔπαινος ("All of Homer's poetry is praise of virtue").

[74] *Cf.* Gregory's *Poemata arcana*, which do present a summary of Christian doctrine.

I would argue instead that Gregory here fuses lament and prayer together into something new. The principal generic strand of the poem is announced at line 104: Gregory's personal suffering (ὀϊζύς). It is in this distress that all disparate elements unite. He tells past successes to underscore his present distress and recounts past suffering only so that it may be surpassed by his present misfortune.[75] Ps.-Menander Rhetor's remarks on the speech of lament (monody) are illuminating for Gregory's lament. Ps.-Menander points to laments of Priam, Hecuba, and Andromache for Hector in *Il.* 24 as important models. Moreover, many of the elements prescribed for the monody are present in Gregory's work: we move from present, to past, to future, as Menander suggests. Yet there is considerable novelty as well. Gregory's mourning is not tied to the death of a specific individual (Ps.-Menander gives dictates specifically for a private address to the family of a deceased person). The death of Gregory's brother is significant but subordinated to the more important disorder of Gregory's own soul (221–234). Indeed, the most significant novelty of Gregory's work is its intense preoccupation with the self. The laments in Homer feature a subjective mourner and objective *flendus*. So Andromache weeps over the dead Hector. Gregory, by contrast, becomes his own object of mourning. There is some precedent for this in the self-narration of Odysseus' sufferings to the Phaeaceans (*Od.* 9–12), but there lament soon gives way to a long, colorful narrative. Formally, the situation is reversed in *De rebus suis*: an extended lament is interrupted by short narrative vignettes and prayer.

The other significant element from the classical past is prayer (εὐχή). The most celebrated was Chryses' brief prayer to Apollo in *Il.* 1.37–42,[76] yet there were other important models in

---

[75] *Cf.* Menander Rhetor's remarks on the encomiastic element in monody, where the dead person is praised precisely to emphasize the sorrow caused her or his departure; p. 202 ed. Russell and Wilson 1981.

[76] See Casanova 1999 147.

Homer. Andromache's plea to Hector in *Il.* 6.407–439, though not addressed to a deity, was a poignant model of plea. Both prayer (εὐχή) and lament (γόος) admit narrative. For instance, in Andromache's plea in *Il.* 6, she recounts the death of her family at the hands of Achilles in order to underscore the precariousness of her place in the world should Hector perish. In pursuit of variety (ποικιλία), Gregory incorporates narrative into both prayers and laments. After announcing woe as his theme in lines 105ff., he describes his childhood and the death of his brother Caesarius. He embeds the next narrative section into a priamel of woe climaxing in his present distress (307–336). Later, by contrast, he prays that God would show him mercy for his parents' sake. This mention of his parents presents him with the opportunity to recount the story of his birth.[77]

Finally, let us address the didactic elements of the poem. Though wrong about the mode of the poem, Milovanovic is correct that the "Two Ways" motif, introduced in 36–49, plays a significant role in the work and is right to see didactic intent in Gregory's efforts. Moral observations abound in the poem. The most extensive passages are:

- 37–62: on the lives of the just and the wicked, and the sufferings of the just
- 467–483: on the insecurity of both the just and the wicked
- 505–529: on seeming versus being and the frightfulness of divine judgment

These are incorporated, however, within a larger lament. Such moral reflections could easily be incorporated into poems whose primary mode was not didactic. Callimachus' excursus on the just and unjust cities in *hArt* 124–35 is one such example.

I would argue therefore that in *De rebus suis* we have a fusion of prayer (εὐχή) and lament (γόος). The chief novelties are that the mourner and the one mourned are identical and that

---

[77] Gregory's mother Nonna already had a daughter but wanted a son too. She vowed to consecrate her son to divine service if God would grant her a son. Gregory naturally compares this to the biblical episode of Hannah and Samuel. See lines 422–466.

Gregory has chosen the hexameter as his metrical scheme.[78] One must also note the pervasive

influence of the Bible on the basic outlook of the poem. Gregory laments his misfortune with the

sort of unremitting tenebrity only found in the wisdom literature of the Old Testament. The

Psalms of Lament and the prayers of Job shape the spirit of poem decisively, even if the formal

models lie elsewhere. Grasping this generic novelty is crucial for rightly understanding the poem.

This generic mixing or crossing is no less conscious than his individual allusions and re-workings

of the literary past examined below. This phenomenon has been most famously explored by

Wilhelm Kroll in his *Kreuzung der Gattungen*.[79] Kroll gave numerous examples of generic crossing,

like the influence of mime and epic in Theocritus, the entry of Bucolic into epigram, and the

transformation of elegiac code. The phenomenon is also common in Late Antiquity, though it

has not been used much for Gregory's verse.[80] For Gregory, as for ps.-Oppian, this generic

experimentation is a self-consciously Callimachean act.[81] Keydell has criticized Gregory for

failing to hew to fixed forms except in "low genres" like the epigram, as though Gregory had no

concept of literary genre.[82] Yet longer poems (like the 1.2.1(A), the *Hymn to Virginity*) demonstrate

that Gregory is perfectly capable of composing within established genres when he wishes.[83] We

should thus regard Gregory's formal inventiveness as a deliberate emulation of Callimachus'

generic variety (πολυείδεια), which the Cyrenaean defended so pointedly in *Iamb* 13.

---

[78] One might have expected elegiac couplets, given the connection in ancient literary criticism between elegy and mourning. Gregory indeed writes a similarly extensive poem in elegiac couplets (2.1.45), which I examine in chapter 5.

[79] Kroll 1924

[80] For a discussion of generic mixing in Prudentius, see Fontaine 1980.

[81] See my remarks on the opening to ps.-Oppian's *Cyn.* in chapter one.

[82] "*Seine übrigen Dichtungen aber litten schwer unter dem Mangel der Bindung an eine feste Form*" Keydell 1953 142.

[83] Keydell here was at a disadvantage, as the *Hymn to Virginity* had not yet been identified as a distinct poem. See my remarks in chapter 4.

De rebus suis is naturally full of noteworthy small-scale appropriations of the literary past. Perhaps the most moving nods to the classical past are Gregory's evocations of the tender conversation between Hector and Andromache in *Il.* 6. The first comes in Gregory's lament for his brother Caesarius, who died prematurely (215–234). Caesarius is described in Hectorian terms as Gregory's guardian, one who kept his brother safe from the troubles of the crowd. Gregory then gives a long priamel: He mourns for the loss of his own preferred way of life, the sorrow common to all people, and the loss of his siblings, but most of all he mourns the state of his own soul. This echoes Hector's priamel in *Il.* 6.450–55, where the Trojan prince describes how neither the death of his parents nor the capture of his city grieves him so much as the impending slavery of his wife Andromache. Gregory varies the wording considerably,[84] but the structure is the same, and Gregory's final simile makes it clear that he has this passage in mind— he compares his soul to a noble and lovely queen who has fallen into the hands of her enemies (229–234).[85]

Gregory summons the Iliadic scene again near the end of the poem (599–605). Here the poet cries out in anguish and reminds his God that he has no other source of protection and comfort, neither wife, nor children, nor friends:

> Σοὶ δ' ἄρ' ἐγὼ μούνῳ, Βασιλεύτατε, μοῦνος ἐλείφθην,
> ὅς πάντων κρατέεις, καί μοι σθένος ἐσσὶ μέγιστον.
> οὔ μ' ἄλοχος κομέουσα δυσαλθέα κήδεα λύσει
> ἥ τε καὶ ἀσχαλόωντα παρηγορίῃσιν ἰαίνει·
> οὐδὲ φίλοις παίδεσσιν ἀγάλλομαι, οἷς ὑπὸ γῆρας

---

[84] I note only line 227 οὔτε κασιγνήτων. The phrase appears in *Il.* 6.452, at the same metrical *sedes*.

[85] Bernardi points to Iphigenia at Aulis (Bady, Tuilier, and Bernardi 2004, *ad loc.*), but it seems clear that even if the verbal overlaps are slight, the scene between Hector and Andromache in *Il.* 6 is the most important poetic antecedent. He is right, however, to point to *Phaedo* 82e as the *Urtext* for the imprisoned soul.

ὀρθοῦται, νεαροῖσιν ὑπ' ἴχνεσιν αὖθις ὁδεῦον ·
οὐδὲ κασιγνήτοις ἐπιτέρπομαι, οὐδ' ἑτάροισι.

To thee alone my king have I been left,
who rulest all and art my greatest strength.
No wife with blandishments shall me console
and free me from my cares; delight I can't
in children of my own, who'd ease the sorrow
of my old age as guides upon the path;
nor is their joy in brothers or in friends.

The verbal overlaps are slight,[86] but again, we hear Andromache's plea to Hector to abide in the

city, for she has no other protector.[87]

As one would expect, Gregory exploits opportunities to combine classical and Christian

resonances. When narrating the episode of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego's encounter with

Nebuchadnezzar's furnace, Gregory states that "God concealed the three brave boys in a dewy

cloud after they lifted their hands." (ἐν φλογὶ δ' Ἀσσυρίη δροσόεν νέφος ἀμφεκάλυψε /

θαρσαλέους τρεῖς παῖδας ἐπεὶ χέρας ἐξεπέτασσαν 8–9). There is no cloud mentioned in the

biblical episode, but one naturally thinks of the nimbic theophanies in the *Iliad* (and indeed, in

the Transfiguration). It is a fitting motif for the epic grandeur assumed by the poet. Gregory's

assertion that "Dreaded Death hath for mortals two gates" (δοιαὶ γάρ τε πύλαι θνητοῖς

στυγεροῦ θανάτοιο 37), has a rich classical and Christian pedigree. Gregory turns the two gates

through which dreams pass in *Od.* 19.563 into the two gates through which mortals pass at

death.[88] The most important biblical passage is without a doubt within Jesus' Sermon on the

Mount (Mt. 7:13-14), but there are others too.[89] At 461, Christ is described as the one who leads

---

[86] *Cf.* the beginning of l. 605 (οὐδὲ κασιγνήτοις) with the beginning of *Il.* 6:430 (ἠδὲ κασίγνητος).

[87] *Il.* 6.413–430.

[88] *Cf.* also Zeus's two jars in *Il.* 24.527, one of blessing, and one of curses.

[89] For a full list of comparands, see Bady and Tuilier (2004), *ad loc.*

Gregory through the narrow and toilsome road to the tiny (λεπτὴν) gate not tread by many. The framework is evangelical: we have the narrow road leading to the narrow gate as we do in Mt. 7:13–14. The passage also recalls Callimachus, as we saw above. One of Gregory's most striking similes in the poem is his comparison of his soul to a tree uprooted by a rushing river (529–542). Simpler versions can be found in Homer (*e.g.* Ajax is compared to a rushing river at *Il.* 11.492–95), and much of the vocabulary is Theocritean.[90] But we might also hear the first Psalm, where the righteous man resembles a tree planted beside pleasant waters. Gregory was once so, but now the enemy has left naught but a rotting remnant of his soul.

Conclusion

Scholars have typically attributed the original elements in Gregory's verse either to his Christian faith or to his importation of schemes from prose rhetoric. I have argued that neither solution is satisfactory. The search for rhetorical parallels for Gregory's verse has often missed important poetic antecedents and misrepresented the complicated interconnectedness of rhetoric and poetry in Late Antiquity. Though it is true that rhetorical theorists had codified the primary strands of *De rebus suis* (lament and prayer) among the different types of speeches, the most influential source and model for these rhetorical dictates was the Homer. Moreover, we have seen that the epigrammatic tradition, even in its partially preserved state, provides precedent for the most striking features of Gregory's epigrams, like his repeated returns to the same theme and his funerary sequences. Gregory's Christian faith is clearly pervasive in his verse. And yet, we are too hasty if we attribute Gregory's poetic originality solely to his faith. First, this experimentation with form was characteristic of both secular and Christian authors in Late Antiquity.[91] Moreover,

---

[90] *V.* Bady and Tuilier (2004), *ad loc.*

[91] For an analysis of generic *mélange* in Ausonius, Ambrose, and Ammianus Marcellinus, see Fontaine 1977.

no other Christian poets working in the fourth and fifth centuries produced anything resembling Gregory's *De rebus suis.* Gregory easily could have written biblical epic, as had Juvencus and Apollinaris, or written a long didactic poem in the style of Aratus or Oppian.[92] He might even have written centos or hagiographic verse, as would the empress Eudocia a few decades later. Instead, Gregory went a different way. The reasons for this are more aesthetic than spiritual (though perhaps we should not divide so sharply between the two). *De rebus suis* is simply one conspicuous example of a generic inventiveness that we see throughout Gregory's work. The poem's place at the head of *Gedichtgruppe* 1 suggests all the more that Gregory wished to underscore his aesthetic originality and mastery over his models. Gregory's inventiveness in *De rebus suis* shares much with Callimachus' *Aetia*, which also lacks a clear generic model.[93] Even when Gregory works within an existing genre, as in the epigrams, he introduces formal innovations. So he adapts the epigrammatic cycle, a feature of erotic epigram, for funerary purposes, and devotes entire sequences of epigrams to deceased friends and family members. Similarly, his creative allusivity, reversals of *topoi*, and new coinages reveal a capable poet eager to display both his knowledge of the literary past and his own new road. Thus we see that a key part of Gregory's effort to produce a poetic *oeuvre* that rivaled pagan verse was his cultivation of Callimachean originality. Taking the untrodden path was for Gregory both an evangelical and an aesthetic imperative.

---

[92] Gregory does indeed write quite a lot of didactic verse, but even in his *Poemata arcana* he innovates the form by creating a unified sequence of didactic poems rather than one unified work like we find in Hesiod, Aratus, or Oppian.

[93] See the succinct treatment of the generic status of the *Aetia* in Harder 2012 23–36. As a didactic catalog poem, the most important antecedents were Hesiodic, especially the *Catalog of Women* and the *Theogony*. Yet Callimachus chose elegiac couplets instead of hexameter, thereby connecting it also to the tradition of narrative elegy.

Chapter 3: ΛΕΠΤΟΤΗΣ. Gregory's Style

In this chapter, I probe the influence of Callimachus on Gregory's style. Gregory was long

regarded by many scholars as an incompetent versifier, someone at heart more a rhetorician than

a poet.[1] More recently, however, scholars have shown that Gregory was sensitive to the various

rules governing verse construction, even if there are prosodic irregularities.[2] I begin by exploring

how Gregory consciously appropriated elements of Callimachean style. This is most evident in

his preoccupation with proper length of "measure" (μέτρον), which he frames in specifically

Callimachean terms on multiple occasions. But it is also observable in the other features of

Gregory's style, especially in his complicated syntax and in his cultivation of repetitions of all

sorts. And yet, I also show that Gregory intentionally departed from Callimachus in important

respects, especially in his cultivation of didactic elements like gnomes and paroimia. As we shall

see from Gregory's remarks in *ep.* 52 and *carm.* 2.1.39, the Cappadocian considered cultivation of

the didactic to be the signature mark of his literary style. Callimachus has extensively shaped

Gregory's style, but the Cappadocian is not afraid to depart from his Alexandrian model.

Part 1: Gregory the Callimachean
Proper Measure
ΟΛΙΓΟΣΤΙΧΙΑ

Like Callimachus, Gregory shows himself to be quite concerned with the proper length of his

literary works. He is the only subsequent poet to use Callimachus' coinage ὀλιγόστιχος ("few-

---

[1] Wilamowitz wrote that Gregory, "considered poetry to be the less worthy sister of rhetoric.""*Es ist wahr, der Rhetor behandelt die Poesie als minderwertige Schwester der Rede.*" Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1912 294. Keydell 1953 142 was even harsher, arguing that Gregory never learned to write proper verses ("*Er hat nicht einmal gelernt, korrekte Verse zu bauen*").

[2] For metrics, see especially Agosti and Gonnelli 1995. See also Simelidis 2009 47–57.

lined", *Aet. fr.* 9).[3] Gregory does this on two occasions (2.2.7 300–05 and in 1.1.11). As both are

of programmatic significance, let us consider each in turn.

Carm. 2.2.7 is a hexametric address of 334 lines to a governor of Cappadocia, Nemesius.[4]

The ostensible purpose of the work is to convince the learned governor to embrace Christianity.

Near the end of the work (lines 300–05), Gregory describes portrays himself for the governor as a

sophisticated Callimachean poet:

> αὐτὰρ ἐγώ, τά με Χριστὸς, ἐμὸν φάος, ἐξεδίδαξεν, [300]
> ἐξερέω, μύθοιο θεμείλια πάντ' ἀναφαίνων
> ἡμετέρου, θεότητα, Θεοῦ κτίσιν, οἴακα παντός,
> ᾧ κόσμον μεγάλοιο Θεοῦ Λόγος αἰὲν ἑλίσσει·
> καὶ τάδ' ἐπιδρομάδην, ὀλιγόστιχον, εὐρέα μῦθον,
> ὡς νόμος ἐστὶν ἔμοιγε· τὰ δ' ἔκτοθι ῥίψα Γαδείρων. [305]

> But all that Christ my light has taught to me,
> I'll speak, illumining my word's foundations
> the Godhead, God's creation, guide of all
> by which God's Word forever whirls the world.
> I'll speak of subjects great with brevity,
> as is my wont; all else I throw past Spain.

Gregory briefly outlines his literary *mores* at the end of a letter primarily concerned with

delineating his own literature from the pagan literature of the past. He will speak in a cursory

manner (ἐπιδρομάδην) a poem that is both broad (εὐρέα) and brief (ὀλιγόστιχον). This is not

only his practice here, but his normal way of writing (ὡς νόμος ἐστὶν ἔμοιγε). In addition to the

plainly Callimachean use of ὀλιγόστιχος ("few-lined"), there are a few other possible echoes.

The formula αὐτὰρ ἐγώ ("but I") in 300 is a favorite tag of the Cyrenaean, who uses it to close

---

[3] Philip uses the derived noun ὀλιγοστιχίη in the *sphragis* to his garland (*AnthPal* 4.2).

[4] The poem dates to the beginning of Nemesius' term as governor of Cappadocia II, which ran from the middle of 383 to 384. See McLynn 2015 for analysis of the historical context.

the *Aetia* (αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Μουσέων πεζὸν [ἔ]πειμι νομόν "but I shall go to the foot-pasture of the Muses." fr. 112.9).[5]

What precisely does Gregory mean by "broad" (εὐρέα)? The passage comes into focus when compared with Gregory's remarks on speaking "Laconically" in *ep.* 54. This letter, addressed to Nicobulus, is suitably short: "Speaking Laconically is not, as you think, simply writing few syllables. Rather, it is saying little about much. Thus I consider Homer extremely concise and Antimachus verbose. How so? Because I judge length by substance (πράγμασι), not letters."[6] Cameron has observed this disapproval of Antimachus almost certainly derived from Callimachus infamous condemnation in fr. 398, (Λύδη καὶ παχὺ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τορόν "The Lyde is a fat and unpolished work").[7] In both *carm.* 2.2.7 and *ep.* 54 we see Gregory adopting a concise and refined style, which he associates with Callimachus.

In *carm.* 1.1.11[8] Gregory attacks the verbosity of his theological rivals, the Apollinarians, who asserted that Christ did not assume a full humanity in the incarnation, but that the divine

---

[5] On this concluding formula, see Lloyd-Jones 1963 92–93.

[6] Τὸ λακωνίζειν οὐ τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὅπερ οἴει, ὀλίγας συλλαβὰς γράφειν, ἀλλὰ περὶ πλείστων ὀλίγας. Οὕτω ἐγὼ καὶ βραχυλογώτατον Ὅμηρον λέγω καὶ πολὺν τὸν Ἀντίμαχον. Πῶς; τοῖς πράγμασι κρίνων τὸ μῆκος, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ τοῖς γράμμασι.

[7] Cameron 1995 336.

[8] I reproduce the text of Caillau 1842. The text has also been rendered into English by McGuckin 1995 and Gilbert 2001. I briefly catalogue my disagreements here:

McGuckin renders the ἤ … ἠὲ in 5 as "and…and" but Gregory here expresses a disjunction. The fools mentioned in lines 1–2 are Arians, those in 3–4 Apollinarians. The former divide Son and Father, the latter divide Word from Incarnate Son. In line 11, he renders τόσσον ἔχοις as "for how great you are!" But this is addressed not to Christ, but to his heretical interlocutor. It means "that's all you may have," or more periphrastically, "that's all you get." In 12 he misses the Callimachean pun and awkwardly renders μέτρα λόγου as "the dispensations the Word has made for us with God." The important adjective ὀλιγόστιχα is left untranslated in line 15. Finally, the pages mentioned in the final lines are turned into "tablets of the heart," which is unnecessarily metaphorical in a poem of literary polemic: Gregory is talking about pages.

Gilbert improves upon McGuckin's in a number of ways, but it would probably be better to render the passive ἐπάγη in line 7 as a passive in English "made a human being." Line 8 is difficult, but it seems

Logos replaced his human mind (νοῦς).[9] The poem is replete with allusions and stylistic features

that evoke Callimachus.

> Νήπιος, ὅστις ἄνακτα Θεοῦ Λόγον αἰὲν ἐόντα
>   οὐ σέβετ’ ἰσοθέως Πατρὸς ἐπουρανίου.
> νήπιος, ὅστις ἄνακτα Λόγον βροτὸν ἔνθα φανέντα
>   οὐ σέβετ’ ἰσοθέως οὐρανίοιο Λόγου.
> τέμνει δ’ ἢ μεγάλοιο Πατρὸς Λόγον, ἠὲ Λόγοιο [5]
>   μορφὴν ἀνδρομένην, καὶ πάχος ἡμέτερον.
> ἦν Θεὸς, ἀλλ’ ἐπάγη Πατρὸς Λόγος ἡμέτερος φώς,
>   ὥς κε Θεὸν μίξῃ, μικτὸς ἐὼν χθονίοις.
> εἷς Θεὸς ἀμφοτέρωθε · τόσον βροτὸς, ὅσσον ἔμ’ ἔρδειν
>   ἀντὶ βροτοῖο Θεόν. Ἵλαθι, τρωτὸς ἄνω. [10]
> τόσσον ἔχοις. Τί δ’ ἔμοιγε νόον, καὶ μίξιν ἄφραστον;
>   ἀμφὶ Θεὸν, θνητοὶ, στέργετε μέτρα λόγου.
> εἰ μὲν δὴ πεπίθοιμι, τὸ λώϊον. Εἰ δὲ μελαίνεις
>   τὸν χάρτην πολλαῖς χιλιάσιν ἐπέων,
> δεῦρ’ ἄγε, πλαξὶ τεαῖς ὀλιγόστιχα ταῦτα χαράξω [15]
>   γράμματ’ ἐμῇ γραφίδι, ἢ μέλαν οὐδὲν ἔχει.

> Foolish who worships not th’ eternal Word
> as equal to the high Father in heaven.
> Foolish who worships not th’ incarnate Word,
> as equal to the heavenly Word on High,
> but cuts from Father’s might His Word, or else
> doth cut the Word from human shape, our breadth.
> The Father’s Word was God, but made our man
> so that, with mortals mixed, He’d mix in God.
> A single god comprising both: a man,
> to make man into gods: have mercy, thou
> who art above the Wounded Word on high.
> For you, no more– why seek from me the knowledge
> of that ineffable and holy mixture.
> Oh mortals, mind the boundaries your speech.
> Should I persuade thee, that is all the better;
> yet if you stain your page with myriad lines

Gilbert read μικρὸς (“small”) instead of μικτὸς (“mixed”). We want the latter for the wordplay with μίξῃ. In line 12, ἀμφὶ θεὸν θνητοὶ cannot mean “both are God, mortals” but “as regards God, you mortals, respect…” μέτρα λόγου is rendered as “limits of reason” but it is the limits of human speech that Gregory has in mind here. In line 15, πλαξὶ is rendered as “tables,” but Gregory means “pages,” a common usage in later verse.

[9] For Gregory’s role in the Apollinarian controversy, see McLynn 2015 57–63.

> come here and I will scratch these letters few
> onto your books, with pen that bears no stain.

Gregory begins with learned etymological word-play. The Homeric adjective νήπιος ("childish" or "foolish") was derived in several ways. The prefix νη– generally negated what followed, but some ancient writers speculated that νη could also be an intensifier (*cf.* the affirmative particle ναί, still used for "yes" in Modern Greek). Clement of Alexandria, for instance, argued that the νη- in νήπιος should not be understood as a privative (κατὰ στέρησιν), but an intensifier.[10] He thereby argued that νήπιος meant "extremely gentle" (cf. ἤπιος, "gentle") rather than "witless."[11] Gregory here employs the νη in an intensifying manner, but derives the compound νήπιος from νη and ἔπος ("word" or "verse"). Instead of Clement's "extremely gentle," Gregory suggests the heretics are extremely verbose. Gregory thus subtly introduces a theme that runs through the poem: the verbosity of heretics and the limits of human speech.

Allusions to Callimachus are quite appropriate in a poem about well-measured speech. Gregory delays them until the end, but then makes them quite explicit. If his opponents fail to respect the limits of human speech, they will go on "blackening their pages with many thousands of lines" (πολλαῖς χιλιάσιν ἐπέων), with which Gregory alludes to *Aet.* fr. 1.4 (ἐν **πολλαῖς** ἤνυσα **χιλιάσιν** "[because I have not written one song] in many thousands of lines"). The adjective ὀλιγόστιχα (1.1.11 15) occurs several lines later in the *Aetia* prologue (fr. 1.9), also before the bucolic diaeresis.

Though Gregory delays the Callimachean allusions until the end of the poem, the small work contains Callimachean stylistic elements throughout. One might compare the striking

---

[10] καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ ἔστι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ νηπίου κατὰ στέρησιν ἡμῖν νοούμενον, ἐπεὶ τὸ νη στερητικὸν γραμματικῶν νομοθετοῦσιν παῖδες (Clem. of Al. *Paed.* 1.20).

[11] Chantraine 1968 *s.v.* rejects an etymology from νη- and ἔπος.

anaphora of the two opening couplets (νήπιος ὅστις ἄνακτα in 1 and 3, οὐ σεβετ᾽ ἰσοθεῶς in 2 and 4) with *hZeus* 86–87, which both begin and end with ἑσπέριος … νοήσῃ. Moreover, Gregory employs a number of juxtaposed prosodic variants, a favorite technique of Callimachus.[12] Some he achieves through position, that is, by placing a word ending with a closed short syllable before a word beginning with vowel and then repeating it before a word beginning with a consonant, thus lengthening the syllable. So λόγον ("Word") in line one is scanned as a pyrrhus (˘ ˘), but in line three it is scanned as an iamb (˘ ¯) because its final syllable is lengthened by the following βρότον ("person"). He also exploits the flexibility afforded by consonant clusters composed of mutes and liquids, which optionally lengthen a preceding short vowel. So πατρὸς is scanned as a trochee in line 2 (¯ ˘) but a pyrrhus in line 4 (˘ ˘). He combines the two methods in line 7, where πατρὸς again appears, but now scans as a spondee (¯ ¯), since it is followed by a word beginning with a consonant. Finally, Gregory exploits bi-forms of the same word. In lines 9 and and 11, he places τόσον, ὅσσον, and τόσσον in close proximity. The prosodic variation imparts a Callimachean savor.

Gregory's etymological word play continues in line 7, where he writes that "the Word of the Father was made our man (φώς)." He here exploits the homophones φώς (man) and φῶς (light). By Gregory's period the original difference in tonal accentuation would scarcely have been heard.[13] Gregory certainly intends us to hear John 1 in the background, where Jesus as the

---

[12] The term refers to the juxtaposition of the same or similar words with prosodic variation. For instance, Call. *hZeus* 55: καλὰ μὲν ἤεξευ, καλὰ δ᾽ἔτραφες, οὐράνιε Ζεῦ ("Well you grew, and well you were raised, heavenly Zeus"). The first καλὰ must be scanned as a trochee (¯ ˘), the second as a pyrrhus (˘ ˘).

For a typology and examples, see Hopkinson 1982. In his partial catalogue, he lists several examples from Gregory, but none from this poem.

[13] This is another coincidence on which Clement of Alexandria commented (*Paed.* 1.6.28). He suggested that because the redeemed person is "light in the Lord" (φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ, from Eph 5:8), the human being was rightly called a φώς by the ancients.

Word (λόγος) is described as "the light of men" (τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων Jn 1:4), "the true light that illumines every human being" (τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον Jn 1:9), and where the Logos is said to "become flesh and dwell among us" (Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν Jn 1:14).

After a few lines dealing with Jesus' incarnation, he bids his interlocutor to be satisfied with his extremely brief account of the incarnation (11). Instead of probing things that are, strictly speaking, ineffable (ἄφραστον), Gregory tells them to "respect the limits of speech" (12). Gregory here again plays on the polyvalence of the word μέτρον ("limit" or "measure"). The more significant point is a theological one: the nature of the Incarnation is ultimately beyond the human being's capacity to capture in words. Yet Gregory playfully takes it also to the more banal reality of the length of a literary work. The last few lines of the poem link this theological error (failing to respect the limits of human speech) to an aesthetic error (writing endlessly with no sense of proper length). Gregory characterized his own reply as unstained in both senses: it is true theologically and written in a concise style. The stylistic concerns are foregrounded by the allusions to Callimachus already mentioned, and by the poem's striking ending, where Gregory promises to write his works with a "pen that bears no stain" (line 16). He is, once more, delighting in paradox, for we could equally translate the line "a pen that has no ink." Gregory here uses γραφίς ("pen") in a metaphorical sense similar to the Latin *stilus*.[14] His theological insight finds expression in a "spotless" style characterized precisely in Callimachean terms. Though μέτρον ("measure") is not a prominent part of Callimachus' vocabulary, Gregory's

---

[14] This is the only passage of which I am aware where an author uses γραφίς in this metaphorical sense.

preoccupation with "measure" (μέτρον) is here presented as a distinctly Callimachean concern.

We shall see the same when we come later to *ep.* 51.

ΤΥΤΘΟΣ

In imitation of Callimachus, Gregory deploys the binary of thick and thin to describe his poetry.[15] We have already seen in Gregory's epigrams his Callimachean comparison of his small see to the small pearl and small Bethlehem.[16] Gregory deploys similar vocabulary at the end of *carm.* 2.2.1 (*Ad Hellenium*), which ends with a Callimachean flourish:

> Τυτθὴ μὲν πόλις ἐσμὲν, ἀτὰρ πολὺ σεῖο, φέριστε, [305]
>   Δώσομεν ἀνθρώποις, ἡ Διοκαισαρέων,
> Οὔνομα, καὶ πινάκεσσι χαράξομεν · «Οὗτος ἄριστος,
>   Οὗτος ὁ καὶ Μώμου κρείσσονα μέτρα φέρων.»
>
> We are quite small in Diocaesarea,
> but will on thee bestow a name of greatness,
> my exc'llency, and then inscribe in plate,
> "his excellence by envy does not judge."[17]

In addition to the use of τυτθή ("small"), we see Callimachean elements in the extreme hyperbaton between πολὺ and οὔνομα (over two lines), the bucolic diaereses, and the anaphora with οὗτος in 307-308. The final line reworks a famous Callimachean epigram we saw in chapter 2: (Call. G.-P. *epigr.* 29.4 κρέσσονα βασκανίης).

Gregory also deploys Callimachean vocabulary earlier in this poem, when he asks Hellenius to respond favorably to his plea for aid (307–314):

> Λίσσομ' ὑπὲρ ψυχῶν, καὶ οὐρανίου βιότοιο,
>   Λίσσομ' ὑπὲρ μελέων πνεύματι δαπτομένων.
> Δὸς χάριν ἡματίοισι πόνοις, νυχίῃσί τ' ἀοιδαῖς ·
>   Δὸς δὲ χαμευνίῃ, λεπταλέοις τε γόοις, [310]

---

[15] The most detailed treatment of Callimachus' stylistic metaphors is Asper 1997.

[16] *AnthPal* 8.21. See discussion in chapter 2.

[17] More literally, "We are a small city, Diocaesarea, but we will grant you a great name and inscribe it publicly, 'this man is best, this man who does not judge by envy.'"

Καὶ τρυχίνοις ῥακέεσσι, καὶ ὄμμασι τηκομένοισι ·
   Δὸς δὲ νόῳ καθαρῷ, δὸς δ' ἱεροῖσι λόγοις,
Ὄφρ' ἀρετὴν τίων, ἀρετῆς ὁδὸν ἀμπετάσειας
   Πλείοσι, καὶ πλεόνων μισθὸν ἔχοις Θεόθεν.

I plea for souls and for the heavenly life;
I plea for limbs consumed by holy spirit.
Show favor to our daily tasks and songs
of night, and show it to our dusty beds, [310]
to our laments of tenderness, to rags,
to eyes that melt away with tears; show it
to our pure mind, and to our holy words,
so that by 'steeming virtue virtue's road
thou mayest free and have reward of God.

The anaphora (λίσσομ' ὑπὲρ in 308–09; δός in 309–12) and asyndeta are highly reminiscent of

Artemis' requests of Zeus in *hArt* 6–25.[18] The allusions to a hymn for a virgin is quite suitable in

an epistolary request of aid for monastics. Gregory's catalogue of requests is different than

Artemis', however, for Gregory's contains not a list of items desired, but a list of objects for the

governor's pity. Among those listed are "tender laments" in l. 310 (λεπταλέοις τε γόοις). We

are no doubt meant to hear Callimachus' "skinny muse" in the background (Μοῦσαν, δ'ὠγαθέ

λεπταλέην *Aet.* fr. 1.24). Gregory also asks the governor to have pity on the "pure mind" of the

monks (312) so that the road of virtue may be opened to many (313–14). Again Gregory evokes

simultaneously Callimachus and Hesiod alongside the biblical notions of purity of heart and the

ways of the righteous.[19]

---

[18] The imperative δός begins lines 6, 8, 13, 15, and 18.

[19] For purity as a Callimachean catchword, see *epigr.* 57 (Gow-Page). The two roads motif originates in Greek literature in Hes. *WD* 287–292. *Cf.* Ps. 1:6 "The Lord knows the road of the righteous, but the road of the wicked will be destroyed" (ὅτι γινώσκει κύριος ὁδὸν δικαίων, / καὶ ὁδὸς ἀσεβῶν ἀπολεῖται.). The *locus classicus* for purity of heart is Mt. 5:8. Note that for most patristic authors, including Gregory, the biblical "heart" was simply another word to describe the soul, and hence "mind" (νοῦς) and "heart" (καρδία) were interchangeable terms.

ΜΕΤΡΟΝ

Finally, I wish to show that even when not using Callimachean vocabulary for brevity, Gregory

still frames concision as a Callimachean pursuit. By far his favorite word for concision is μέτρον

("measure"). We have already encountered this word in 1.1.11, where he bid the Apollinarists to

"respect the limits of human speech" (στέργετε μέτρα λόγου). Gregory uses it also in several

passages of great programmatic significance. In *carm.* 2.1.39, the proper cultivation of "measure"

is the first reason he gives for writing verse (34–37). Though Gregory there wants us to hear

ethical undertones (μέτρον not simply as brevity but as living a measured life), he underscores the

stylistic aspects of the noun:

> πρῶτον μὲν ἠθέλησα τοῖς ἄλλοις καμὼν
> οὕτω πεδῆσαι τὴν ἐμὴν ἀμετρίαν, [35]
> ὡς ἂν γράφων γε, ἀλλὰ μὴ πολλὰ γράφω
> καμὼν τὸ μέτρον.
>
> After laboring for others, I first wished to reign in my lack of measure so
> that in my writing I'd not write too much, as I was laboring over the
> meter.[20]

Measure also plays a significant part in his programmatic *carm.* 2.1.34a. There, Gregory writes

that the purpose of his silence-fast during the Lenten season of 382 was "by conquering it entirely

to learn to bring limits to my speech" (ὡς κε μάθοιμι / μύθῳ μέτρα φέρειν παντὸς ἐπικρατέων

11–12). Though he here underscores the ethical aspects of human speech, stylistic concerns are

not far from the surface, for Gregory later in the poem programmatically states the themes of his

verse (69–91; see chapter 4 for analysis).

Gregory's most extended treatment of stylistic measure, however, comes in *ep.* 51, a letter

in which he offers advice to his grand-nephew Nicobulus on the art of letter-writing. Gregory

---

[20] Note that when translating passages from *carm.* 2.1.39, I have used prose instead of verse. See the
introduction for further detail.

observes that some people write letters that are longer than is fitting, while others write them too short: both, however, miss the mark. The need (χρεία) should determine the length. Sometimes much needs to be said, and sometimes very little. He then elaborates:

> Should craft (σοφία) be measured by the Persian rope (περσικῇ σχοίνῳ)? Or with a child's hand, where we write with such brevity that it becomes in effect no writing at all, writing that imitates the shadows at midday or a painter's lines on the face, whose widths diminish and, when recognized by parts of their extremities, are glimpsed more than seen? These are, properly speaking, images of images. We must eschew both extremes to obtain proper measure.[21]

Gregory again frames proper length in specifically Callimachean terms. "Measuring with the Persian rope" comes from *Aet* fr. 1.18, where the Cyrenaean exhorts his listeners to judge his poetry by the poet's skill, rather than the length of the poem. Gregory then associates the opposite extreme, excessive brevity, with measuring by a child's cubit or span. This also picks up the opening of the *Aetia*, where Callimachus' critics accuse the Cyrenaean poet of writing like a child because he is unable to write an extended work (fr. 1.6). We see then that even when Gregory uses the non-Callimachean language of "measure" (μέτρον), he does with with Callimachus in mind. Callimachus is the archetype of the appropriately concise poet.

---

[21] Τί γάρ; Ἢ τῇ περσικῇ σχοίνῳ μετρεῖσθαι δεῖ τὴν σοφίαν, ἢ παιδικοῖς πήχεσι, καὶ οὕτως ἀτελῆ γράφειν ὡς μηδὲ γράφειν, ἀλλὰ μιμεῖσθαι τῶν σκιῶν τὰς μεσημβρινὰς ἢ τῶν γραμμῶν τὰς κατὰ πρόσωπον ἀπαντώσας, ὧν συνιζάνει τὰ μήκη καὶ παραφαίνεται μᾶλλον ἢ φαίνεται τῶν ἄκρων τισὶ γνωριζόμενα, καὶ ἔστιν, ὡς ἂν εἴποιμι καιρίως, εἰκασμάτων εἰκάσματα; Δέον, ἀμφοτέρων φεύγοντα τὴν ἀμετρίαν, τοῦ μετρίου κατατυγχάνειν. (*ep.* 51.3, ed Gallay 1964).

The passage is difficult to render, for Gregory is rather terse. Storin 2012 captures the flow of the sentence better than Gallay 1964, who misunderstands the allusions to the *Aetia* and thinks "mid-day" shadows are the most visible, instead of the most difficult to see. Storin however renders σοφία as "wisdom" where it should be "craft" (the older pre-platonic meaning of the word), and misconstrues Gregory's words about lines. By "lines that meet on the face" Gregory refers to the fine lines needed by a painter to depict the nose and eyes. For the proverbial fineness of such lines see Theod. *Hist. relig.* 9.6. The painting imagery further accounts for Gregory's assertion that these are "images of images," for a painting is merely a copy of another image, the human face.

Craft

Metrics

The mechanics of Gregory's hexameter have received solid analysis from Agosti and Gonnelli,[22] who show him to be a skillful manipulator of the hexameter in line with the literary trends of his period. I here wish to compare Gregory's practice explicitly with Callimachus in order to gauge the extent to which Gregory followed Callimachean metrical strictures. As a case study, I have selected for comparison two hexametric passages from Gregory's poetry: *Poem. arc.* 3 (93 lines) and *De rebus suis* 294–392 (99 lines). These passages are both about one hundred lines, but vary considerably in tone and subject. The former is primarily hymnic praise and theological argument, while the excerpt from *De rebus suis* consists of lament and prayer. The difference of theme allows us to see which features of Gregory's hexametric style are consistent across genres and which he deploys only for certain tasks.

As we would expect, Gregory's hexameters exhibit the Late Antique preference for dactyls of spondees:[23]

Dactyls per line	Homer	Homeric Hymns	Callimachus	Gr. Combined	Gr. *Poem. arc.* 3	Gr. *DRS* 294–392	Nonnus *Dion.*
5	19%	20%	23%	32%	33%	37%	38%
4	42%	42%	49%	49%	49%	42%	48%
3	30%	28%	25%	17%	16%	19%	13%
2	8%	9%	3%	1%	2%	1%	0%

---

[22] Agosti and Gonnelli 1995.

[23] Data for Homer, the Homeric Hymns, and Callimachus are taken from Stephens 2015 30. Data for Gregory's larger corpus and for Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* comes from Agosti and Gonnelli 1995 373. The other columns derive from my own observations.

Gregory has about the same number of lines with four dactyls as Callimachus, but considerably more holodactylic lines and fewer lines with three dactyls.

In his configuration of dactyls and spondees, Gregory is about as strict as Callimachus. In the first four feet, I have counted 12 arrangements of dactyls and spondees in *DRS* 294–392 and *Poem. arc.* 3. Harder counted the same number for the hexameters in the *Aetia*.[24]

Pattern	Frequency
DDDD	35.94%
SDDD	19.27%
DSDD	11.98%
DDDS	8.85%
DDSD	6.25%
SDDS	5.21%
SSDD	4.17%
SDSD	3.13%
DSDS	2.6%
DSSD	1.56%
SDSS	0.52%
SSDS	0.52%

Spondaic lines are quite rare in Gregory; only three occur in our passages (1.6%), which is in line with his practice elsewhere (1.7% according to Agosti and Gonnelli).[25] They are rare in Callimachus also (7% according to Stephens[26]), although more prevalent than in Gregory.

Gregory's preferences for the feminine caesura in the third metron reveal Alexandrian influence.[27] Callimachus most favored the feminine caesura (74%).[28] Gregory similarly prefers

[24] Harder 2012 57

[25] Agosti and Gonnelli 1995 373

[26] Stephens 2015 31

[27] That is, a caesura between the two shorts of the third foot, rather than after the princeps of the third foot.

[28] Lightfoot 2014 68–69. Of hellenistic poets, only Euphorion (77%) used the feminine caesura more than Callimachus.

the feminine (78.8%) to the masculine caesura in the third metron (22.2%). Nonnus, another poet extensively indebted Callimachus, shows similar preferences. Both poets, moreover, like Callimachus, always place a caesura in the third foot, whereas other poets would occasionally postpone the caesura until the fourth foot.[29] In these respects, Nonnus and Gregory contrast sharply with the author of the *Metaphrasis psalmorum*, attributed to Apollinaris of Laodicea, who uses the feminine caesura only 62% of the time, which, as Gonnelli notes, gives this poem a Homericizing quality. Similarly the *Metaphrasis* has thirteen lines without a third foot caesura.[30]

Author	Freq. of Feminine Caesura[31]
Homer, *Il.* and *Od.*	57%
Callimachus, *Hymns*	74%
Dionysius, *Perieg.*	64.5%
Nonnus, *Dionysiaca*	81.1%
Met. Psalm.	62.1%
Gregory (All)	78.8%
Gr. *Poem. arc.* 3	83.9%
Gr. *DRS* 294–392	80.1%

I have analyzed several of the bridges respected by Callimachus. Gregory respects the most important, Hermann's bridge.[32] He is less strict with other Callimachean prohibitions. As

---

[29] For example, West 1982 36 notes *Il.* 1.218. There are two such lines in Dionysius' *Periegesis* (630, 753). See Lightfoot 2014 68.

[30] Agosti and Gonnelli 1995 378. If Andrew Faulkner is correct that the *Metaphrasis* is actually authentic and preceded Gregory, then it would add a fascinating literary element to the dispute between the two men, for then Gregory's Callimacheanism would be set over against the Homericizing of his theological opponent.

[31] Statistics for Homer derive from West 1982 36; for Callimachus, Stephens 2015 31; for Dionysius, Lightfoot 2014 68; for Nonnus, the *Metaphrasis*, and Gregory's broader corpus, Agosti and Gonnelli 1995 377.

[32] The only possible infringements against Hermann's bridge of which I am aware in Gregory are 2.1.17 47 (κλέος δὲ σὸν), 2.1.19 47 (θεῷ γε μέν), and 1.2.17 35 (σταθμά γε μὲν). The first is probably done for effect, since Gregory is there paraphrasing the rough language of the Septuagint (we could conceivably, however, write κλέος δέ σου, or perhaps σόν was also felt to be enclitic). For the latter, however, note that μέν was effectively enclitic in Late Antiquity, and hence γε μέν would not have been felt to be in violation

Bacci observes,[33] Gregory normally follows Naeke's law (a word break should not follow a spondee in the fourth foot). I see only one violation in 192 lines (0.5%): *Poem. arc.* 3.13 … καὶ εἴ τι Πνεύματος ἀγνοῦ. There are 13 lines where Gregory places an uncorrepted καί before a bucolic diaeresis (e.g. *DRS* 296 (Οἶος δ' ἐντὸς ἔμεινε πόθος, καὶ ἄλγος ἄελπτον), but though Callimachus does not do this it should probably not be regarded as a violation, for the καί is more or less appositive and may be taken almost as a proclitic with what follows.[34] As for Meyer's first law (words of the shape x ¯ ˘ rarely end in the second metron), I have found only two violations.[35] It is done for effect in *Poem. arc.* 3. 47 (οὔ σε, κάθαρσι φίλη, οὐ ψεύσομαι[36]). By contrast, I see no discernible cause for the violation in *DRS* 320 (τῆμος ἐμαυτὸν ἔδωκα); perhaps it adds to the drama of the scene. I have found one violation of Giseke's law (words of the shape x ¯ ˘ ˘ never end the second metron): *Poem. arc.* 3.77 εὖτε τριῶν τινα. I have found no violations of Hilberg's law (word-break rarely occurs after a spondaic second metron).Thus, though not quite so scrupulous as Callimachus, Gregory did take care to construct technically correct hexameters.

Gregory was not quite as strict as Callimachus in the elision of short vowels. Callimachus avoided elision at positions 3.5 (Meyer's bridge), 5 and 5.5 (the main caesura), at 7.5 (Hermann's bridge), and the 8 (the bucolic diaeresis). Gregory, by contrast, elides across Meyer's bridge (e.g.

---

of Hermann's bridge. See West 1982 180. We may also note Homeric precedent for γε μέν in the fourth biceps (*Cf.* Simelidis 2009 139).

[33] Bacci 1996 56.

[34] The appositive nature of καί is illustrated by the fact that Homer never places a caesura following it; see West 1982 36.

[35] The violation in *Poem. arc.* 3.62 is only apparent, for ἐν is proclitic.

[36] *Cf.* Call. *hDem* 91 ὡς δὲ Μίμαντι χιών, ὡς ἀελίῳ ἔνι πλαγγών. Hollis 1990 20 notes that the repeated ὡς to some extent diverts attention from the irregularity).

Poem. arc. 3.36, 41) and occasionally at 5 or 5.5, though never across the line's main caesura.[37] Gregory never elides over Hermann's bridge or the bucolic diaeresis.

Gregory and Callimachus are both strict with correption and hiatus, though they exhibit different preferences. In Callimachus correption tends to occur at 1.5, 5.5, 8, and 9.5, and is typically avoided at 3.5, 4, and 7.5.[38] In the passages from Gregory, correption occurs at 2, 6, 8. As for hiatus, Callimachus avoided it between metra, except with the conjunction ἤ or words originally containing a digamma. Within metra, hiatus occurred only after the princeps when the metron was dactylic (e.g. *Hec.* fr. 9.1 κολουραίῃ ὑπὸ πέτρῃ). Gregory shows the reverse tendency: he admits hiatus primarily between metra but not within. Hiatus tends to occur, as in other later poets,[39] after the first metron (e.g. *Poem. arc.* 3.59 τέμνει, ὄφρα) and after the fourth metron (the bucolic diaeresis). Fully half of the instances of hiatus in the passages analyzed occur between the fourth and fifth foot at the bucolic diaeresis. There is variation between the works, however. Hiatus at the bucolic diaeresis occurs only once in *Poem. arc.* 3 (line 64), but six times in *DRS* 294–392 (296, 305, 307, 312, 365, and 379). Thus we see that Gregory conforms much more closely to Callimachus' rules for hiatus in *Poem. arc.* 3 than in *DRS*. Hiatus occurs five times in 93 lines: one instance occurs with ἤ (54), one with a word with an historical digamma (καί οἱ 14), and one within a metron (47). Gregory thus only twice departs sharply from Callimachean practice (*Poem. arc.* 59 and 64). It is clear Gregory took care to construct metrically correct and sophisticated hexameters and it appears that he striving for a Callimachean sound particularly in *Poem. arc.* 3.

---

[37] For instance, consider *DRS* 297: Τοὔνεκεν αἰάζω. Τὸ δ᾽ ἐσαύριον οὐ σάφα οἶδα. Gregory elides at position 5.5, but there is a masculine caesura and pause after αἰάζω.

[38] Stephens 2015 31–32

[39] Sykes 1979 14–15

Prosody

Gregory's takes considerably more license in his prosody than he does in his metrics. He is considerably more flexible than even Homer in admitting short syllables before consonantal clusters. For instance, at *Poem. arc.* 3.15 he scans γυμνὴν as an iamb (˘ ¯). The LfGRE lists no precedent for this unusual scansion.[40] Notable also is *Poem. arc.* 3.42 where ἄκτιστον is scanned as a dactyl. In Homer, the only instances of a short vowel not being lengthened by consonantal cluster στ occur at *Od* 21.178, 183 (ἐκ δὲ στέατος ἔνεικε). Following Homeric practice, Gregory allows a short vowel to be lengthened by the a concluding ν, ρ, or σ of the following word (*e.g. carm.* 1.2.17 11 τυτθὸν ὑποείξας, where τυθὸν is scanned as a spondee).[41] Furthermore, on occasion Gregory does not observe traditional vowel lengths for the dichrona (α ι υ), though his "false quantities" are more common in iambic than in hexametric verse.[42] In my passages, I have observed four prosodic irregularities: *Poem. arc.* 3.29: ἡμῖν scanned as a trochee; *DRS* 294: κειμήλια, with the opening syllable scanned short; *DRS* 314: λιτῆσι, with the opening syllable scanned short; *DRS* 353: θείαν, with the ultimate syllable scanned short. In all instances but *DRS* 314 (λιτῆσι), there is an easy emendation that observes classical prosody. See the appendix of textual discussions for further detail. Gregory thus seems to depart occasionally from classical

---

[40] See LfGRE *s.v.* γυμνός.

[41] West 1982 16.

[42] Crimi, Kertsch, and Guirau 1995 104–107 provide a list of prosodic irregularities in Gregory's iambic 1.2.10 *De virtute*. Their list is too capacious, as they occasionally note irregularities even when there is classical precedent. For instance, they include ὑμὶν in 1.2.10 513 as a prosodic irregularity, but there is Sophoclean precedent for this form, which they observe in a note. From this larger list, I have noted 27 irregularities in 998 lines, or about 1 every 36 lines. In the 192 lines of hexameter, I have found 3 prosodic irregularities, 2 of which have likely emendations. Even if we follow the manuscripts and print the false quantities, this 1 irregularity in every 64 lines. If we emend, then the ratio jumps to 1 in 192 lines. For treatments of Gregory's prosody, see especially Crimi 1972 and Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 26–31. "False quantities" is perhaps too classicizing a piece of terminology, for at least some of them may be intentional. See Simelidis 2009 36, 54–55.

prosody, perhaps intentionally, but only on rare occasions. As Simelidis has noted,[43] much more text-critical work must be done on Gregory before we can properly grasp the extent to which his prosody departed from classical norms.

Repetitions

Simelidis has aptly noted Gregory's penchant for repetitions of all sorts.[44] Gregory is fond of stylistic devices like alliteration and anaphora, but even on occasion repeats larger pieces of text in close proximity. Indeed, as we will see in Chapter 4, Gregory sometimes has passages of 10–15 lines that occur in more than one poem. I here wish to focus upon smaller-scale repetitions, especially alliteration, anaphora, and juxtaposed prosodic variants. Though such stylistic features are hardly exclusive to Gregory and Callimachus, anaphora and juxtaposed prosodic variants in particular are prominent in the Cyrenaean poet and I think it likely that Gregory perceived them as elements of a Callimachean style.

Though a standard feature of Latin poetry, alliteration only became prominent in Greek during the Imperial period, perhaps due to the transition from tonal to accentual period. Nonnus also used it extensively, as did ps.-Oppian.[45] As Opelt observed, the purpose of the trope is often to emphasize the syntactical connection of the alliterated elements (*strukturelle Fuktionalität*), but may also serve euphonic purposes (*klangliche Funktionalität*). Perhaps the most striking instance in the passages chosen is *Poem. arc.* 3.18, where four of the five words of the verse begin with alpha: ἄχθος ἄγειν κραδίῃσιν ἀφαυροτάτῃσιν ἄπιστον ("[it was not fitting] to lay an unbearable burden on such feeble hearts"). Gregory here emphasizes the impropriety of revealing the Spirit's

---

[43] Simelidis 2009 54–55

[44] Simelidis 2009 52

[45] See Opelt 1958. It is worth noting that Nonnus and ps.-Oppian both depicted themselves as Callimachean poets.

divinity too soon. In *Poem. arc.* 3.25–26, he combines pairs a spondaic line with an alliterative tetracolon to underscore the gradual revealing of Christ's divinity: Χριστοῖο μέγα κλέος αὐγάζεσκε / παύροισιν πινυτοῖσι φαεινόμενον μερόπεσσιν ("The great renown of Christ was growing by being revealed only to a few wise people"). Gregory also uses alliterations to underscore a contrast in the alliterated elements, as in *Poem. arc.* 3.45, where he observes that through baptism he returns to the light, as death is buried (θαπτομένου θανατοῖο). Or, the technique may add vivacity to a scene, such as *DRS* 319, where the repetition of π in περι– and πάντοσε underscores the fright of being surrounded by a storm at sea: Λάμπετο, καὶ κρατεραῖς περιάγνυτο πάντοσε φωναῖς ("[The air] shone [with lightning] and cracked on all sides with mighty sounds").[46] Though alliteration played little role in Callimachus' poetry, the prominence of the technique in ps-Oppian and Nonnus suggest that it was felt a suitable technique for Callimachean poets.

Like Callimachus, Gregory is quite fond of anaphora, at least in hymnic sections.[47] *Poem. arc.* 3.47 is one striking instance: **οὔ** σε, κάθαρσι φίλη, **οὐ** ψεύσομαι (" I shall not, my purification, I shall not betray you"). At *Poem. arc.* 3.72–73, where repeats of οὔτε…ἐπεὶ at the beginning of the line and after the feminine caesura: οὔτε μονὰς νήριθμος, ἐπεὶ τρισὶν ἵστατ' ἐν

---

[46] We may further note *Poem. arc.* 3.16 πινυτὸν ποθέων; 42 ἄκτιστον ἄχρονον ἐσθλὸν ἐλεύθερον; 57 ἄναρχον ἀνέρχεται 61 πόρος, πηγὴ, ποταμός; 62 τρισσοῖσι τύποισιν; 82 δῆρις δὲ διάστασις; *DRS* 296 ἐντὸς ἔμεινε … ἄλγος ἄελπτον; 299 ἐξ ἀχέων, ἀπὸ δ' ἄχθεα; 307 τοιόνδε τοσόνδε τε ἄλγος ἀνέτλην; 343 καὶ κόσμου κρατεροῖο λαβὰς, καὶ χάσμα; 355 παρεζόμενος ποταμοῖο; 356 Ὠιδῆς ὄργανα πάντα παρακλίνας; 377 ἐσιδὼν ἐλέηρεν, ὃν οὐκ ἐλέηραν 382 κεδνῆς καταβάντα; 389 πέμποις πόλιν.

[47] Harder 2012 44 observes that the repetition of words in the *Aetia* is rare, though she points to fr. 1.33 (ἵνα γῆρας ἵνα δρόσον) and 25.1 ἄρνες τοι φίλε κοῦρε… ἄρνες) as counter-examples. Callimachus, however, is quite fond of the device in the *Hymns*. For just a few examples, consider Ζεῦ σε…Ζεῦ σε (6–7), Κρῆτες… Κρῆτες (8–9), πολλὰς… πολλὰς… πολλὰ (22–24), καλὰ μὲν… καλὰ δ'ἔτραφες (55), ἐν δὲ … ἐν δ' (84), ἑσπέριος… ἑσπέριος (87–88, combined with homoeoteleuton). He even creates near anaphorae, such as when line 72 begins with the conjunction ἀλλὰ and the following line begins with the adjective ἄλλα. For a more extensive list, see Lapp 1965 54ff.

ἐσθλοῖς / οὔτε Τριὰς πολύσεπτος, ἐπεὶ φύσις ἔστ' ἀκέαστος. ("Nor is the monad without number, since it is in three excellences, nor is the trinity polytheistic, since the divine nature is undivided"). In 3.72 unity is described in the first half of the line, and trinity in the second. In the 3.73, this is reversed. Gregory thus uses the anaphora to juxtapose carefully the demands of unity and trinity in the Godhead. He does the same in *Poem. arc.* 3.75–76.[48] But elsewhere Gregory uses the device much more sparingly. I have found six instances in the 93 lines of *Poem. arc.* 3,[49] but only one instance in the 99 lines of *DRS* 294–392, a decidedly Homeric repetition of πρίν ("until") at *DRS* 301. Again it would seem that Gregory was striving for a more Homeric mode in *DRS.*

Gregory frequently employs polyptoton to good effect, a technique Callimachus particularly favored in the *Hymn to Apollo*.[50] *Poem. arc.* 3.3–4 constitute one striking example: Πνεῦμα μέγα τρομέωμεν, ὅ μοι **θεός**, ᾧ **Θεὸν** ἔγνων, / **ὃς Θεός** ἐστιν ἔναντα, καὶ **ὃς θεὸν** ἐνθάδε τεύχει· ("Let us tremble before the mighty Spirit, who to me is God, the one by whom I know God, who is God there, and who who makes me a god here.") Gregory begins with a strong assertion of the Spirit's divinity: μέγας ("mighty") has been used as an epithet of divinity (θεότης) already at *Poem. arc.* 1.5, and of the Father and the Son at *Poem. arc.* 1.27–28 (Υἱέος … μεγάλοιο Πατὴρ μέγας, another polyptoton). After asserting the Spirit's divinity, Gregory constructs an ascending tetracolon to drive home the point still further. He repeats the relative

---

[48] Εἷς Θεός ἐστιν ἕκαστον, ἐπὴν μόνον ἐξαγορεύῃς. / εἷς Θεὸς αὖθις ἄναρχος, ὅθεν πλοῦτος θεότητος ("Each is the one God, since you address them as only one; and again, the one god is without beginning; from him is the wealth of the godhead.")

[49] *Poem. arc.* 3.4 ὅς… ὅς, 47 οὐ… οὐ, 60 ἐκ μονάδος … καὶ ἐκ Τριάδος , 72–73 οὔτε… ἐπεὶ, 75–76 εἷς θεός… εἷς θεός, 87–88 ἓν μὲν … ἓν δὲ … ἓν κλέος, ἓν δὲ.

[50] *E.g. hAp* 62–63 (κεράεσσιν … κεράων, κεραοὺς), 68–71 (Ἀπόλλων … ὤπολλον … Καρνεῖον… Καρνεῖε), 109–10 (ἐφ ὕδατι / ὕδωρ, also a juxtaposed prosodic variant).

pronoun in three different forms (ὅ, ᾧ, ὅς) and the noun θεός in both the nominative singular

and the accusative singular. The variation of case in the relative pronoun also permits prosodic

variation: the neuter ὅ is short, while the other the dative ᾧ is long, and the nominative ὅς are

lengthened by position. Each element of the tetracolon becomes progressively longer (4, 6, 8,

then 9 syllables). The second pair expands upon and effectively glosses the first couplet: The terse

"he is to me God" is expanded by "He is god there" (i.e. in heaven, that is, by his very nature)

and "he's the means by which I know God" is expanded by "he makes me a god here on earth."

The structure and polyptoton reinforce Gregory's assertions about the Spirit's role within the

Godhead and salvation history. Gregory also uses the device on a smaller scale. At *Poem. arc.* 3.60,

he uses μονάς ("unity") and τριάς ("trinity") in both the nominative and genitive singular (Ἐκ

μονάδος Τριάς ἐστι, καὶ ἐκ Τριάδος μονὰς αὖθις, "the Trinity is rooted in unity, but again the

unity is rooted in the trinity"). In *Poem. arc.* 3.74, he uses the definite article in two different forms

and the noun θεότης in both the dative singular and the nominative singular (Ἡ μονὰς ἐν

θεότητι, τὰ δ' ὧν θεότης τρισάριθμα. "The unity is in divinity; that which is divinity is three").

In *Poem. arc.* 3.80–81, Gregory combines polyptoton with *parisa*[51]: Μηδὲ θεῶν ἀγορῇ

τερπώμεθα τῇ **πολυάρχῳ**. / ἴσον γὰρ **πολύαρχον** ἐμοὶ καὶ πάμπαν **ἄναρχον** ("Let us not

delight in an assembly of gods with many rulers, / for to my mind many rulers is the same as

utter anarchy.") The ridiculousness of polytheism is emphasized by the repetition of πολύαρχος

(here "having many rulers" not "ruling much") and the use of a word from the same root but

with a different prefix (ἄναρχος "anarchic"). On the whole, polyptoton is much more common

---

[51] *Parisa* occurs when words with the same root are used but with a different prefix (in this case,
πολύ**αρχος** is juxtaposed with ἄν**αρχος**).

in *Poem. arc.* 3 than in *De rebus suis*.[52] This suggests that Gregory finds it more suitable for hymn

and argument than narrative.

Syntax

Let us now turn to Gregory's syntax. Though he is quite pithy on occasion, his sentences

generally expand over several lines. This is well illustrated by the frequency with which he uses

enjambement. I argue that Gregory specifically cultivates several types enjambement favored by

Callimachus.[53]

Work	Not Enjambed	Unperiodic	Necessary
Gr. *Poem. arc.* 3	35.5%	31.2 %	33.3%
Gr. *DRS* 294–392	36.4%	40.4%	23.23%
Gr. *Total*	35.9%	35.9%	28.1%
Homer *Il.*	48.5	24.8%	26.6 %
Homer *Od.*	44.8 %	26.6%	28.5 %
Hesiod *Theog.*	33.0%	39.1%	27.9%
Hesiod *WD*	43.0%	27.2 %	29.7%
Callimachus *Hymns*	40.2%	25%	34%
Apollonius *Arg.*	34.8%	16.0 %	49.1%

Gregory enjambs lines far more frequently than Homer and Hesiod, and even more than

Callimachus; only Apollonius enjambs more often. There is, however, considerable variety from

---

[52] I have found only one instance: Gregory repeats ὁδίτης (traveler) in different cases in 369 and 372 but two entire lines intervene.

[53] For analyzing enjambment I have used the categories adopted by Parry 1929 and McLennan 1974, from whom I derive the statistics for Homer, Callimachus, and Apollonius. Unperiodic enjambment occurs when the sense is complete at the end of a line, but further modifiers are appended in the succeeding line. For instance, consider *Poem. arc.* 3.3–9. The sense is complete with the feminine caesura in 3.3 (πνεῦμα μέγα τρομέωμεν, "Let us tremble before the mighty Spirit"), but Gregory then appends 6.5 more lines that further modify πνεῦμα ("Spirit"). Necessary enjambment occurs when the sense is not complete at the end of the line. In *Poem. arc.* 3.19–20 (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀρχομένοισι τελειοτέροιο λόγοιο / καιρός) the sense is not complete until the subject (and implicitly the verb ἐστί) are supplied in line 20.

No enjambment occurs when a new clause begins with a new line.

each Callimachean work to the next. Even among the *Hymns*, Callimachus varies his practice considerably:

Work	Not Enjambed	Unperiodic	Necessary
Call. *hZeus*	37.8%	29.5%	32.7%
Call. *hAp*	46.4%	25.9%	27.7%
Call. *hArt*	30.4%	20.7%	48.97%
Call. *hDel*	34.5%	23.4%	42.1%
Call. *hDem*	51.9%	25.2%	21.6%

Gregory does not in *Poem. arc.* 3 and *DRS* 294–392 approach Callimachus' high numbers for necessary enjambement in *Hymns* 3–4. Gregory is particularly fond of unperiodic enjambement. Only Hesiod in the *Theogony* comes close to Gregory's frequency; it is striking that only a poem given in large part over to genealogical lists would come close to matching Gregory in the use of unperiodic enjambement. Generally Gregory uses unperiodic enjambement to append numerous adjectival clauses. *Poem. arc.* 3.4–9 is one good example (see note above).

Gregory does, however, cultivate two types of necessary enjambement particularly favored by Callimachus. In the first, the sense extends onto the next line but no further than the first word.[54] McLennan points to examples at Call. *Hymn* 1.11–12 (ἔνθεν ὁ χῶρος / ἱερός, "where the precinct is holy") and at *Hymn* 1.19–20 (ἔτι δ' ἄβροχος ἦεν ἅπασα / Ἀζηνίς "but all of Arcadia was still unwatered").[55] I have found the following similar instances in *Poem. arc.* 3 and *DRS* 294–392:

> *Poem. arc.* 3.12–13 τρίβους εἰς ἓν συνιούσας / ὄψεται; 19–20 Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀρχομένοισι τελειοτέροιο λόγοιο / καιρός; 55–56 θεοφόροισιν / ἄνδρασιν; 81–82 πάμπαν ἄναρχον / μαρνάμενον; 82–83 ἡ δ' ἐπὶ λῦσιν / σπεύδει. *DRS* 294–95: ἀπ' ἐμοῖο / ψυχῆς; 318–19 καὶ στροπῇσι / λάμπετο; 331-332 φάος δ' ἐμὸν οἷα φονῆος / ὤλετο; 333–334 ἀνέπεμψα θυηλὴν / πνεύματος; 340–41: ἐνέκυρσε τάλαινα /

---

[54] McLennan 1974 201

[55] McLennan 1974 201

ψύχῃ; 354–54 ἐπὶ κραναῆς πεδίοισιν / δουριαλὴς; 356–57
παρακλίνας ἀτίνακτα / δακρυόεις; 360–61 οὔποτε ἔληξα / ἱμείρων;
380–81 ἐγὼ ἀντεβόλησα / πήμασι.

In the second type of enjambement, Callimachus places an adjective on one line and the noun with which it agrees in the next. McLennan points to Call. *Hymn* 2.52–53, οὐδ' ἀγάλακτες / οἴιες ("nor where the sheep un-milked") and observes that this type of necessary enjambment is extremely rare in Homer. Note that there is some overlap between these two types of enjambement, as we can see from the example at *Hymn* 1.19–20 mentioned above. Gregory does this less frequently than the first type of enjambement mentioned above, but I have still noted five instances in *Poem. arc.* 3 and *DRS* 294–392.

> *Poem. arc.* 3.51–52 ὅλος καὶ σεπτὸς ἔμοιγε / ἔστι θεός; 52–53 ἢ
> ἀγαθοῖο / πνεύματος; 54–55 καὶ θεοφόροισιν / ἄνδρασιν; *DRS* 365–
> 66 χθαμαλοῖσιν / εὐμενέων πάντεσσιν; 308–09 **κορυσσόμενον**
> ἀνέμοισι / γαίης ἐκ Φαρίης ἐπ' Ἀχαιΐδα, **πόντον** ἔτετμον; 381–82
> μεγαίρων / λῃϊστὴς

Note that all the instances in *Poem. arc.* 3 come from six dense lines (51–56), where Gregory also employs the Callimachean formula ὅστις ἀλιτρός ("whosoever is wicked" *Poem. arc.* 52. *Cf.* Call. *Hymn* 2.2, ἑκάς, ἑκὰς ὅστις ἀλιτρός). Gregory has combined a Callimachean allusion with adaption of a stylistic technique favored by his Cyrenaean master. Gregory's use enjambement allows him to produce a striking stylistic variety redolent of the Cyrenaean; Mineur has noted that the variety produced by such enjambement is virtually required by Callimachean principles.[56]

Gregory's hyperbata can be quite striking. In *DRS* 308–09, mentioned above, Gregory places a participle after the caesura in 308, while its noun does not appear until after the caesura

---

[56] Mineur 1984 34

in the following line, with seven words intervening. He also sometimes requires us to supply an antecedent from several lines prior. For instance, Gregory employs only the genitive pronoun τῆς for the genitive absolute in *Poem. arc.* 3.17 (μή πω τῆς Χριστοῖο βροτῶν πλεόνεσσι φανείσης, "as Christ's [divinity] had not yet been revealed to many people"). We have to supply the noun θεότητος ("godhead") from two lines prior. We may also consider the elaborate priamel that extends from *DRS* 307–45. Gregory begins by stating that he has never experienced the sort of misfortune that presently plagues him (307). He then inserts four prior unfortunate episodes from his life, each introduced by οὐδ' ὅτε ("neither when…" 308, 322, 327) or οὐδ' ὁπότ' ("nor when…" 329). This means that the relative subordinate temporal clauses beginning in 322, 327, and 329 are separated from their main clause by 13, 18, and 20 lines respectively. I am unaware of anything quite so dramatic in Callimachus, but the Cyrenaean did have a reputation for using needlessly difficult syntax.[57]

Gregory's sometimes avails himself of a type of anastrophe common in Callimachus, the reversal of standard word-order for conjunctions. I have not observed any instances in these particular passages, but one may point to the postponement of ἀλλά in *carm.* 2.1.38 32 (λίσσομαι ἀλλὰ πόροις ἀμφότερ' εὐαγέως, "but I pray that you would grant both [my speech and my hearing] to be holy") or the postponement of καί in *hVirg* 80 (δίζετο καὶ σοφίης ἐπιίστορα, "And he sought one practiced in wisdom").[58] The textbook example for such anastrophe was Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.15–16: Μασσαγέται καὶ μακρὸν ὀϊστεύοιεν ἐπ ἄνδρα / Μῆδον

---

[57] Harder 2012 42

[58] This example perhaps alludes to *hZeus* 16 αὐτίκα δίζητο ῥόον ὕδατος ("at once she looked for a flow of water").

("and may the Massagetes shoot from afar at the man from Media").[59] See also *Aet.* fr. 43.53 φίλατο καὶ κεστοῦ δεσπότις ἦν Ἔρυκα ("[I can tell about…] Eryx, which the mistress of the girdle loved." tr. Harder, modified). Callimachus also postpones the conjunction ἀλλά at *hZeus* 18 Λάδων ἀλλ᾽ οὔπω μέγας ἔρρεν ("But the great Ladon river was not yet flowing"). In anastrophe we thus see Gregory again employing a technique favored by the Cyrenaean.

Part 2: The Gregorian Style

We have seen in part one of this chapter that Gregory took care to cultivate and advertise a Callimachean style. And yet, it would certainly be mistaken to ignore the places where Gregory departs sharply from the Cyrenaean, especially when these departures are deliberate. I wish first to show that Gregory considered gnomic and other didactic elements to be his stylistic signature. Then, by examining how Gregory reverses a number of Callimachean metaphors for style, I argue that Gregory held these didactic elements to be a stylistic departure from his Cyrenaean model.

Stylistic Signatures (ΓΝΩΡΙΣΜΑ ΤΩΝ ΛΟΓΩΝ)

Let us consider first a letter of Gregory to his grand-nephew Nicobulus (*ep.* 52), where the old bishop observes that the distinguishing feature of his style is his use of gnomes and maxims (γνῶμαι and δόγματα):

> Ἄλλου μὲν γὰρ ἄλλο τι γνώρισμα, ἢ μικρὸν ἢ μεῖζον· τῶν δ᾽ ἡμετέρων λόγων τὸ παιδευτικὸν ἔν τε γνώμαις καὶ δόγμασιν, ὅπη παρείκοι. Καὶ καθάπερ εὐγενεῖ τόκῳ, τοῖς λόγοις ὁ πατὴρ ἀεὶ συνεμφαίνεται οὐχ ἧττον ἢ τοῖς σωματικοῖς ὡς τὰ πολλὰ χαρακτῆρσιν οἱ φύσαντες. Τὸ μὲν οὖν ἡμέτερον τοιοῦτον.

> Each author has a distinguishing feature, however small or large. As for our writings, it is the didactic element expressed wherever possible in gnomes and *dogmata*. An author, like a father in a noble son, is often even

---

[59] For ancient definitions of the various types of anastrophe, see the scholia to Dionysius Thrax, ed. Hilgard 1901, p. 460.

> more visible in his works than parents are in the bodily features of their children. Such has been the case for me.

Though Gregory is here speaking specifically to the writing of letters, he notes that the cultivation of the didactic is the trademark of all his written work (λόγοι encompasses his letters, orations, and poems). The manner in which Gregory cultivates the didactic, however, is somewhat unclear. He states that he uses gnomes and *dogmata*; gnomes, at least, were a well-established feature of rhetorical discourse. Following Aristotle, Ps.-Hermogenes and Aphthonius defined it as a short declarative statement of either a protreptic or apotropaic nature.[60] They offer examples like *Il.* 2.24: οὐ χρὴ παννύχιον εὕδειν βουληφόρον ἄνδρα ("a prudent man should not sleep all night"). The meaning of δόγματα is less certain. Normally it would refer to dogma in our sense: the teachings of various philosophical schools or religious systems. The word could also refer to an imperial edict (*e.g.* Luke 2:1). But Gregory is clearly referring here to a rhetorical method of expression, not a decree or teaching. The closest sense offered by the lexica is Lampe's "precept", (see *s.v.* D.1). But here Gregory uses it in parallel with γνῶμαι, presumably as a catch-all for the other sorts of gnomic speech that are not gnomes proper, like proverbs (παροιμίαι) and anecdotes (ἀποφθέγματα). I have thus translated it as "maxim." I shall argue later that Gregory uses δόγμα in this same quasi-technical sense in *carm.* 2.1.39 58–67.

Discursive Sweeteners (ΛΟΓΟΙ ΓΛΥΚΕΙΣ)

Gregory also mentions maxims in *ep.* 51, a letter on the writing of letters. After stating that proper length and clarity are the first two characteristics of a good epistle, he turns to the third, grace:

> Τρίτον ἐστὶ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν, ἡ χάρις. Ταύτην δὲ φυλάξομεν, εἰ μήτε παντάπασι ξηρὰ καὶ ἀχάριστα γράφοιμεν καὶ ἀκαλλώπιστα,

---

[60] Γνώμη ἐστὶ λόγος ἐν ἀποφάνσεσι κεφαλαιώδης ἐπί τι προτρέπων ἢ ἀποτρέπων. (Aphth. *Progymnasmata* p. 7. ed. Rabe 1926). *Cf.* Ps.-Hermogenes, *Progymnasmata* 4. Aristotle's definitions occurs in *Rhet.* 1394a.

> ἀκόσμητα καὶ ἀκόρητα, ὃ δὴ λέγεται, οἷον δὴ **γνωμῶν** καὶ **παροιμιῶν** καὶ **ἀποφθεγμάτων** ἐκτός, ἔτι δὲ σκωμμάτων καὶ αἰνιγμάτων, οἷς ὁ λόγος καταγλυκαίνεται· μήτε λίαν τούτοις φαινοίμεθα καταχρώμενοι· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀγροῖκον, τὸ δ᾽ ἄπληστον. (6) Καὶ τοσαῦτα τούτοις χρηστέον, ὅσα καὶ ταῖς πορφύραις ἐν τοῖς ὑφάσμασι. Τροπὰς δὲ παραδεξόμεθα μέν, ὀλίγας δέ, καὶ ταύτας οὐκ ἀναισχύντους. **Ἀντίθετα** δὲ καὶ **πάρισα** καὶ **ἰσόκωλα** τοῖς σοφισταῖς ἀπορρίψομεν· εἰ δέ που καὶ παραλάβοιμεν, ὡς καταπαίζοντες μᾶλλον τοῦτο ποιήσομεν ἢ σπουδάζοντες.

> The third characteristic of letters is grace. We will preserve this so long as we do not write letters that are entirely dry and without charm, letters adorned and unsatisfying, which is to say, letters without gnomes, proverbs, and sayings, or even without jokes and riddles. By these, the work is made more sweet. But neither should we appear to use these too often. For their absence is rustic but their abuse is self-indulgent. We should use them like purple dye in a web of cloth. As for figures of speech, we will use them but only a few, and only ones that are not garish. We will leave *antitheta*, *parisa*, and *isocola* to the sophists. If we use these, it will be more in jest than in earnest.

The whole of the letter is perhaps more playful than is often observed, for Gregory has used a number of the tropes that he "leaves to sophists."[61] But we should note that when Gregory turns to the topic of adornment the first techniques to be mentioned are gnomes, proverbs, and sayings (γνῶμαι, παροιμίαι, and ἀποφθέγματα).

Discursive Sweeteners in Verse (ΔΙΔΑΣΚΟΝΤΕΣ ΛΟΓΟΙ)

I would now like to bring these excerpts from Gregory's letters to bear on a difficult passage from Gregory's *carm.* 2.1.39 (*in suos uersus*), lines 58–70. Scholars have without exception taken these lines to contain a systematic, if selective, summary of Gregory's poetry.[62] I propose instead that Gregory here emphasizes the didactic features of his poetic style, like gnomes and maxims. I print De Blasi's text, with departures noted.

---

[61] Note, *e.g.,* the *parisa* in the juxtaposition of φαίνω and παραφαίνω.

[62] De Blasi 2018, *ad loc.*, Crimi and Costa 1999, Demoen 1996 61 n. 108, Milovanović-Barham 1997 500.

Πρὸς ταῦτα νῦν γινώσκεθ᾽ ἡμῖν, οἱ σοφοί,
τῶν ἔνδον.[63] εἰ δ᾽ ἥττησθε, τῶν αὐτῶν λόγων
πλεῖστον τὸ χρῆμα ·[64] καὶ τὰ παιζόντων λόγοι<ς>[65] [60]
χωρεῖτε. μακρὸν δ᾽ οὐδὲν οὐδ᾽ ὑπὲρ κόρον
ἀλλ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ἄχρηστον ὡς ἐγῷμαι παντελῶς.
αὐτοὶ διδάξουσ᾽ οἱ λόγοι θέλοντά σε ·
τὰ μὲν γάρ ἐστι τῶν ἐμῶν, τὰ δ᾽ ἔκτοθεν,
ἢ τῶν καλῶν ἔπαινος ἢ κακῶν ψόγος [65]
ἢ δόγματ᾽ ἢ γνώμη τις ἢ τομαὶ λόγων
μνήμην ἔχουσαι τῇ δέσει τοῦ γράμματος.
Εἰ μικρὰ ταῦτα, σὺ τέλει τὰ μείζονα ·
μέτρον κακίζεις εἰκότως ἄμετρος ὤν,
ἰαμβοποιὸς συγγράφων ἀμβλώματα. [70]

Moreover, smart ones, take note of what's within. If you yield, the words themselves are of much use. You should accept even the tricks of those who play with words, for nothing here is long nor indulgent but rather perfectly useful, I should think! The words themselves will teach you if you're willing. Some of these things are mine, some come from elsewhere, whether praise of virtue or critique of vice, whether maxims, a gnome, or some cuttings from the scriptures, which help recall the scripture through the bond [of meter]. If these are small concerns, you go do greater things! It is quite fitting that you attack my measure since you utterly lack it, you iambic reviler, producer of abortions.[66]

Most recent scholars have taken lines 58–59 to be retrospective, understanding it to mean something to the effect of "now you know, smart ones, my reasons for writing verse."[67] We should, however, take these lines as prospective. With the opening phrase of 58 (πρὸς ταῦτα, "moreover") Gregory marks a transition from his reasons for writing verse to a new topic: the

---

[63] De Blasi 2018 does not punctuate here, instead connecting τῶν ἔνδον with εἰ δ᾽ ἥττεσθε and translating, "*se voi cedete al cuore dei miei ragionamenti è massimo il guadagno.*" The δέ in the third foot, however, shows that a new clause begins with εἰ. I have thus punctuated with a full-stop, as did Caillau 1842.

[64] I am the first, to my knowledge, to introduce punctuation here.

[65] *Scripsi.* The manuscripts and editions read καὶ τὰ παιζόντων λόγοι.

[66] Though I generally prefer to translate verse with verse, I have opted for the clarity of prose when rendering 2.1.39, since the meaning of so much of the poem remains uncertain.

[67] Abrams Rebillard 2003 translates τῶν ἔνδον as "what lies behind them." Crimi and Costa 1999 similarly translates, "*E così voi ora siete a conoscenza, o competenti, di quanto sta dentro di noi.*" Lieggi 2009 90 and De Blasi 2018 *ad loc.* follow. White 1996 instead translates "my innermost thoughts."

style and content of his poetry.[68] The verb γινώσκετε in 58 should be taken as imperative in this polemical context, not indicative (Crimi, Abrams Rebillard, White).[69] Indeed, the imperative is reinforced by the particle νῦν, which often accompanies commands or requests.[70] We should thus understand τῶν ἔνδον not as Gregory's reasons for writing verse, but as the contents of his poetry books.[71]

In line 60, the transmitted text is almost certainly corrupt, as De Blasi notes.[72] τὰ παιζόντων λόγοι is nonsensical, but emending the nominative plural to the dative plural (λόγοις) restores sense of the line. Gregory thereby bids his opponents to accept the things characteristic of those who play with words (τὰ παιζόντων λόγοις / χωρεῖτε), *i.e.* stylistic adornment and tropes. The lines that follow offer further support for the emendation, for they show parallels with Gregory's discussion of tropes in *ep.* 51.5. Compare the following:

carm. 2.1.39	*ep.* 51
μακρὸν δ' οὐδὲν	οὔτε μακρότερα γραπτέον…
οὐδ' ὑπὲρ κόρον	τὸ δ'ἄπληστον
οὐδ' ἄχρηστον[73] … παντελῶς	ἔστι δὲ μέτρον τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἡ χρεία

The accumulation of evidence confirms that, in line 58, Gregory has transitioned from a discussion his reasons for writing verse to a new theme: his style.

---

[68] Abrams Rebillard's "Regarding these verses" is possible, but πρὸς ταῦτα, like διὰ τοῦτο, is virtually a conjunctive particle. See LSJ πρός III.2.

[69] De Blasi 2018 *ad loc.* prints νῦν γινώσκετε but in his note prefers the more poorly attested συγγινώσκετ' ("pardon"). But even an ironic plea for pardon does not cohere well with the mention of yielding in the next verse.

[70] LSJ *s.v.* II.3.

[71] For ἔνδον used with the contents of a book, *cf.* Diog. Laert. *Vit. Phil.* 5.4.

[72] De Blasi 2018 *ad loc.*

[73] Gregory may well be punning in this line on the presence of χρεῖαι (witty anecdotes attributed to historical persons) in his verse.

Once we have recognized Gregory's preoccupation with stylistic matters, the catalogue in lines 64–67 comes into sharper focus. As noted, scholars have typically taken this list to refer to the different kinds of poems that Gregory wrote.[74] But this interpretation has difficulties with line 64, where Gregory says, "Some of these things are mine and some are from others." If we regard entries in the catalogue as referring to entire poems (or groups of poems), then Gregory would apparently be saying that he stole whole poems from other poets.[75] Instead of embracing this absurdity, scholars have severed line 64 from the catalogue that follows, either by understanding the referent of the nominative neuter plural articles (τὰ μὲν… τὰ δ') as some generic term, like "considerations,"[76] or by reading the line in apposition with οἱ λόγοι in line 63.[77] Instead we should look to lines 65–67 for the referent of the definite articles. Gregory refers not to types of poems but something much more concrete: the proverbs, gnomes, and other aphorisms that are ubiquitous in his verse. After all, in *ep.* 52 Gregory had specified precisely this propensity for the didactic as the characteristic mark of his style. This makes much more sense of Gregory's admission in line 64 that some "things" come from pagans, for the deployment of preexisting gnomes was expected practice. The line is thus not a "timid inclusion of pagan themes" , as De Blasi has it,[78] but a statement of the author's inventiveness in creating his own aphorisms, for Gregory has not only employed maxims of others but crafted his own.[79]

---

[74] *E.g.* Demoen 1996 61–63.

[75] De Blasi translates "*Se tu sei bendisposto, maestre ti saranno / queste stesse parole, qui mie, là di altra fonte*," which I admittedly find puzzling. He takes τά in 64 as correlative with οἱ λόγοι which would be rather awkward, particularly as Gregory could easily have written οἱ μὲν … οἱ δέ.

[76] Moreschini et al. 1994 16

[77] So De Blasi 2018 *ad loc.*

[78] De Blasi 2018 *in l.* 64

[79] Gregory's fondness for definitions is well-attested in 1.2.34, a poem consisting entirely of definitions.

Let us now reconsider each element of the catalogue in the light of the prior argument. Praises of virtue and excoriations of vice (ἢ τῶν καλῶν ἔπαινος ἢ κακῶν ψόγος) refer not to extended compositions, but to concise aphorisms. Notably, Gregory's contemporary Aphthonius distinguished ἔπαινος from ἐνκώμιον precisely on the basis of length: the former was short, the latter longer with more stylistic elaboration.[80] As for δόγματ' in line 66, we should take this to refer to some sort of maxim-like statement, for Gregory has placed it here in parallel with γνῶμαι, just as he did in *ep.* 52; we may consider the line that concludes *carm.* 1.2.27 as an example: "Nobility consists in one thing: good character" (μί' εὐγένεια, τὸν τρόπον χρηστὸν φέρειν 1.2.27 34). Gnomes, in turn, would not refer to gnomological poems, like *carm.* 2.1.34, but to what fourth century rhetoricians meant by the term: concise apotropaic or protreptic aphorisms. Gregory's final entry in the list, τομαὶ λόγων (lit. "cuttings of words"), admittedly enigmatic, probably refers to concise paraphrases of a verse or two of scripture. These abound in Gregory's verse; for example, consider *Poem. arc.* 1.21 (οὐρανὸς εἰσαΐοι, χθὼν δέχνυσο ῥήματ' ἐμεῖο "Let Heaven hear; O Earth receive my words" cf. Dt. 32:1 and Is. 1:2) or *Adv. iram* 398 (ζήλωσον, ἀλλὰ τὴν νόσον γ'αὐραῖς δίδου "Be zealous, but give the disease [of anger] to the wind." *cf*. Ps. 4:5 and the citation of the Psalm by St. Paul in *Eph* 4:26).

Understanding the catalogue as a list of didactic elements of style accounts well for lines 68–70, where Gregory addresses potential criticism. De Blasi finds the transition quite sudden and is unsure of the antecedent of ταῦτα in line 68. But these lines (and indeed, the whole section running down to 81) are tightly connected with 58–67. Though Gregory becomes more

---

[80] Διενήνοχε [scil. τὸ ἐγκώμιον] δὲ ὕμνου καὶ ἐπαίνου τῷ τὸν μὲν ὕμνον εἶναι θεῶν, τὸ δὲ ἐγκώμιον θνητῶν, καὶ τῷ τὸν μὲν ἔπαινον ἐν βραχεῖ γίνεσθαι, τὸ δὲ ἐγκώμιον κατὰ τέχνην ἐκφέρεσθαι ("Encomium differs from hymn and *epainos* in that a hymn honors the gods, while an encomium hnors mortals, and in that an *epainos* is concise, but an encomium is extended through rhetorical art." vol. 10, pg. 21, line 10).

openly polemical in 68, he has already hinted at the audience's potential hostility: they will profit from his verses but only if they yield (59) and come with an open mind (63). If we take the catalogue to refer to gnomic statements and other maxims, there is no problem understanding the pronoun ταῦτα to refer to what it must, the elements of the preceding catalogue. In this passage, then, we see Gregory advocating a Callimachean attention to brevity and stylistic purity while accusing his opponent of lacking impurity in both the stylistic and ethical realms. We might paraphrase line 68 so: "if concern for such small stylistic features is pedantic, you go do bigger things!" Gregory defends in a Callimachean manner even his adoption of un-Callimachean elements like gnomes and maxims.

My analysis of *DRS* 294–392 and *Poem. arc.* 3 suggests that Gregory was quite right to view the cultivation of gnomes and maxims as a prominent element of his style. The Cappadocian uses gnomes far more frequently than either Homer or Callimachus. Lardinois, modifying the figures of Ahrens, notes that there are 123 gnomes in the *Iliad*.[81] This amounts to about one every 128 lines. I have counted seven in the Hymns of Callimachus (about one every 155 lines):

- *hZeus* 6 κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται ("Cretans are always liars")
- *hZeus* 63–64 ἐπ' ἰσαίῃ γὰρ ἔοικε / πήλασθαι ("For it is fitting to cast lots on equal terms")
- *hAp* 9–10 ὠπόλλων οὐ παντὶ φαείνεται, ἀλλ' ὅ τις ἐσθλός / ὅς μιν ἴδῃ, μέγας οὗτος, ὃς οὐκ ἴδε, λιτὸς ἐκεῖνος. ("Apollo does not appear to all, but whoever is noble. Great is he who sees him; wretched he who does not.")
- *hAp* 25 κακὸν μακάρεσσιν ἐρίζειν ("it is wicked to vie with blessed gods")
- *hArt* 1 οὐ γὰρ ἐλαφρὸν ἀειδόντεσσι λαθέσθαι ("For it is no small thing for singers to forget")
- *hDel* 25 θεὸς δ' ἀεὶ ἀστυφέλικτος ("the god [Apollo] always is sure")
- *hDel* 122 ἀναγκαίη μεγάλη θεός ("Necessity is a mighty god")

---

[81] See Lardinois 1997 214–15 and Ahrens 1937. Lardinois uses Aristotle's definition for γνώμη in *Rhet.* 1394a, whence derive the more concise definitions of the later theorists like Hermogenes.

In the passages selected from Gregory, by contrast, I have counted nine in 192 lines, or about

one every 21 lines. From *Poem. arc.* 3 I note:

- 16-18 Οὐ γὰρ ἐῴκει … ἄχθος ἄγειν κραδίῃσιν ἀφαυροτάτῃσιν ἄπιστον. ("For it was not fitting to lay an incredible burden on hearts so feeble.")
- 19–20 Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀρχομένοισι τελειοτέροιο λόγοιο / καιρός. ("nor was it time for those beginning to have a more perfect explanation.")
- 32 Καὶ γὰρ πῦρ Θεὸν οἶδα κακοῖς, ὡς φῶς ἀγαθοῖσιν. ("For I know God to be fire to the wicked, a light to the good.")
- 81–82: ἴσον γὰρ πολύαρχον ἐμοὶ καὶ πάμπαν ἄναρχον / μαρνάμενον. ("For the rule of many is the same to me as utterly quarrelsome anarchy.")
- 82 δῆρις δὲ διάστασις ("difference is strife.")

From *DRS* 294–392:

- 304 ἔνθα δ᾽ ἄκος μερόπεσσι, τὰ δ᾽ ὕστατα δέσμια πάντα. ("Here there is healing for mortals, but at the last day, everything is chained in place.")
- 335 ψαύειν μὴ καθαρῷ γὰρ ἁγνοῦ κακὸν ("It is wicked for one impure to touch what is clean.")
- 348–50 ἦ γὰρ ἄριστον / δάκρυόν ἐστι βροτοῖσιν ἄκος, ψυχαῖς τε μελαίναις, / καὶ κόνις αἰθαλόεσσα, καὶ ἐν χθονὶ σάκκος ἐρυμνός. ("For truly tears are the best medicine for mortals and for stained souls, along with black dust and rough sackcloth on the ground.")
- 365–66 Ἕλκων οἶκτον Ἄνακτος ὀϊζύϊ, ὃς χθαμαλοῖσιν / εὐμενέων πάντεσσιν ὑπερφιάλους ἀθερίζει· ("Begging for mercy for my woe from the Lord, who is merciful to all who are humble but scorns the arrogant.")

Gregory shows stylistic variety in his construction of gnomes. *Poem. arc.* 3.16–18 has striking

alliteration with alpha, while *DRS* 335 has alliteration with kappa. We have *parisa* along with

enjambement in *Poem. arc.* 3.81–82. It is also striking just how varied the gnomes are in length.

Only two of the nine extend precisely to one hexameter line, the typical length of a gnome in

Homer (*Poem. arc.* 3.32 and *DRS* 304). Others are shorter (*Poem. arc.* 3.82) or span multiple lines.

Poem. arc. 3.48–50 even extends to three. Moreover, even while cultivating an un-Callimachean

technique, Gregory at times employs elements of Callimachean style. We may note the use of

enjambement that extends only to the first word of the second line (*Poem. arc.* 3.19–20, 81–82)

and enjambement that involves an adjective followed in the next line by its governing noun (*DRS*

348–49 ἄριστον / … ἄκος). Gregory's cultivation of the gnomic does not align him with

Callimachus, but it does align him with one of Callimachus most important models, Hesiod.[82]

We should thus regard Gregory's cultivation of the didactic as a Callimachean development of a

technique not particularly favored by the Alexandrian.

Thundering Poets (ΒΡΟΝΤΑΝ ΝΑΙ ΕΜΟΝ ΕΣΤΙ)

Let us now consider several of Gregory's stylistic metaphors. I argue here that Gregory's embrace

of the didactic constituted a conscious departure from Callimachus. We first turn *Poem. arc.* 1.1

22–24, where Gregory asks the Holy Spirit to make him into a "loud-resounding trumpet of

truth."

> Πνεῦμα θεοῦ, σὺ δ' ἔμοιγε νόον καὶ γλῶσσαν ἐγείροις
> ἀτρεκίης σάλπιγγα ἐρίβρομον, ὥς κεν ἅπαντες
> τέρπωνται κατὰ θυμὸν ὅλῃ θεότητι μιγέντες.
>
> O Spir't of God, my mind and tongue now raise
> as loud-resounding trumpet of thy truth,
> that all in soul may gladly with the godhead
> mix.

In this adaptation of Is. 58:1,[83] Gregory reverses Callimachus' claim in the prologue of the *Aetia*

to sing high and sweet like the cicada and leave thundering to Zeus (*Aet.* fr. 1.20, 29–30). Not

only is Gregory's trumpet strongly marshal in its associations, and hence highly redolent of the

kings and heroes that Callimachus shunned, but Gregory uses the rare adjective ἐρίβρομος

("loud-thundering") to emphasize the contrast further. Sykes is quite right that the lines have an

"ancient and solemn ring," which is reinforced by the Homeric formula of dative+participial

---

[82] Hesiod already had a reputation for excelling in gnomes in the classical period. See Isocr. *Ad Nicoclem* 43. The gnomological statements are extremely frequent in the opening lines of the *Works and Days*. At least 43 lines of the first 201 contain gnomic statements (5–8, 11–16, 20–26, 28–30, 35, 40, 42, 100–05, 134–37, 176–79, 187–94, 200–01). Theognis is certainly also a significant gnomic model for Gregory.

[83] Sykes and Moreschini 1997 *ad loc.* suggests *Ex.* 19.16–19 as a parallel but the language of Is. 58:1 is the most immediate linguistic comparand: Ἀναβόησον ἐν ἰσχύι καὶ μὴ φείσῃ, ὡς σάλπιγγα ὕψωσον τὴν φωνήν σου καὶ ἀνάγγειλον τῷ λαῷ μου τὰ ἁμαρτήματα αὐτῶν καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ Ιακωβ τὰς ἀνομίας αὐτῶν. ("Cry out in your strength and do not spare, lift up your voice as a trumpet and announce to my people their sins and to the house of Jacob their transgressions").

form of μίγνυμι at the end of the next line.[84] We may further add that by selecting an adjective associated with Dionysus (ἐρίβρομος), Gregory has subtly evoked a rival of Callimachus' Apollo. Gregory's claim to truth, however, does still place him within the broader tradition of Hesiodic and Callimachean poetry. In employing the trumpet as a metaphor, Gregory alludes both to the polemical aspects of what follows (he will, in effect, "wage war" with heretics) and, through the Isaian allusion, to his claim of a prophetic mantle.

We see a similar reversal of Callimachean precedent in *carm.* 2.1.32, where Gregory transforms from a delicate bird into a thundering prophet. He carefully builds up a picture of a Callimachean "bird-like" poet in the first 8 lines before suddenly reversing it with a sonnet-like *volta.*

> Ἤθελον ἠὲ πέλεια τανύπτερος, ἠὲ χελιδὼν
> Ἔμμεναι, ὥς κε φύγοιμι βροτῶν βίον, ἤ τιν' ἔρημον
> Ναιετάειν θήρεσσιν ὁμέστιος (οἳ γὰρ ἔασι
> Πιστότεροι μερόπων), καὶ ἡμάτιον βίον ἕλκειν,
> Νηπενθῆ, νήποινον, ἀκηδέα· ἓν τόδ' ἄθηρον [5]
> Μοῦνον ἔχειν, θεότητος ἴδριν νόον, οὐρανοφοίτην,
> Ὥς κε γαληνιόωντι βίῳ φάος αἰὲν ἐγείρω·[85]
> Ἤ τινος ἠερίης σκοπιῆς καθύπερθεν ἀερθεὶς,
> Βρονταῖον πάντεσσιν ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἀῦσαι·

> I longed like long-winged doves to be, or swallows
> that I may flee the life of men and dwell
> in hearth of beasts, for they are loyal more
> than men, and lead quotidian life without
> concern or pain or care, to have this one
> un-beastly bit, a mind that knows its God,
> that lifts aloft to heav'n, that I may always
> in peace my eye raise up, or rise myself
> and take some lofty vantage point so I
> may loudly thunder to all those below.

---

[84] Sykes and Moreschini 1997 *ad loc.*

[85] The mss all transmit ἀγ-, but "that I may gather/collect light in peace" seems a rather strange locution. I suspect that Gregory instead wrote ἐγείρω ("raise").

The passage begins in both a Callimachean and Biblical vein. Simelidis suggests[86] that Gregory's choice of the dove and the swallow is inspired by Isaiah 38:14: "I shall speak like the swallow, and meditate like the dove."[87] He moreover rightly notes the parallel with *Aet.* fr. 1.32–35, where Callimachus expresses the wish to be like "the small winged one" and feed on the dew of the airs, so that he may escape the burden of old age.[88] There are a few further points of contact with Callimachus' *Aetia*. Gregory's rare-adjective οὐρανοφοίτην ("frequenting heaven") effectively glosses Callimachus' desire to rise into the air and feed off the dew of the "divine sky" (δρόσον … ἐκ δίης ἠέρος εἶδαρ ἔδων *Aet.* fr 1.32–34).[89] Yet the most striking appropriation is βρονταῖον in line 9, which effects a striking reversal of images. In the first eight lines Gregory has employed light, nimble images: the dove and the swallow. Correspondingly, the rhythm has been primarily dactylic: lines 3–4 have one spondee a piece, line 5 two to emphasize the absence of cares, but lines 1–2 and 6–8 are completely dactylic. By contrast, line 9 commences with two spondaic feet, of which one means "thunder-like." Gregory has metamorphosed from a timid bird into a loud prophet.

The lines that follow this incipit suggest that Gregory associated "thundering" with the sort of moral exhortation found in the prophets of the Hebrew Bible. Gregory issues in this thundering tone a stern, prophetic warning for humankind. All earthly delights are hollow and temporary and the only true and lasting wealth is to be found in God. As one might expect, the address is full of the features associated with didactic, like vocative address (10, 38–39), rhetorical

---

[86] Simelidis 2009 222–23

[87] ὡς χελιδών, οὕτως φωνήσω, καὶ ὡς περιστερά, οὕτως μελετήσω.

[88] Simelidis 2009 219

[89] *Cf.* also Call. *hDel* 59, where Callimachus uses σκοπίην in the same position as Gregory to describe Hera staring down from Heaven at Leto.

questions (10–13), imperatives (14), and maxims (44–45). Gregory thus sees his cultivation of the didactic as a departure from Callimachus relatively gnome-free style.[90]

Conclusion

There is plainly much more to say about Gregory's style. I should like in the future to explore how he carefully juxtaposes poetic and philosophical terminology in the *Poemata arcana*, since word-choice is integral to creating the right sorts of poetic effects. Moreover, no selection of passages can do justice to the incredible variety in his *oeuvre*. It would be well worth our attention to consider how his style changes between metrical schemes. Though I have spoken of Gregory's style in the singular, it is clear that he adapted his approach to the needs of various contexts, and that his tone, register, and diction could change considerably from one poem to the next. Nonetheless, even with the limitations of this chapter, I have made several significant observations. First, I have argued that Gregory intentionally cultivated a Callimachean style. This is most evident in his preoccupation with proper length or measure, which he consistently depicts in terms and images that evoke Callimachus. But we see it too in other elements of style, such as his penchant for repetitions of all sorts, the types of enjambement he cultivated, and the care he shows in constructing his hexameters. Gregory did, however, strike his own path in some respects, and this is most clear in his cultivation of gnomes and other paroimiac statements. Gregory himself identified this as the signature element of his style; my preliminary soundings have shown that he did in fact employ these far more often than either Homer or Callimachus. As Gregory characterizes his didactic mode as "thundering" (a decidedly un-Callimachean metaphor), I have posited that Gregory regarded his cultivation of the didactic as a deliberate

---

[90] Pontani 2011 102 observes that Callimachus "remained virtually unknown to the paroemiographers and florilegia."

departure from Callimachus. Yet the variety and skill with which Gregory constructs these maxims show that Gregory's didacticism was less a return to Homer and Hesiod than a Callimachean development of a technique the Alexandrian had shunned. Alan Cameron not without reason called Gregory, "perhaps the most enthusiastic reader Callimachus had in the fourth century of our era."[91]

---

[91] Cameron 1995 335

Chapter 4: ΕΠΙΣΤΑΜΕΝΟΙΣ ΑΓΟΡΕΥΣΩ. Erudition.

The purpose of the present chapter is to consider the manifold ways in which Gregory

manipulated learning in his poetry. Gregory's self-proclaimed mastery of both pagan and

Christian literary traditions was a key aspect of his literary *persona*, as we saw in chapter 2. I have

selected for analysis two quite different works of Gregory: the 546 line iambic *Adversus iram* (*carm.*

1.2.25) and the 214 line hexametric *Hymnus in Virginitatem* (*carm.* 1.2.1a). For each poem, I

consider his use of existing "specialist" prose-literature before examining allusions to earlier

poetic texts. The concluding section juxtaposes Gregory's practices with those of Callimachus.

The patent practicality of works like the *Adv. iram* depart from Alexandrian precedent. But in

other respects, Gregory was faithfully Alexandrian, particularly where he put erudition to

polemical ends, and in his interest in incorporating a non-Greek "barbarian" wisdom into the

Greek literary tradition.

1.2.25 *Adv. iram*

Gregory's *Adversus iram* (*carm.* 1.2.25)[1] consists of 546 iambic trimeters and dates from the Lenten

season of 382, making it contemporary with most of the poems I will examine in chapter 5, like

carm. 2.1.34a/b (*in silentium ieiunii*). The intended audience of the poem is not homogenous. The

great majority of the work gives the impression of being addressed to a generic, well-educated

Christian youth, and I do not doubt that Gregory intends the poem to be useful to the young.

The end of the poem, however, suggests an additional polemical purpose:

> καὶ ταῦτα σιγῆς· οἱ δὲ λύσαντες λόγον,
> εἰ μέν τοι τούτων ἄξιον φθέγγοισθ' ἔπος,

---

[1] The most recent text remains that of Caillau, reprinted in *PG* 37.813–851, though Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 provides corrections in his commentary to Caillau's text. I have incorporated these into my citations of *Adv. iram*. See also text critical remarks in Crimi 2018. The text has been rendered into English by Dunkle 2012 80–120, who also prints a lightly corrected version of Caillau's text.

φθέγξασθε κἀμοί · εἰ δὲ σιγῆς, οὐκ ἐμοί. [545]
καὶ ὦτα δήσω τοῖς λόγοις, ὥσπερ λόγον.

This too's from silence– you who bound my speech,
if you should speak a verse of similar worth,
declare! But not if it's worth only silence— [545]
I'll bind my ears as you have done my speech. (*Adv. iram* 543–46)

Those who "bound his speech" are the clerical leaders back in Constantinople who engineered

Gregory's withdrawal from the city and retirement to Cappadocia. The work then is not only a

poem of instruction, but a polemical piece intended to underscore the superiority of Gregory's

paideia to that of his rivals in the capital.

Gregory's metrical scheme lacks precedent among the authors of Alexandrian didactic.

Iambic trimeter, most well-known as the primary metrical scheme of dialog in Greek tragedy,

was not the normal choice of poetry on didactic topics. The earliest and most important extant

witness for iambic didactic is the *Periegesis* of ps.-Scymnus, which describes the geographical

features of the known world. Its author identifies several features of his work that become

normative for the iambic didactic tradition more broadly.[2] First, the authors in this tradition aim

for clarity (σαφήνεια) instead of ornate eloquence. Second, they aim for memorability

(εὐμνημόνευτον), which accounts for the adoption of meter instead of the freedom of prose.

Third, authors of iambic didactic explicitly announce their sources.While authors of hexametric

didactic from Aratus onward were deeply indebted both to prior prose and poetry, the solemnity

---

[2] See especially lines 33–35 of ps.-Scymnus' *Periegesis*:

μέτρῳ δὲ ταύτην ἐκτιθέναι προείλετο,
τῷ κωμικῷ δέ, τῆς σαφηνίας χάριν,
εὐμνημόνευτον ἐσομένην οὕτως ὁρῶν.

"He [the author's model] decided to produce this epitome in verse, but in the comic trimeter, for the sake of clarity, because he saw that this would be the most easy to remember."

I take the Greek text of ps.-Scymnus from Marcotte 2002.

of the hexameter permitted only allusion, not explicit citation.[3] By contrast, Ps.-Scymnus not only

listed his geographical sources extensively in his prologue, but much of his account was told in

the third person: "they (*i.e.* his sources) say that X is here, and Y there." Gregory retains the

traditional aim for clarity, but elevates the form to a certain extent. He presents himself as an

authority in his own right instead of constantly referring back to his sources. When he does

mention the opinions of prior philosophers (*Adv. iram* 31–45), he cites them not by name but as a

group (ἄνδρες παλαιοί, "men of old"). These prior authorities then fall to the side, instead of

being consistently cited as in Ps.-Scymnus. Finally, on occasion he incorporates epic similes and

other flourishes to add vivacity to the work.

Prose Sources for *Adv. iram*
Scripture
As one would expect, Gregory deploys his extensive knowledge of the Christian Bible and its

exegetical traditions. This is most plain in the section containing scriptural exempla (*Adv. iram*

183–252) and the exegesis of the Sermon on the Mount (*Adv. iram* 304–314). Gregory sometimes

refers to well-known stories, like the ten plagues of Egypt; in other cases, he presents a synthesis

of material gleaned from several passages, like his conflation of the two incidences where David

steals an item from Saul (*Adv. iram* 202–09), or in his description of Peter's conflict with Paul over

the matter of dining with uncircumcised Christians (*Adv. iram* 222–30).[4] Gregory's memory

---

[3] By contrast, Callimachus felt perfectly free to cite his sources by name in the elegiac *Aetia*. See, for example, fr. 75.54.

[4] Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 *ad loc.* suggests that Gregory has infelicitously conflated events from Acts 11 and Gal. 2. I think he is wrong, however, to see the city in *Adv. iram* 225–26 as Jerusalem. It is perfectly plausible to understand this as a reference to Antioch, where Paul accused Peter of improperly withdrawing from table fellowship with gentiles. *Adv. iram* 227 should not be understood to say that Paul accused Peter of wrongly being in table fellowship with gentiles, as Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991, Caillau 1842, and Dunkle 2012 *ad loc.* have it, but to mean that Peter was not being a good participant in the common table. I suspect, moreover, that *Adv. iram* 229–30 refer not to Peter's fear of God, but Paul's.

occasionally slipped: he reports at *Adv. iram* 214 that David punished the one who told the king of Absalom's death, which is not the case (he makes the same mistake at *Carm.* 2.2.3 324). Such lapses indicate that Gregory was frequently working from memory. Scripture manifests in more subtle ways too. In his own paranesis, Gregory sometimes paraphrases scripture without explicitly alerting us. At *Adv. iram* 398, for instance, he tells us "Be zealous, but surrender the disease to the winds."[5] This is clearly a paraphrase of Ps. 4:5 "Be angry, but do not sin."[6]

Philosophical Literature
The most explicit use of philosophical literature comes near the beginning of the poem, where Gregory discusses several different philosophical accounts of anger (*Adv. iram* 31–49):

> Μικρὸν δ' ἄνωθεν τὴν νόσον σκεψώμεθα,
> Ἥτις, πόθεν τε καὶ ὅπως φυλακτέα,
> Ἀνδρῶν παλαιῶν συλλογὰς σκοπούμενοι,
> Ὅσοι διεσκέψαντο πραγμάτων φύσεις.
> Εἴσιν μὲν οἳ λέγουσιν αἵματος ζέσιν [35]
> Τοῦ γειτονοῦντος καρδίᾳ τὴν ἔκστασιν·
> Ὅσοι νέμουσι τὴν νόσον τῷ σώματι,
> Ὥσπερ τὰ πολλὰ τῶν παθῶν ἄλλοις τισίν.
> Ἄλλοι δ' ὄρεξιν εἶπον ἀντιπλήξεως
> Ψυχῇ διδόντες τὴν βλάβην, οὐ σώματι, [40]
> Ὀργὴν δὲ τὴν ὁρμῶσαν· εἰ δ' ἔνδον μένοι
> Λοχῶσα, τοῦτο μνησικακίαν τυγχάνειν.
> Ὅσοις δ' ἔδοξεν ἡ νόσος τοῦ συνθέτου,
> Ζέσιν μὲν εἶπον αἵματος, τὴν δ' αἰτίαν,
> Ὄρεξιν εἶναι, συντιθέντες καὶ λόγον. [45]
> Ταῦθ' ὡς ἔχει μὲν, οὐχὶ νῦν σκοπητέον.
> Ἐκεῖνο μέν τοι καὶ λίαν τῶν γνωρίμων,
> Ὡς νοῦς ἁπάντων ἡγεμών· ὃν σύμμαχον
> Δέδωκεν ἡμῖν κατὰ παθῶν ὁ Δεσπότης.
>
> Briefly then, let us now investigate
> this ill, its nature, source, and antidote

That is, Gregory explains that Peter bore Paul's accusation because Peter knew the charge was made in good faith.

[5] ζήλωσον, ἀλλὰ τὴν νόσον γ'αὐραῖς δίδου. That is, be zealous, but surrender sinful anger.

[6] ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε

>by examining the views of ancient men
>who carefully sought the nature of the world.
>Some say that it's a seething of the blood [35]
>that flows about the heart; these blame the body,
>as others do for many of the passions.
>Still others find the soul at fault and say
>that it's an appetite for striking back,
>a rushing anger, while rancor's the kind
>that hides within and sets the soul a trap.
>Still others think the ill's a mix of both;
>they mention seething blood but also say
>an appetite's the cause; so they compile [45]
>th' account. But now is not the time to see
>just how these things are so; well known, it is,
>that mind's the master of these all, which God
>has giv'n us as ally against the passions.

Gregory notes three different explanations for the source of anger. The bodily explanation,

derived from medical literature, explained wrath as a bodily phenomenon caused by the swelling

in the blood around the heart. Gregory then discusses a psychological explanation, derived from

a ps.-Platonic definition and mentioned in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, which explained anger as a desire

(ὄρεξις) to strike back (ἀντίπληξις). The final account mentioned is a composite view in which

the soul's disturbance gives rise to physical effects, which is the view advocated by Aristotle in *De*

anima 403a16.[7] Gregory then ends the theoretical discussion, announcing that everyone agrees

that the mind has been given as a bulwark against the passions, and that his focus henceforth

with be practical: how can one defeat anger?

This transition is admittedly puzzling. Gregory apparently does not endorse a definition,

though it is clear from elsewhere that he holds to the composite definition. At *Carm.* 1.2.34 43

(*Definitiones minus exactae*) he calls anger a "seething of the mind" (ζέσις φρενός). He has there

combined the vocabulary of the somatic and psychological approaches offered here. Oberhaus

---

[7] See Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 *ad loc.* for a fuller discussion of the sources.

rightly rejects Geffcken's conclusion that Gregory cut short the theoretical discussion because of "discomfort" (*Unbehaglichkeit*) with such topics.[8] Gregory is quite capable of philosophical sophistication when required: the *Poemata arcana* are one superb example. Why not excise the theoretical discussion altogether? Oberhaus suggests that Gregory's introduction of philosophical *dubia* prepares for his assertion in *Adv. iram* 48 of the ubiquitous view that mind should rule over the passions. This is part of the answer, most likely, but I do not think that Gregory is simply introducing a problem in order to quickly solve it, as Oberhaus then suggests.[9] Rather, a theoretical discussion was necessary in a poem on a vice. The definition, inherited in the rhetorical schools from Plato, remained a significant rhetorical and philosophical exercise. Gregory's fondness for definitions is evident elsewhere in his verse, and not only in the poem (1.2.34) that he devotes entirely to defining terms. His *de anima* (*Poem. arc.* 7) fittingly begins with a definition of soul; his iambic poem (1.2.27) on nobility ends similarly. The section allows Gregory to establish his credibility by freely deploying his learning. In *Adv. iram* 36, he calls anger an ἔκστασις (an removal of the mind from control), revealing his familiarity with Aristotle's dictum in *Phys.* 247a3 that virtues are perfections (τελειώσεις) and vices degradations or distractions (ἐκστάσεις). At *Adv. iram* 39 he has probably coined the word ἀντίπληξις ("striking back").[10] Finally, the section affords Gregory the opportunity to correct Basil, who had stated that ὀργή was lasting anger, while θυμός was the sudden sort (Basil, *Contra eos qui irascentur* 6). Gregory instead draws from Chrysippus[11] and defines θυμός as a sudden type of anger (ὀργή ὁρμῶσα);

---

[8] Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 *ad loc.* responds to Geffcken 1909 29.

[9] Gregory does not here emphasize the disagreement, as he does in the parallels adduced by Oberhaus.

[10] Gregory's uses are the only attested before the fifth century, with the possible exception of Ps.-Justin, *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos* p. 452 (ed. Otto 1881).

[11] See *SVF* 3 fr. 394.

μνησικακία by contrast is the type that takes up residence within the soul for an extended period of time.[12] The section is an important instrument for demonstrating Gregory's philosophical erudition.

Has Gregory read other specialist literature on wrath? Like Cameron, I think it likely that he did.[13] The points of contact with Plutarch's *De cohibenda ira*, for instance, are not so numerous as those with Basil's *Hom. 10*, but suggestive nonetheless. Both Gregory and Plutarch adopt the metaphor of the painter (though to different ends),[14] both mention the mirror as a useful tool to remind the angry person of his ugly countenance,[15] both discuss laughter (a topic not mentioned by Basil), both compare anger and drunkenness (another topic not mentioned by Basil). If Gregory has not read this treatise, he has read something of the sort. Plutarch's ethical *oeuvre* is in many ways an excellent *comparand* for Gregory's larger poetic project, for Plutarch likewise composed a sequence of dialogs discussing different vices.[16] Gregory even takes up in verse the dialog form on more than one occasion, including in the work that he composed just before this one (1.2.24, *dialogus adversus eos qui frequenter iurant*).[17]

---

[12] The schema of anger is somewhat different in Gregory's *carm.* 2.1.34 (*Definitiones minus exactae*) 43–45. There, θυμός is sudden anger, which becomes ὀργή when it persists, and finally become μνησικακία once it festers within the soul. See Simelidis 2017 99. The parallel language between the two passages only underscores the differences between the two *schemata*.

[13] See Cameron 2006 333–35.

[14] The painter metaphor opens Plutarch's treatise. *Cf. Adv. iram* 99.

[15] Gr. naz. *adv. iram* 87-90; Plutarch *De coh. ira* 456B.

[16] In addition to Plutarch's *De coh. ira*, consider for instance his *De tranquillitate animi* and *De invidia et odio*.

[17] Gregory mentions in *Adv. iram* 4–5 that he turned to this work on anger after "restraining oath-swearing."

Basil's Homily 10

We now turn to Gregory's use of Basil's 10th Homily. As Oberhaus has noted,[18] the parallels

between *Adv. iram* and *Hom. 10* are particularly strong in the respective *ekphrases* of an angry

person (Gr. Naz. *Adv. iram* 85-110 and Basil *Hom.* 10.2). Both Cappadocians describe in vivid

detail the physical features of someone suffering from anger. These *ecphrases* occur near the

beginning and function as a sort of prooemium for what follows.

> Ὀφθαλμοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἐκείνοις οἱ οἰκεῖοί τε καὶ συνήθεις ἠγνόηνται·
> παράφορον δὲ τὸ ὄμμα, καὶ **πῦρ ἤδη βλέπει**. Καὶ παραθήγει τὸν
> ὀδόντα κατὰ τῶν **συῶν** τοὺς ὁμόσε χωροῦντας. Πρόσωπον
> πελιδνὸν καὶ **ὕφαιμον**· ὄγκος τοῦ σώματος **ἐξοιδαίνων**·
> **φλέβες διαῤῥηγνύμεναι**, ὑπὸ τῆς ἔνδοθεν ζάλης κλονουμένου
> (357) τοῦ πνεύματος. **Φωνὴ τραχεῖα, καὶ ὑπερτεινομένη, καὶ ὁ
> λόγος ἄναρθρος καὶ εἰκῆ προεκπίπτων**, οὐ κατὰ μέρος, οὐδὲ
> εὐτάκτως, οὐδὲ εὐσήμως προϊών.[19]

> For their normal and customary visage becomes unrecognizable. The eye
> goes askance with a fiery blaze and they sharpen their teeth like boars
> that advance on one another. The face becomes livid and bloodshot; the
> whole girth of the body swells; veins nearly break from the internal
> squall, while the breathing rushes wildly. The voice becomes exceedingly
> high and tense, while speech becomes inarticulate and falls forth to no
> end, proceeding without proportion, measure, or seemliness. (Basil of
> Caesarea, *Hom.* 10.2 *PG* 31.356–57)

> εἴ σοί τις ὦπται τῶν ἁλόντων τῷ πάθει, [85]
> οἶδας σαφῶς ὅ φημι, καὶ γράψει λόγος.
> ἔσοπτρον ἐχρῆν ἑστάναι χολουμένοις,
> ὡς ἂν βλέποντες, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτῶν ὕβριν
> μικρὸν χαλῷεν, τοῦ πάθους ἐξ ὄψεως,
> κατηγόρῳ σιγῶντι κάμπτοντες φρένα. [90]
> ἢ καὶ τόδ᾽ ἕστηκ᾽ αὐτὸς ὑβριστὴς ὁ σός,
> ἐν ᾧ κατόψει σαυτὸν, εἰ σχολὴν ἄγοις.
> πάθος γὰρ οἷς ἕν, κοινὰ καὶ συμπτώματα.
> **ὕφαιμον ὄμμα**, καὶ θέσεις διάστροφοι,
> **τρίχες συώδεις**, καὶ γένυς διάβροχος, [95]
> ὠχρὰ παρειά, νεκρότητος ἔμφασις·

---

[18] Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 *ad loc.*

[19] To my knowledge, the best text remains the Maurist edition, reprinted in PG 31 coll. 353-372, which I
have cited here. The homily has been rendered into English in Wagner 1950.

ἄλλων ἐρυθρὰ, καὶ μολιβδώδης τινῶν ·
ὅπως ἄν, οἶμαι, καί τινα χρώσας τύχοι
ὁ βακχιώδης καὶ κάκιστος ζωγράφος ·
αὐχὴν διοιδῶν, ἀγκυλούμεναι φλέβες, [100]
πνοὴ λόγον κόπτουσα καὶ πυκνουμένη,
λυσσῶδες ἄσθμα, καὶ φρύαγμ' ἀσχημονοῦν,
μυκτὴρ πλατύς τε καὶ πνέων ὅλην ὕβριν.
κρότοι τε χειρῶν, καὶ ποδῶν ἐξάλματα,
κύψεις, στροφαί, γέλωτες, ἱδρῶτες, κόποι · [105]
τίνος κοποῦντος; οὐδενός, πλὴν δαίμονος.
νεύσεις ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω, λόγου δίχα,
γνάθοι φυσώμεναί τε καὶ ψοφούμεναι,
ὡς δή τις αὐλοῖς[20] · παιομένη τε δακτύλοις
ἡ χεὶρ ἀπειλή[21] καὶ ψόφων προοίμιον.   [110)

If you should see one caught in passion's grip [85]
you know quite clearly what it is I say
and what my poem shall at once describe.
One ought to place a mirror before the angry,
that they may see and after just a bit
of rage, the passion glimpsed, restrain their soul
before their figure's silent accusation. [90]
Or if you find yourself at ease, your foe
may serve the same end as the polished glass,
for one disease has symptoms shared by all:
The eyes are shot with blood and out of place,
the hair is bristling, jaws are wet with spit; [95]
The cheeks are pale— the very look of death.
some parts red, and some a leaden blue
as though the face had got its hues from painters
who knew no skill but only how to drink.
The neck swells; veins distend and curve away. [100]
The breath then cuts and strangles off the speech;
the breathing's manic; thence, unseemly snorts.
The nose grows broad, replete with insolence.
The hands and feet begin to leap and spring;
they stoop and strain, turn, mock and sweat. [105]
and who's to blame? none but this demon foe.
Their jaws move up and down without a word;
their cheeks inflate, emitting senseless sounds

---

[20] P Caillau ἄλως (*contra metrum*) : *codd.* ἄλλος : ἀσκός Oberhaus.

I have adopted the conjecture of Crimi 2018 136.

[21] codd. ἀπειλεῖ : ἀπειλή susp. Oberhaus

as flutists' do. The hands, balled into fists,[22]
become a threat and precursor of more. [110] (Gr. Naz. *adv. iram* 85–
110)

Note the following parallels:

- πῦρ βλέποντα (l. 23, before the excerpt above; cf. Basil's πῦρ ἤδη βλέπει)
- ὕφαιμον ὄμμα (l. 94; G. uses ὕφαιμον "flush with blood" of the eye instead of the face)
- αὐχὴν διοιδῶν (l. 100; G. describes the swelling of the neck instead of the entire body)
- τρίχες συώδεις (l. 95; G. compares hair rather than teeth to swine)
- ἀγκυλούμεναι φλέβες (l. 100; G. veins are "curved"; Basil's "bursting")
- πνοὴ λόγον κόπτουσα καὶ πυκνουμένη (l. 101; Similar in thought, if not vocabulary, to Basil's Φωνὴ τραχεῖα, καὶ ὑπερτεινομένη, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἄναρθρος καὶ εἰκῆ προεκπίπτων).

Gregory took the basic structure of Basil's *ecphrasis* and built upon it. Basil had moved from the

eyes to the cheeks and face to the difficulties of breathing and speaking when angry. Gregory

dwelled at greater length on the individual features of the face and the agitations of the rest of the

body, but retained the basic structure. Gregory adopted some of Basil's terminology, but often

adapted adjectives, participles, or metaphors for a different purpose. So, Gregory has compared

the angry person's hair to swine; Basil had made this comparison with the angry person's teeth.

We see a similar picture when considering Gregory's historical *exempla* in *Adv. iram* 183–

252. Gregory incorporated several of Basil's scriptural examples, but occasionally reversed their

significance in a striking manner. In section 6 (*PG* 31.368–69), Basil had presented a long list of

Biblical figures who exemplify righteous anger: Moses commanding the Levites to slay their

brethren who had succumbed to worshipping the golden calf (Ex. 32); Phineas' slaying of the

Israelite who took a Midianite wife (Num 25); Samuel's chastisement of Saul for failing to execute

Agag, the captured king of the Amalekites (1 Sam 15); and Elijah's mockery of the 400 prophets

---

[22] The sense of παιομένη δακτύλοις is obscure. I have followed the paraphrase Geffcken 1909 30, who interprets the phrase as a circumlocution for "balled fists." Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 *ad loc.* rejects this in favor of menacing hand gestures. See also discussion in Crimi 2018.

of Baal on Mt. Carmel. Gregory has mentioned several of these, but made them *exempla* of

meekness (τὸ πρᾶον), rather than anger (θυμός). Moses and Aaron are instead commended for

their patience toward the vacillating Pharaoh. Gregory has praised Samuel for meekly forgiving

Saul when Saul ripped the prophet's robe (1 Sam 15). This is a particularly creative bit of

exegesis (perhaps too creative), as this small incident sits within the larger frame of Samuel's

anger against Saul and the Amalekite king, which Basil had commended as an instance of

righteous anger.[23] Gregory has completely reversed the thrust of the story.

Gregory's repurposing of these *exempla* fits in with his broader skepticism toward anger.

Unlike Basil, our poet leaves almost no place for positive wrath. Gregory is careful to address two

potential biblical warrants for anger, the first of which is God's wrath (*Adv. iram* 371–398).

Following Origen, Gregory understands the language of God's wrath to be of the same sort as

the scriptural language describing God's hands and feet. Just as God's "hands" describe his

strength and deeds, so the biblical authors condeigned to human weakness by using wrath as a

way to describe God's chastisement of the wicked.[24] God cannot be said, after all, to suffer from

passions. Gregory then addresses the anger of the saints (*Adv. iram* 399–410). Rather than citing

positive examples of anger from the scripture, as Basil had done, Gregory simply asserts that their

anger was justified. Or rather, he clarifies, they experienced not anger, since this experience of

emotion (πληγή) did not result in sin but virtuous action.

---

[23] Gregory then mentions David's refusal in the wilderness to harm Saul (1 Sam 16) and David's meekness
toward his rebellious son Absalom (2 Sam 18). But these are in line with Basil's use of the same *exempla* in
the homily.

[24] For the theological principle in Origen, see, for example, *Contra celsum* 4.72.

Chreiae and Basil's De legendis gentilium libris

Let us now consider how Gregory uses pagan *exempla* in *Adv. iram* 253–303. This is perhaps a surprising subject for a chapter on erudition: Gregory's historical *exempla* derive not directly from careful reading of ancient literature, but from the collections of *chreiae* ubiquitous in the rhetorical schools. Indeed, Crimi judges the section to have an "innervating" effect on the work as a whole.[25] But proper use of these witty sayings attributed to historical individuals was one important technique that a student of rhetoric was required to master. By considering Gregory's *chreiae* in the light of late antique rhetorical theory, I argue that Gregory deploys the technique in a self-conscious and skillful manner; I then juxtapose the section to Basil's use of two identical *chreiae* in *De legendis gentilium libris* 7.

Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata* provide a useful theoretical discussion against which to judge Gregory's practice. Little is known of Aphthonius' life, though he was apparently a friend of Libanius, and hence a contemporary of Gregory.[26] Aphthonius' short section on the *chreia* (sec. 3) provides a useful theoretical framework for examining Gregory's use of the technique. The sophist begins by defining a *chreia* as a "brief anecdote fittingly attributed to an individual."[27] He then derives the etymology from χρήσιμον (useful) and offers a simple typology. *Chreiae* may either be *logikon* (report speech), *praktikon* (report an action), or mixed (report both a speech and an action). Aphthonius then notes a number of possible ways to elaborate upon the bare *chreia*: encomium, paraphrase, considering the cause, considering its opposite, comparison, example,

---

[25] "*il carme … poggia su una impalcatura teorica innervata da exempla, immagini e dialoghi con un interlocutore fittizio….*" Crimi 2018 131.

[26] Rabe 1926 XXII

[27] Χρεία ἐστὶν ἀπομνημόνευμα σύντομον εὐστόχως ἐπί τι πρόσωπον ἀναφέρουσα. sec. 3, ed. Rabe 1926.

the testimony of the ancients, and a short epilogue or concluding statement.[28] The section ends

with an example of each type of elaboration.

After defending his use of pagan examples, Gregory states at *Adv. iram* 260: μεμνήσομαι

δὲ καί τινων, καὶ συντόμως ("I shall, though briefly, cite several examples.") The use of the verb

μιμνήσκω ("to recall") and adverb συντόμως ("briefly") recalls Aphthonius' definition of the

chreia as a brief anecdote or record (σύντομον ἀπομνημόνευμα). Gregory thereby signals that he

is about to initiate a sequence of *chreiae*. He may be using a common technique, but he does so in

an erudite and self-conscious manner.

Gregory then employs five *chreiae*. In the first, Aristotle refuses to strike his slave after the

philosopher detects his own anger. In the next, Alexander refuses to raze a captured city. For the

third, Pericles patient bears with insults and eventually wins over his accuser. Then an

anonymous sage (σοφός) vows to win over an enemy. Gregory then surprises us by concluding

with a *chreia* of Constantius II, who replies with skill to an influential man's criticism of Christians.

The poet has taken care to use at least one of each type mentioned by Aphthonius. The

Alexander, Constantius, and anonymous sage *chreiae* are all examples of the "speech *chreia*"

(λογικόν). The Pericles *chreia* is a "deed chreia" (πρακτικόν), and the Aristotle example is mixed.

Gregory skillfully elaborates the *chreiae* in a number of places. Before reporting Aristotle's words,

the poet inserts a brief expression of marvel (ὢ σοφοῦ λόγου, "Oh wise word!" *Adv. iram* 265).

This encomiastic elaboration comes not at the end, as one might expect, but is woven into the

narrative itself. Gregory has perhaps been too verbose in several of the *chreiae*, but the Pericles

---

[28] Ἡ μὲν οὖν διαίρεσις αὕτη τῆς χρείας· ἐργάσαιο δὲ αὐτὴν τοῖσδε τοῖς κεφαλαίοις· ἐγκωμιαστικῷ, παραφραστικῷ, τῷ τῆς αἰτίας, ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου, παραβολῇ, παραδείγματι, μαρτυρίᾳ παλαιῶν, ἐπιλόγῳ βραχεῖ (Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 3).

and Constantius *chreiae* carefully save their wit for the final lines. The end of the Pericles' *chreia*

(*Adv. iram* 279–84) is particularly well-done, as Oberhaus notes.[29] A lit lamp quenches anger.

> Ἐλοιδόρει τις τὸν μέγαν Περικλέα,
> Πολλοῖς ἐλαύνων καὶ κακοῖς ὀνείδεσι [280]
> (Τῶν οὐδὲ τιμίων τις), ἄχρις ἑσπέρας.
> Ὁ δ' ἡσυχῇ τὴν ὕβριν, ὡς τιμὴν, φέρων,
> Τέλος καμόντα καὶ βαδίζοντ' οἴκαδε
> Προὔπεμψε λύχνῳ, τὸν χόλον τ' ἀπέσβεσεν.

> Someone was pestering great Pericles,
> reviling him with many mockeries,
> (no high-born man he was) til evening.
> As praise, he gently bore that insolence.
> At last, the mocker, wearied, left for home.
> He lit his lamp and led the mocker's way;
> As light was lit, the anger then was quenched.

It is surprising that Gregory selects Constantius II to conclude his list of pagan *exempla*. *Chreiae*

were almost exclusively attributed to statesmen, philosophers, or rhetoricians of the ancient past.

Correspondingly, Aphthonius mentions "the testimony of the ancients" as a suitable manner of

elaboration. Moreover, Constantius was a Christian monarch, not a pagan sage or statesman.

Gregory in fact draws attention to his transgression of normal practice in 290–92 and 296–97,

thereby underscoring his command of rhetorical practice.[30] The selection perhaps has a larger

ideological point: the wisdom of pagan Greece culminates not in Julian's Neoplatonic paganism,

but in Constantius' Christian *paideia*.[31]

---

[29] Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 *ad loc.*

[30] Ackermann 1903 30 states "control of material" as one of the characteristics of Gregory's didactic verse, but fails to provide good evidence for the assertion.

[31] Gregory's reverence for Constantius is all the more strange since Constantius was not a supporter of Gregory's pro-Nicene party.

Poetic Sources

I turn now to Gregory's use of prior poetry. We now examine in detail eleven lines (*Adv. iram* 15–

25) near the beginning of the poem to show how Gregory uses epic and tragic language and

allusions to underscore the importance of his theme.

> δεῖ δ', ὡς ἔοικε, μή τι μαλθακὸν λέγειν, [15]
> κακοῦ τοσούτου τῷ λόγῳ προκειμένου ·
> ἀλλ' ὡς πυρὸς βρέμοντος ἀγρίαν φλόγα,
> πηδῶντος, αἰθύσσοντος ἐντινάγμασι
> πολλοῖς, ἄνω ῥέοντος ἐμψύχῳ φορᾷ,
> λάβρως ἀεὶ τὰ πρόσθεν οἰκειουμένου, [20]
> ὕδωρ, κόνιν πέμποντας εὐνάσαι βίᾳ ·
> ἤ θῆρα λόχμης ἐκφανέντα συσκίου,
> φρίσσοντα, πῦρ βλέποντα, ἐξαφρούμενον,
> μάχης ἐρῶντα, καὶ φόνων καὶ πτωμάτων,
> λόγχαις, κυνηγοῖς, σφενδόναις καταιχμάσαι [25]
>
> For one must, as is meet, avoid all languor, [15]
> when such an ill is set before one's reason,
> and quench, like those that dirt and water cast
> against a fire that belches wild flame,
> and leaps and jumps with numerous shakes,
> and climbs aloft with motion from within
> greedily making all that was its own; [20]
> or slay, as hunters take the wild beast
> with spears and slings, when it appears from deep
> within the shadowed grove, with eyes ablaze
> and hair erect, foam oozing from its mouth,
> lusting for battle, corpses and their death. [25]

Medea's μαλθάκοι λόγοι and Alcestis' shade

The passage begins with a two line incipit, suitably in tragic diction. The expression μάλθακον

λέγειν ("to speak softly") is Euripidean, occurring at *Med.* 316 and 776.[32] In both passages, it is

Medea speaking "soft words." In the first (*Med.* 316–19), Medea begs Kreon to allow her to

remain in Corinth after Jason's marriage to Kreon's daughter. Kreon denies the request, saying:

> Κρ. **λέγεις** ἀκοῦσαι **μαλθάκ**', ἀλλ' ἔσω φρενῶν
> ὀρρωδία μοι μή τι βουλεύῃις κακόν.

---

[32] Lucian, *Symposium* 13 is the only other attestation of the phrase before Gregory.

τοσῷιδε δ᾽ ἧσσον ἢ πάρος πέποιθά σοι·
γυνὴ γὰρ ὀξύθυμος, ὡς δ᾽ αὔτως ἀνήρ[33]

You speak words easy to the ears, but in my heart
there's fear that you on us are plotting ill.
Now more than ever I trust you all the less.
For woman, just as man, is swift to wrath.

In the second, Medea promises to speak "soft words" (μαλθάκοι λόγοι) to Jason in order to trick

him into presenting his new wife with a poisoned cloak:

πέμψασ᾽ ἐμῶν τιν᾽ οἰκετῶν Ἰάσονα
 ἐς ὄψιν ἐλθεῖν τὴν ἐμὴν αἰτήσομαι.   [775]
  μολόντι δ᾽ αὐτῶι **μαλθακοὺς λέξω λόγους,**
†ὡς καὶ δοκεῖ μοι ταῦτα καὶ καλῶς ἔχει†[34]
γάμους τυράννων οὓς προδοὺς ἡμᾶς ἔχει,
καὶ ξύμφορ᾽ εἶναι καὶ καλῶς ἐγνωσμένα.

I'll send one of my serving girls to Jason,
request that he come to my audience.
On his arrival I'll speak soft words,
how his plans seem good and that he's marrying well
into the house of kings (whom he has, betraying me!)
and that this all is profitably planned

The evocation of Medea, admittedly faint, nevertheless adds texture to Gregory's depiction of

anger. Speaking "soft words" can lead to dire consequences. Medea, characterized by Kreon as

"quick to anger" (ὀξύθυμος), is certainly one of the most infamous *exempla* of the dangers of

wrath. Medea's reputation as a sorceress suggestively contrasts Gregory's characterization of his

own poem, which he calls a collection of φάρμακα (drugs) and ἐπῳδαί (songs or

enchantments).[35]

---

[33] I cite the plays of Euripides according to Diggle 1984.

[34] Diggle brackets the line. Mastronarde 2002 prints: ὡς καὶ δοκεῖ μοι ταὐτὰ καὶ καλῶς γαμεῖ, which relies on two conjectures, for which see *ibid. ad loc.*

[35] See *Adv. iram* 183 and 304 with comments by Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 *ad loc.* and Crimi 2018 132–35.

Adv. iram 16 is a a reworking of Euripides *Alc.* 837, where Heracles has just learned that he has enjoyed Admetus' hospitality while Admetus' household was mourning the death of Alcestis:

> ἀλλὰ σοῦ τὸ μὴ φράσαι,
> **κακοῦ τοσούτου δώμασιν προσκειμένου**[36].
> ποῦ καί σφε θάπτει; ποῖ νιν εὑρήσω μολών;

> Alas, you did not speak, though such an ill was at your door? Where did
> he bury her? Where now to go and find her?

Gregory changes only δώμασιν ("house") to τῷ λόγῳ ("reason"). When Gregory adopts this much of a line, normally he intends to invoke the original context. Here it fits rather nicely. Alcestis has died and been pulled down to Hades. Only Heracles' might can save her. In our new context, Alcestis becomes the soul threatened by an anger that only intense effort can extirpate. Gregory is in fact wont to compare the soul to a captive queen (*e.g.* in *De rebus suis* 215–34, discussed in the chapter 2), and Heraclean strength is precisely what he prescribes in this fight against anger.

Fire and Anger: Ajax and Achilles

In the first simile (17–21), Gregory tells his reader that one must fight against anger like those desperately working to put out a fire. The language is largely reminiscent of tragedy and epic. Gregory moves neatly moves within an epic simile from Sophocles to Homer.[37] Lines 17 and 18 echo *Ajax* 1278–80, where Teucer upbraids Agamemnon for forgetting all of Ajax's heroic deeds during the Trojan War, most especially Ajax's holding fast when Hector almost burned the ships.

> ὦ πολλὰ λέξας ἄρτι κἀνόητ᾽ ἔπη,
> οὐ μνημονεύεις οὐκέτ᾽ οὐδέν, ἡνίκα
> ἑρκέων ποθ᾽ ὑμᾶς ἐντὸς ἐγκεκλημένους,
> ἤδη τὸ μηδὲν ὄντας ἐν τροπῇ δορός,   [1275]
> ἐρρύσατ᾽ ἐλθὼν μοῦνος, ἀμφὶ μὲν νεῶν
> ἄκροισιν ἤδη ναυτικοῖς <θ᾽> ἐδωλίοις

---

[36] The mss read προκειμένου. προσ- is Scaliger's emendation. See Diggle 1984, *ad loc.*

[37] See remarks in Kuhn 2014 114.

> **πυρὸς φλέγοντος**, ἐς δὲ ναυτικὰ σκάφη
> **πηδῶντος ἄρδην** Ἕκτορος τάφρων ὕπερ; [1280][38]

> What foolish words you've now just said!
> Do you not at all remember how when
> you were shut up in the bulwarks,
> come to nothing in the contest of the spear,
> he alone came to your aid at the peaks and decks of the ships,
> while the fire blazed, and Hector eagerly
> leaped over the ditches toward the hulls?

Soph. *Aj.* 1280 is the only extant tragic line to begin with πηδῶντος, where the participle describes Hector leaping about in battle trying to set fire to the Greek ship. Gregory easily transfers the epithet to the fire itself. The mention of the Trojan War naturally leads into Homer, who lies behind *Adv. iram* 19–20. Gregory here draws on Achilles' battle with the Scamander (*Il.* 21.268–71):

> τοσσάκι μιν μέγα κῦμα διιπετέος ποταμοῖο
> πλάζ᾽ ὤμους καθύπερθεν· ὃ δ᾽ ὑψόσε ποσσὶν **ἐπήδα**
> θυμῷ ἀνιάζων· ποταμὸς δ᾽ ὑπὸ γούνατ᾽ ἐδάμνα [270]
> **λάβρος ὕπαιθα ῥέων**, κονίην δ᾽ ὑπέρεπτε ποδοῖιν.[39]

> As often as the huge wave of the flush river reached up to his shoulders,
> he [Achilles] would leap upward with his feet, distressed in his heart. For
> the river, in its mad rush, was nearly overcoming his strength, and
> throwing mud down on his feet.

Adv. iram 19–20 adapt for fire language that Homer had used for the river (λάβρος ὕπαιθα ῥέων).

Angry Beasts: Iliadic Lions and Odyssean Boars

Gregory's depiction of the wild beast in *Adv. iram* 22–25 owes much to the account of Odysseus' boar hunt in *Od.* 19, with certain elements inspired by Homer's comparison of Achilles to a lion

---

[38] I cite the *Ajax* according to Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990

[39] I cite the *Iliad* according to West 1998.

in *Il.* 20. The language generally has tragic pedigree, but the contexts evoked are Homeric.[40] In

Od. 19.439–454, Odysseus narrates the boar hunt of his youth that gave him his scar. Gregory

compresses 7 lines of Homeric description (*Od.* 19.439–445) into one trimeter.[41] Line 22

describes "a beast appearing from a shadowy lair." He uses the Homeric word for lair (λόχμη)

and "shadowy" (σύσκιος) glosses the elaborate four line description of the boar's lair in Homer

(*Od.* 19.440-443). Gregory's physical description of the beast begins by reworking *Od.* 19.446,

whence come the bristling and blazing eyes: Compare Gregory's Φρίσσοντα, πῦρ βλέποντα,

ἐξαφρούμενον ("with eyes ablaze and hair erect, foam oozing from its mouth" *Adv. iram* 23) with

Hom. *Od.* 19.446: φρίξας εὖ λοφιήν, πῦρ δ' ὀφθαλμοῖσι δεδορκώς ("bristling his mane and

looking fire from his eyes").[42]

The Odyssean passage has no mention of foam. This Gregory takes from another

Homeric passage, *Il.* 20.164–175, where Achilles is compared to a wounded and enraged lion. In

writing ἐξαφρούμενον ("foaming at the mouth"),[43] Gregory has transposed into iambs the

hexametric περί τ' ἀφρὸς ὀδόντας / γίνεται ("Foam appeared about his teeth" *Il.* 20.168-69).

---

[40] Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 *ad loc.* notes Aesch. *Sept.* 392 and Eur. *Troiad.* 732 as parallels for μάχης ἐρᾶν ("lusting for battle"). The noun φόνος ("slaughter") is naturally plentiful in both tragedy and epic; the use of πτῶμα to mean "corpse" is particularly frequent in tragedy. See LSJ, *s.v.*

[41] Compare Hom. *Od.* 19.439–45:
ἔνθα δ' ἄρ' ἐν λόχμῃ πυκινῇ κατέκειτο μέγας σῦς ·
τὴν μὲν ἄρ' οὔτ' ἀνέμων διάη μένος ὑγρὸν ἀέντων,   [440]
οὔτε μιν ἠέλιος φαέθων ἀκτῖσιν ἔβαλλεν,
οὔτ' ὄμβρος περάασκε διαμπερές · ὣς ἄρα πυκνὴ
ἦεν, ἀτὰρ φύλλων ἐνέην χύσις ἤλιθα πολλή.
τὸν δ' ἀνδρῶν τε κυνῶν τε περὶ κτύπος ἦλθε ποδοῖϊν,
ὡς ἐπάγοντες ἐπῆσαν · ὁ δ' ἀντίος ἐκ ξυλόχοιο,

and *Adv. iram* 22:
Ἤ θῆρα λόχμης ἐκφανέντα συσκίου

[42] For Homer's *Odyssey* I cite von der Mühll 1962.

[43] ἐξαφροῦμαι is a very rare word, probably medical in origin. *Cf.* Clem. *Paed.* 1.6.48.

In both contexts the description of the foam occurs at line end. We are no doubt meant to appreciate the metaphrastic skill needed to rework Homer in iambic trimeter.

Both Homeric passages contribute to Gregory's new context. Though not in all respects virtuous, Odysseus' cleverness and steadfastness are appropriate models for the young man's fight against anger. Gregory's focus throughout the poem on using reason to combat anger makes it natural to allude to a hero renowned for subtle σοφία. Gregory's evocation of Achilles is less straightforward. Achilles readily embodies the sort of wrath one must avoid. It is fitting then, that Gregory compares wrath to an Achillean lion. On the other hand, Gregory has made it clear that wrath can be legitimate when directed against wrath itself. Gregory's work opens θυμῷ χολοῦμαι ("with wrath I'm angry"), which, though with different diction, certainly recalls the opening of the Iliad (μῆνιν ἄειδε θεά, "wrath Goddess sing!"). Achilles is thus both type and anti-type, *imitandus* and *evitandus*. These evocations of heroic warfare, however, underscore what is at stake. Mastering one's anger may lead to a successful νόστος as the soul finds rest in God; or it may lead to a bloody and unpleasant end.

1.2.1 (a) *Hymn Virg.*
We now turn to Gregory's *Hymn to Virginity* (*carm.* 1.2.1 a), a 214 line hexameter hymn describing the arrival of a personified Virginity in human society. The work contains numerous features that situate it within the tradition of pagan hymnography. Virginity is personified and treated as the *deus laudandus* of the hymn. The poem opens with her name in the accusative: Παρθενίην (*cf.* Call. *hArt* 1 Ἄρτεμιν; similarly, *hZeus* 1 Ζῆνος). Gregory refers to the poem as a hymn (ὕμνος) three times (at *Hymn Virg.* 2, 7, and 8).[44] In *Hymn Virg.* 7–10, he exhorts the pure to draw near (*cf.* Call.,

---

[44] The term ὕμνος is polyvalent and could be used loosely to refer to epideictic rhetoric more generally, but here Gregory uses it in its technical sense. See Lampe, *s.v.*, for the term's variety of meanings. Menander Rhetor considered hymn a distinct genre with eight subtypes. See Russell and Wilson 1981 7.

hAp 9–11). Gregory hails the goddess with the traditional formula in *Hymn Virg.* 11: Παρθενίη,

μέγα χαῖρε ("Hail, Virginity!"). In *Hymn Virg.* 12–14 he addresses the chorus, which here consists

of "heavenly beauties" (οὐρανίοισι / κάλλεσιν), *i.e.*, angels. Unlike the *Poemata arcana*, where the

hymnic elements give way to a didactic body, the entirety of the *Hymn Virg.* sits easily within the

tradition of Greek hymnography.[45] After describing the angelic chorus and its relation to the

Trinity, the narrator announces in *Hymn Virg.* 56–57 his theme:

> Εἰ δ᾽ ἄγε νῦν ἐρέω μυστήρια κεδνὰ Θεοῖο,
> Παρθενίη τε χρόνοισιν ὅπως πυμάτοισιν ἔλαμψεν.[46]
>
> I shall now speak the myst'ries of our God,
> how shone in latter days Virginity.

These "mysteries" turn out to be a brisk retelling of the Old Testament followed by the coming

of Christ. In *Hymn Virg.* 58–116, Gregory narrates the creation of the universe, followed by the

creation of the first man, woman, and the institution of marriage. The rest of the history of the

Old Testament is narrated more briefly in *Hymn Virg.* 117–138. These include the fall, flood,

punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah, the giving of the law and the ministry of the prophets. In

Hymn Virg. 139–88 Gregory narrates the incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection. He naturally

places great emphasis on Christ's virginal conception (*Hymn Virg.* 139–55). The section ends with

hymnic praise of God the Father (*Hymn Virg.* 172–88). Only in the conclusion of the poem (*Hymn*

Virg. 189–214) does Virginity finally return, now in her full splendor. As Sunderman noted, we

have a recognizable *Geburtsgeschichte*.[47] As in the Homeric hymns or those of Callimachus, praise

---

[45] Sundermann 1991 1–2 provides further analysis of these hymnic elements, though it seems to me that the Callimachean, rather than the Homeric hymns, are the most important generic model. For an excellent treatment of the hymnic elements in the *Poemata arcana*, see Faulkner 2010.

[46] The best edition of the *Hymn Virg.* remains that of Caillau, reprinted in *PG* 37.521–38.

[47] Sundermann 1991 1–4

operates through narrative: the poet tells of the god's origins and special honors. Callimachus'
Hymns are a particularly significant influence, for here, as in Gregory's epigrams, they function as
a generic model. The generic situation is rather different, therefore, from what we saw above in
Adv. iram. There Gregory elevated a decidedly un-Callimachean genre (iambic didactic). Here
Gregory works in a genre in which Callimachus had also written extensively.

The compositional history and date of the *Hymn Virg.* are complicated and controversial. I
have confined detailed discussion to an appendix, whose results I summarize here, as a long
excursus here would distract from a discussion of Gregory's erudition. Gregory's *Hymn Virg.* is not
separated in the Greek manuscripts from its successor, the *Agon,* in which a personified Married
Life and Virginity engage in a rhetorical duel to establish the superior way of life. Sundermann
and Sicherl have, however, shown that we have two poems, not one.[48] Not only does the work
neatly divide after line 214 into the *Hymn Virg.* and the *Agon*, but external evidence indicates that
originally the two pieces were treated as separate poems. We possess a Syriac translation of only
the *Hymn Virg.* without the *Agon*. Moreover, Jerome mentions only the *Agon* without the hymn.[49]
While the *Agon* certainly does grow out of and depend upon the *Hymn Virg.*,[50] I regard this as
development within a poetic sequence, rather than evidence of a single poem.

The date of the *Hymn Virg.* and *Agon* affect how we construe Gregory's place within the
virginity literature of the fourth century. It is my view that Gregory wrote the *Hymn Virg.* and the
Agon originally in the late 360s or early 370s, but then subsequently revised it in the 380s after
writing the *Poemata arcana*. Gregory's mention of Julian's death in the *Agon* (1.2.1b 460) establishes

---

[48] See Sundermann 1991 4 and Sicherl 2002 313.

[49] *liber, hexametro versu, Virginitatis et nuptiarum contra se disserentium.* Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 117.

[50] McDonald 2019 persuasively highlights numerous instances where the *Agon* presupposes the *Hymn Virg.*

a *terminus post quem* for the poem (363 AD). Jan Szymusiak and Carmen-Marie Szymusiak-

Affholder date the poem precisely to 371 and 372 respectively, without solid evidence.[51]

McGuckin place it during Gregory's stay at the shrine of Thecla in Seleucia from 375–78.[52]

Sundermann was uncertain over the date of the poem,[53] while Zehles and Zamora date the

poem to the 380s.[54] The latter came to this conclusion by analyzing the lines that appear in both

the *Poemata arcana* and the *Hymn Virg.*[55] In each case, they thought they could demonstrate the

priority of the lines in *Poemata arcana*. Though I think they are correct that *Hymn Virg.* 15–19 and

48–50 originated in the *Poemata arcana*, the reverse is the case for the other overlapping passages

(see the appendix for more detail). We thus have a more complicated picture: Gregory used

many lines that he had written for the *Hymn Virg.* for his *Poemata arcana*, but then subsequently

edited the *Hymn Virg.* In doing so, he introduced in the *Hymn Virg.* some lines that had been

written for the *Poemata arcana*. Similar editing occurred in *De rebus suis* (2.1.1) and probably also for

Gregory's *Carmen lugubre* (2.1.45).[56] The earlier version of the *Hymn Virg.* probably dates from the

late 360s or 370s, since the mention of Julian would be more salient then than later, and because

---

[51] See Szymusiak 1963 55 and Szymusiak-Affholder 1971.

[52] McGuckin 2006 203

[53] See Sundermann 1991 19.

[54] See Zehles and Zamora 1996 2–4.

[55] The lines in question:

- *Hymn Virg.* 15–19 are identical to *Poem. arc.* 6.8–12.
- *Hymn Virg.* 31–34 are identical to *Poem. arc.* 6.13–16.
- *Hymn Virg.* 48–50 are identical to *Poem. arc.* 6.17–19.
- *Hymn Virg.* 56–99 overlap substantially with *Poem. arc.* 7.55–77.
- *Hymn Virg.* 137–154 overlap substantially with *Poem. arc* 8.32–52.

[56] For the date of *carm.* 2.1.1, see Bady, Tuilier, and Bernardi 2004 LI. For Gregory's editing of his orations during retirement, see McGuckin 2001 1.

the *Hymn Virg.* and *Agon* probably predate Nyssen's *De virginitate*, which can be dated safely to the early 370s.

Prose Sources
Scripture

The scriptural influence in the *Hymn Virg.* is in some ways quite different than what we saw above in *Adv. iram*. There Gregory deployed biblical exempla to illustrate or support his arguments.

Exempla are used in the *Agon*, but the narrative shape of the *Hymn Virg.* creates different demands. As before, Gregory will often quietly refashion biblical passages into his own work. We may take the hymnic praise in *Hymn Virg.* 172–77 as one example:

> Ὦ Ἄνα, τίς δέ κε σεῖο νόον καὶ βένθος ἀνεύροι,
> Ὃς σταγόνων ὑετοῖο, καὶ ὃς ἁλίης ψαμάθοιο
> Οἶδας ἀριθμὸν ἅπαντα, καὶ ὃς ἀνέμοιο κελεύθους;
> Τίς δέ κεν αὖ γνώσοιτο τεῆς, Μάκαρ, ἴχνια βουλῆς, [175]
> Ὑψιμέδων ὡς πάντ᾽ ἐφορᾷς καὶ πάντα κυβερνᾷς,
> Αἰὼν ὅσσα κέκευθεν ἀπείριτος;

> O Lord, thy mind and depths who e'er could search?
> Thou know'st the number of the drops of rain,
> the grains of sand on shores, the paths of wind.
> Who, blessed One, could ever trace thy plan?
> On high thou seeest all and steerst it too,
> all that the boundless age conceals within.

Gregory here skillfully weaves together passages from Job 28:24–28[57] and Romans 11:33.[58] The opening line recalls Rom. 11:33f. while the next two lines draw primarily from Job. In 175, we return to Romans, before going back once more to Job in line 176. Though tricky to unweave the various strands, Gregory's tapestry works nicely as a whole. He exploits the verbal link between the two passages created by the derivatives of ἴχνος (ἀνεξιχνίαστοι in Rom. 11:33 and ἐξιχνίασεν in Job 28:27). The various elements of hymnic style naturally also have precedents in Greek hymnography. Compare, for instance, Call. *hZeus* 91–94 for the "insufficiency of the poet" motif or the instances of ὦνα (= ὦ ἄνα, "O Lord") at Call. *hZeus* 33 (also at the start of the line) and *hZeus* 8 (ὦ ἄνα).[59] Here we have a more elaborate example of the scriptural paraphrase that we saw above at *Adv. iram* 398, where Gregory had reworked the biblical admonition in Ps. 4:5 to "be angry but do not sin" into an iambic trimeter.

---

[57] 24 αὐτὸς γὰρ **τὴν ὑπ᾽ οὐρανὸν πᾶσαν ἐφορᾷ**
εἰδὼς τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ πάντα, ἃ ἐποίησεν,
25 **ἀνέμων σταθμὸν ὕδατός τε μέτρα·**
26 ὅτε ἐποίησεν οὕτως, **ὑετὸν ἠρίθμησεν**
καὶ ὁδὸν ἐν τινάγματι φωνάς·
27 τότε εἶδεν αὐτὴν καὶ ἐξηγήσατο αὐτήν, ἑτοιμάσας **ἐξιχνίασεν.**
28 εἶπεν δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ Ἰδοὺ ἡ θεοσέβειά ἐστιν σοφία,
τὸ δὲ ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπὸ κακῶν ἐστιν ἐπιστήμη. ("For he watches over the entire earth below heaven and knows everything in the earth that he has made, the pens of the winds and the measures of the water. When he did such, he numbered the rain and made through shaking the sounds into a way. Then he saw it and explained it; after preparing he measured out its tracks. He said to man, 'Behold, revering God is wisdom, and abstaining from wicked things is knowledge.'") I have consulted the translation of Job by Claude E. Cox in the *New English Translation of the Septuagint*, Pietersma and Wright 2007.

[58] 33 Ὦ **βάθος** πλούτου
καὶ σοφίας καὶ **γνώσεως** θεοῦ·
ὡς ἀνεξεραύνητα τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ
καὶ **ἀνεξιχνίαστοι** αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ.
34 τίς γὰρ **ἔγνω νοῦν** κυρίου;
ἢ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο;

("O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! How inscrutable are his judgments and untraceable his paths! For who understands the mind of the Lord? Who has been his counselor?")

[59] If Gregory intends us to hear Call. *hZeus* 33, then it is to contrast Zeus needing to be washed with water to clean off muck from the childbirth with the God from whom such water takes its source.

Surprisingly, Gregory avoids almost completely explicit exegesis in both the *Hymn Virg.* and the *Agon*. Nowhere is Paul's discussion of marriage and virginity in 1 Cor. 7 mentioned, a passage prominent in nearly all literary treatments of the topic. Nor does Gregory discuss the chorus of virgins in Revelation 14, to which Methodius devoted lavish attention in the eighth speech of his *Symposium*. Gregory evidently eschewed the well-trodden paths to undertake something more subtle; his understanding of scripture instead emerges from the manner in which he retells sacred history. He has made marriage the culmination of the creation, rather than the culmination of the fall, and roots the appearance of Virginity closely with the incarnation of Christ, something not universal in the virginity literature of the period. It is to this contemporary literature on virginity that we now turn.

Virginity Literature in Greek of the Fourth Century AD
In Greek, the most significant literary treatments of virginity from the fourth century are:[60]

- Methodius of Olympus, *Symposium*. Around 300,[61] Methodius composed a lovely dialogue modeled on Plato's *Symposium*, in which 10 virgins discuss Virginity and related themes. As we shall see, it was a significant model both in form and content for Gregory.
- Ps.-Basil's *De vera virginitate*. This treatise, transmitted along with the works of Basil the Great, was long attributed to Gregory's slightly older contemporary, the homoian bishop Basil of Ancyra. Anne Burgsmüller has questioned this attribution, and I have followed her in calling the author of the treatise ps.-Basil.[62] The treatise antedates Nyssen's *De virginitate* and hence was written in the 360s or earlier.
- Gregory of Nyssa's *De virginitate*. Gregory's fellow Cappadocian Gregory of Nyssa penned this work sometime in the early 370s.[63] It is one of Nyssen's earliest extant works.

---

[60] For a more detailed list including works in both Greek and Latin, see Sundermann 1991 15–19.

[61] For the date, see Sieber 2017, whose text I employ for the citations below. See Musurillo 1958 for English translation, introduction, and notes.

[62] See Burgsmüller 2005 16–46.

[63] Aubineau 1966 dates the work precisely to 371. Staats 1985 suggests this is too precise, but the work is certainly early, for by 378 Gregory of Nyssa has rethought his approach to Greek medical theory and abandoned the cardiacentrism of *Virg.* For further discussion, see Gilbert 2014 165.

Situating the *Hymn Virg.* among these works is crucial for our present purposes. Methodius'

Symposium forms part of the erudite tradition that Gregory reshaped to new ends. Though Ps.-

Basil does not seem to have influenced Gregory's *Hymn Virg.*, the *De ver. virg.* provides nevertheless

a useful foil for the *Hymn Virg.* Finally, if I am right that Nyssen's treatise post-dates Nazianzen's[64]

first draft of the *Hymn Virg.*, then we may surmise that the *Hymn Virg.* and its successor the *Agon*

were received, albeit critically, as genuine contributions to the learned discussion on virginity.

Gregory was deeply shaped by Methodius' *Symposium*. For instance, in *Symposium* Logos 8,

Methodius describes the paradise as a garden in which each of the plants are platonic forms, over

which Adam presided. Only after the fall did Adam and Eve take on heavier, fleshly bodies.

Gregory's embrace of the scheme is hinted at in *Hymn Virg.* 119–122, where he describes Adam

as "weighed down with his fleshly garments on earth" (δερματίνοισι χιτῶσιν ἑὴν ἔβρισ᾽ ἐπὶ

γαῖαν) after his expulsion from paradise. It is more clear in *Poem. arc.* 7.97–111, where he states

that the paradise represents "heavenly life" (7.105) and that God appointed Adam as a "farmer

of *logoi*." (λόγων δρηστῆρα γεωργόν 7.106). Methodius and Gregory have both departed from

Origen of Alexandria's influential scheme, in which the souls or minds of all rational creatures

existed before their life in the present body. Gregory and Methodius have restricted this heavenly

paradise to Adam and Eve, while each subsequent human soul is created only at the time of

conception.[65]

Gregory was also deeply shaped by Methodius' language of mystery and initiation. In

Logos 3.6, Methodius describes how humans were created as initiates to praise God in song:

---

[64] When necessary I use Nazianzen and Nyssen to distinguish the two Gregories. The simple form "Gregory" I retain for our poet, the Nazianzene.

[65] See Otis 1958 for the fullest treatment of the theological influence of Methodius on Gregory of Nazianzus. Blowers 2016 better accounts for the distinctions between the Cappadocians.

Δεδημιούργητο γὰρ δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔξω φθορᾶς, ἵνα τὸν βασιλέα
γεραίρῃ πάντων καὶ ποιητὴν ἀντίφθογγα μελῳδῶν ταῖς τῶν
ἀγγέλων ἐξ οὐρανοῦ φερομέναις βοαῖς.

For he was created without corruption in order to praise the king and
creator of all things by singing in response to the cries of the angels from
heaven.

In *Logos* 6.10, Methodius describes the "sacred rites of the virgins":

Ταῦτα τῶν ἡμετέρων, ὦ καλλιπάρθενοι, τὰ ὄργια μυστηρίων,
αὗται τῶν ἐν παρθενίᾳ μυσταγωγηθέντων αἱ τελεταί, ταῦτα τὰ
ἐπίχειρα «τῶν ἀμιάντων ἄθλων» τῆς σωφροσύνης.

O lovely virgins, these are the sacred rites of our mysteries, these the rites
of those who have been initiated in virginity, these the rewards of the
"pure contests" of prudence.

Gregory's works, including the *Hymn Virg.*, are replete with the language of mystical rites. For

instance, at *Hymn Virg.* 88–91, Gregory has God the Father describe his intentions in creating

Adam:

Θνητῶν τ᾽ ἀθανάτων τε νοήμονα φῶτα μεσηγύ,
Τερπόμενόν τ᾽ ἔργοισιν ἐμοῖς, καὶ ἐχέφρονα μύστην
Οὐρανίων, χθονίων τε μέγα κράτος, ἄγγελον ἄλλον [90]
Ἐκ χθονὸς, ὑμνητῆρά τ᾽ ἐμῶν μενέων τε νόου τε.

[Adam shall be…]
a rational light between the undying ones
and dying ones below, delighting in
my works, a sober one, initiate
in heav'n above, yet power great on earth,
a second angel from the dust, who sings
in hymns my many deeds, my might, and plans.

Methodius and Gregory were certainly not the only Greek Christian authors to use mystery

language, but both give it a prominent place in their account of humanity's creation and

purpose. Ps.-Basil *De vera virginitate* and Gregory of Nyssa's *De virginitate* do not connect the virginal

life to this ultimate end of humankind.

Like Gregory, Methodius closely connects the coming of Christ and the appearance of Virginity. In Methodius' early speeches, Virginity (ἁγνεία) almost becomes another Christ. In *Logos* 4.1, chastity is the chief salvific instrument that God uses to reconcile humanity to himself and bestow eternal life.[66] Indeed, God has sent chastity to help us in our plight. This sort of language was normally reserved for Christ. This theological misstep is moderated by Procilla's speech (*Logos* 7), when she insists that biblical writers directed their praise at God, rather than the angelic order, and so she will instead praise Christ instead of virginity (*Logos* 7.1). In the *Hymn Virg.*, Gregory brings the relationship between Christ and Virginity into sharper focus. The most extravagant praise of the poem is reserved for God the Father and Christ (172–188). More significantly, Virginity's epiphany is tied directly to Christ's activity on earth, especially his birth in a virgin's womb (195–208). Gregory thereby resolves a tension in Methodius' work that, though not unnoticed, had remained unresolved.

Gregory occasionally rejects Methodian arguments. For Methodius, the institution of marriage was initially imperfect and God slowly improved humankind's sexual mores. Incest gave way to exogamy, exogamous polygamy to monogamy, and finally prudent monogamy made way for chastity, once the Earth had been sufficiently peopled (*Symp.* Logos 1.2). Gregory does imply that population increase has reduced the imperative to procreate (*Hymn Virg.* 128–30), but he locates the institution of marriage firmly in the prelapsarian paradise (*Hymn Virg.* 100–116). Moreover, Gregory does not differentiate between the marriage customs of various ages.

---

[66] Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀκριβῶς ἠσθῆσθαί μοι δοκῶ, ὅτι τῆς εἰς τὸν παράδεισον ἀποκαταστάσεως καὶ τῆς εἰς τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν μεταβολῆς καὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καταλλαγῆς οὐδὲν οὕτως αἴτιον ἄλλο γέγονε καὶ σωτήριον ἀνθρώποις τὸ στρατηγῆσαν ἡμᾶς εἰς ζωὴν ὡς ἁγνεία. ("For I think I do perceive that there is no salvific cause more important for human beings than virginity for bringing about reconciliation with God, restoration to paradise, and the transformation to incorruptibility.")

He adopts the more general scheme in which marriage was preferred in the Old Testament and Virginity in the New.

Gregory's *Hymn Virg.* has several overlaps with ps.-Basil's *De ver. vir.*, but none is strong enough to assert direct influence. Like ps.-Basil, marriage is bulwark against human extinction (*Hymn Virg.* 123–27), but is no longer the best way of life once Christ has come. Both authors mention Christ's birth from a virgin, a fact curiously absent from Methodius' work.[67] But it is difficult to prove any direct influence from such small coincidences. Ps.-Basil takes no great interest in salvation history, as Gregory did, nor did ps.-Basil adequately resolve the divine institution of marriage in the Old Testament with the option of virginity in the New. The practical orientation of ps.-Basil's work further distinguishes it sharply from Gregory's *Hymn Virg.* Gregory does, however, appear to have used the work when composing his later *Praecepta ad virgines* (1.2.2a).[68]

Scholarship on Nyssen's *De virginitate* has generally ignored our Gregory's virginity poems.[69] The relationship of the works is particularly difficult because the dates of the respective works are uncertain. Sundermann was unsure about whether this treatise came before Gregory's hymn.[70] On the whole, I find it more likely that Nyssen is responding to Nazianzen than the

---

[67] *Hymn Virg.* 139–155. *Cf. De ver. virg.* 54.

[68] On the impossibility of having a human husband and Christ as husband, and the danger of monastic cohabitation between the sexes, *cf. Praec. virg.* 96–124 and *De ver. virg.* 39–43. On the necessity of an ascetic diet, *cf. Praec. virg.* 294–299 and *De ver. virg.* 8–9. The most striking overlap comes in *Praec. virg.* 332–36, where Gregory exhorts the virgin to be careful in showing hospitality, noting that it is better to deny hospitality altogether than be too hospitable. *Cf. De ver. virg.* 53.

[69] Aubineau 1966 does not mention Nazianzen's poems in his extensive introduction to the *De virginitate*, nor are they mentioned by Staats 1985.

[70] Sundermann 1991 17

other way around. Nyssen's treatise begins by criticizing those who extoll virginity in detail

without offering any practical advice:

> Ὅσοι δὲ μακροὺς ἐπαίνους ἐν διεξοδικοῖς κατατείνουσι λόγοις, ὡς
> διὰ τούτων προσθήσοντές τι τῷ θαύματι τῆς παρθενίας, λελήθασιν
> ἑαυτοὺς κατά γε τὴν ἐμὴν κρίσιν ἐναντιούμενοι τῷ ἰδίῳ σκοπῷ καί,
> δι' ὧν ἐξαίρουσιν εἰς μέγεθος, ὕποπτον ποιοῦντες διὰ τῶν ἐγκωμίων
> τὸν ἔπαινον … Ὁ δὲ ὑπόθεσιν ἐγκωμίων ταύτην **ὑπὸ φιλοτιμίας**
> ποιούμενος ἔοικε τὴν σταγόνα τῶν οἰκείων ἱδρώτων ἀξιόλογον εἰς
> προσθήκην νομίζειν τῷ ἀπείρῳ πελάγει γενήσεσθαι, εἴ γε
> ἀνθρωπίνῳ λόγῳ δυνατὸν εἶναι τὴν τοσαύτην χάριν ἀποσεμνῦναι
> πεπίστευκεν· ἢ γὰρ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν ἀγνοεῖ ἢ ὃ ἐπαινεῖ οὐκ
> ἐπίσταται. (GNyss, *De virg.* 1)[71]

> But those who extend their works at great length, as though through such
> words they would add something to the marvel of virginity, have, in my
> judgment, worked contrary to their purpose without realizing it. The
> very means by which they extend their work in praise renders it
> suspicious… But the one who takes up this theme of praise for the sake of
> ambition seems like someone who thinks that a drop of sweat from their
> brow is a worthy addition to the vastness of the sea, since he evidently
> believes that it is possible for human speech to praise such a great gift.
> Either he does not grasp his own capacities or does not understand what
> it is that he is praising.

Nyssen's critique here seems aimed at works like the *Hymn Virg.* that plainly had literary

ambitions. His critique here is far sharper than the similar passage in ps.-Basil's *De ver. virg.* 1–2. It

is perhaps bold to suggest that Nyssen had Nazianzen in his crosshairs, but the early 370s placed

many strains on the warm relationship that our Gregory had enjoyed with the family of Basil and

Gregory of Nyssa.[72] Nazianzen resented Basil's sudden interest in ecclesiastical politics and the

latter's elevation to the bishopric of Caesarea in 370. Basil, in turn, resented Gregory's half-

hearted support in his election.[73] The relationship was strained even further in 372 in the Sasima

---

[71] I cite the *De virginitate* of Gregory of Nyssa according to Aubineau 1966. Note that there are two
recensions of Nyssen's treatise with slight differences, for which see Aubineau's introduction.

[72] For modern treatments of the period, see McGuckin 2001 169–227 and Rousseau 1998 233–269.

[73] See Gr. naz., *epp.* 40, 45.

affair, when Basil appointed Nazianzen as bishop over the contested backwater town of Sasima. Cappadocia had been split in two, and a rival bishop Anthemius was claiming authority over a number of sees that had formerly been subject to Basil.[74] The mob more or less ran Basil and Gregory out of town when Basil tried to install Gregory as bishop around Easter, 372, and Gregory subsequently refused to try and exert episcopal authority over the town, much to Basil's annoyance.[75] Gregory then continued to put pressure on Basil over the next two years to break with the homoian bishop Eustathius of Sebaste,[76] which Basil finally did a few years later. In such a tense period, it would not be surprising to see Basil's brother, Gregory of Nyssa, critiquing Nazianzen's penchant for literary display. Gregory's later *Praecepta ad virgines* (1.2.2a) may well have been conceived in part as a response to this critique at a time when Nyssen and Nazianzen were on better terms.

Nyssen's *De virginitate* shares a number of features with Nazianzen's *Hymn Virg.* and *Agon*. Nyssen is to my knowledge the first Greek author to dwell on the paradox of God simultaneously being both a virgin and a father (*De virginitate* 2). This was perhaps prompted by *Hymn Virg.* 20 where our Gregory calls the Holy Trinity the first virgin and *Agon* 237, where the Married Life replies that God is the father of all things. Both authors locate the source of virginity not in the life of the angels, as had Methodius and Ps.-Basil, but first in God's own incorruptibility and purity.[77] As Nazianzen had in *Hymn Virg.* 205–07, Nyssen states that Virginity is as superior to the Married Life as heavenly things are to earthly ones (*De virginitate* 3.1). A number of other *topoi* are shared with the *Agon*. Nyssen's statement that marriage is not entirely wicked since it produced

---

[74] See Gallay 1964 61n1.

[75] See Gr. naz. *epp.* 49–50.

[76] *epp.* 58–59

[77] For the *vita angelica* topos in Methodius and Ps.-Basil, see *Symp.* Logos 8.2, 9.5; *De vera virginitate* 51–53.

many saints (*De virg.* 7) recalls arguments made by Married Life in the *Agon* (1.2.1b 296–329).

When Nyssen states that Death meets its end upon meeting Virginity (*De virg.* 14), he was likely

inspired by our Gregory's *Agon* 425–28, where the death (μόρος) that had come upon humanity

through Adam's sin meets Virginity and perishes. Neither Methodius nor ps.-Basil had made

such a claim. Though Nyssen critiqued aspects of Nazianzen's *Hymn Virg.* and *Agon*, these poems

nevertheless appear to have exercised an important influence on *De virginitate.*

  In short, I have argued that Methodius' *Symposium* was a significant rhetorical and

theological influence for Gregory. Important overlaps with Methodius in several of Gregory's

works shows the breadth of the impact. Gregory was by no means uncritical in what he took, but

Methodius' synthesis of literary art and philosophical and theological sophistication pervasively

shaped Gregory's work. The hymn with which Methodius closed his *Symposium* may well have

been one of Gregory's spurs to take up poetry in the first place. The influence of Ps.-Basil's *De

vera virginitate* is more difficult to prove. Gregory seems to have used it in his later *Praecepta*, but not

in the *Hymn Virg.* Finally, I have argued that Nyssen's *De virginitate* critically adapts Gregory's

Hymn Virg. and *Agon*.

Poetic Sources
Let us now consider how Gregory adapted prior poetry in the *Hymn Virg.* Homer naturally plays

a significant role, but in order to show the range of Gregory's erudition I have selected passages

where Gregory reshapes other poets, principally Hesiod, Callimachus, and ps.-Oppian.

The Hymnic Hail: Callimachus' Hymn to Zeus
At *Hymn Virg.* 11–20, Gregory adapts a line and a half from the end of Callimachus' *hZeus*.

Compare Gregory's lines

> **Παρθενίη, μέγα χαῖρε, θεόσδοτε, δῶτερ ἐάων**,
> **Μῆτερ ἀπημοσύνης**, Χριστοῦ λάχος, οὐρανίοισι
> Κάλλεσιν ἀζυγέεσσιν ὁμόζυγε · ἀζυγέες γὰρ,
> Πρῶτα Θεὸς, μετέπειτα Θεοῦ χορὸς αἰὲν ἐόντος.

> I hail thee, gift of God, Virginity
> the gen'rous mother of security,
> the lot of Christ, who art with heav'nly beauties,
> though they're unbounded, joined in unity.
> Of those unbounded, first comes eternal God
> and then his chorus…

with the following from Callimachus:

> **χαῖρε μέγα, Κρονίδη πανυπέρτατε, δῶτορ ἐάων,**
> **δῶτορ ἀπημονίης**. τεὰ δ' ἔργματα τίς κεν ἀείδοι;

> Hail thee, all-surpassing Son of Cronus, Giver of Goods, Giver of
> Security. Who could sing your works? (Call. *hZeus* 91–96)

Gregory makes a few modifications. The word order changes to suit the noun παρθενίη

("virginity"); θεόσδοτε ("god-given") replaces πανυπέρτατε ("all-surpassing") Callimachus'

second δῶτορ is replaced with μῆτερ ("mother", a nice paradoxical epithet for Virginity), and

the biform ἀπημοσύνης replaces ἀπημονίης (both mean literally "freedom from suffering").

Gregory's choice of source is deliberately ironic: he might have chosen to take lines from one of

the three hymns Callimachus wrote to virgins (*hArt*, *hDel*, *hAth*), but instead Gregory chose lines

from a hymn to Zeus, the most infamous philanderer of the pantheon. *Hymn Virg.* 20 develops the

contrast, where the Trinity is called the "first virgin" (πρώτη παρθένος ἐστὶν ἁγνὴ Τριάς). We

saw above the Gregory was among the first Christian authors to root virginity in the divine

nature. This theological development also carries polemical significance: the Triune God is

perfectly pure, unlike the uxorious Zeus.

Incipient Light: Hesiod's Theogony and Apollonius' Argonautica
In addition to the first three chapters of Genesis, Gregory's creation narrative, draws extensively

from Hesiod and more subtly from Apollonius of Rhodes. I print here *Hymn Virg.* 58–69:

> Ἦν ποτ' ἔην, ὅτε πάντα κελαινὴ νὺξ ἐκάλυπτεν.
> Οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔην ἠοῦς ἐρατὸν φάος· οὐδὲ κέλευθον
> Ἠέλιος πυρόεσσαν ἐπέσσυτο ἀντολίηθεν.   [60]
> Οὐ μήνη κερόεσσα φαείνετο, νυκτὸς ἄγαλμα.
> Πάντα δ' ἅμ' **ἀλλήλοισι** φορούμενα, μὰψ ἀλάλητο

Πρωτογόνου χάεος ζοφεροῖς δεδμημένα δεσμοῖς.
Ἀλλὰ σὺ, Χριστὲ μάκαρ, Πατρὸς μεγάλου φραδίῃσι
Πειθόμενος τὰ ἕκαστα διέκρινας εὖ κατὰ κόσμον.   [65]
Ἤτοι μὲν πρώτιστα φάος γένεθ', ὥς κεν ἅπαντα
Ἔργα πέλοι χαρίεντα φάους πλέα. Αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
Οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα κυκλώσαο, θαῦμα μέγιστον,
Ἠελίῳ μήνῃ τε διαυγέα.

There was a time when shad'wy night hid all,
when lovely light had not yet come to be
when Sun did not yet rush his fiery course
nor horned Moon, the splendor of the night.
All was then borne upon itself; in vain
it wandered, bounded by the gloomy chains
of Chaos, who preceded birth. But thou,
my Christ, didst harken to the Father's will
and didst divide it all in careful order.
For first of all was light then made, that all
should know the splendor of thy gracious light.
Then thou the starry heaven didst beset,
a marvel shining with the moon and sun.

Unsurprisingly, Gregory's cosmogony refers to Hesiod's *Theogony* on numerous occasions. The most obvious instances comes in *Hymn Virg.* 66, where Gregory changes a single letter of the first hemistich of Hesiod's *Theog.* 116. Hesiod's line reads ἤτοι μὲν πρώτιστα Χάος γένετ', ("First Chaos came into existence").[78] Gregory changes the χ to a φ to make "light" (φάος) rather than "chaos" (χάος) the first entity to come into existence. Gregory has also alluded to this passage slightly earlier, when in *Hymn Virg.* 63 he describes Chaos as πρωτογένης ("first-born" or perhaps, "before-birth"). Gregory has clearly summoned the Ascraean bard to correct the *Theogony*.

In *Hymn Virg.* 66, Gregory invites us to notice further contrasts in the purpose clause that follows the creation of light . In the *Theog.*, Gaea produced Uranus as a covering for herself (*Theog.* 126–27):

[78] I cite the *Theogony* according to West 1966.

> Γαῖα δέ τοι πρῶτον μὲν ἐγείνατο ἶσον ἑωυτῇ
> Οὐρανὸν ἀστερόενθ᾽, ἵνα μιν περὶ πάντα καλύπτοι,
> ὄφρ᾽ εἴη μακάρεσσι θεοῖς ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεί

> Gaea then first produced for herself the starry heaven, so that he may
> cover her completely and ever be a sure seat for the blessed gods.

For Gregory, by contrast, the Heaven is revelatory and full of light, not an instrument of concealment (*Hymn Virg.* 66–68).

Several other more subtle points of contact are worth noting. Eros plays a prominent role in the early part of Hesiod's *Theogony*. This is a natural point of departure for Gregory, most especially in a poem on virginity. Gregory's re-workings here are more thematic than verbal, but still worth noting. Hesiod gives three lines to Eros (*Theog.* 120–122). The god of love "overcomes the plans and thoughtful intentions in the hearts of every god and man." Gregory naturally has a different take. In line 89, he describes man as an ἐχέφρονα μύστην (rational initiate), which falls at line end, as does Hesiod's similar ἐπίφρονα βούλην (thoughtful intention) at *Theog.* 122. Gregory moreover notes in *Hymn Virg.* 97 that the human mind presides over both the soul and body (ἣ γὰρ ἄνασσα νόου φύσις ἀμφοτέροισι). Here νόου ("mind") falls in the same place as νόον in *Theog.* 122, where it refers to the intentions of mortals and immortals that are overcome by Eros.

Gregory seems also to allude to Apollonius of Rhodes' cosmogony, which is placed in the mouth of Orpheus (*Arg.* 1.496–511). Particularly relevant are *Arg.* 1.496–98:

> Ἤειδεν δ᾽ ὡς γαῖα καὶ οὐρανὸς ἠδὲ θάλασσα,
> τὸ πρὶν ἔτ᾽[79] ἀλλήλοισι μιῇ συναρηρότα μορφῇ,
> νείκεος ἐξ ὀλοοῖο διέκριθεν ἀμφὶς ἕκαστα ·[80]

---

[79] ἔτ᾽ is Fraenkel's conjecture. The manuscripts read ἐπ

[80] I cite the *Argonautica* according to Fränkel 1961.

> He sang of how the earth, heaven, and sea had first been joined in a
> single form, but then were each divided from the other in a fatal quarrel.

The verbal echoes are perceptible, though slight. The beginning of Orpheus' song (*Arg* 1.496–98)

is recast in Gregory's description of preexistent chaos. The Orphic vision of pre-creation is

positive: Earth, Heaven, and Sea were fitted together into a single form. Their separation was

due only to destructive strife. Gregory uses some of the language but reverses the significance.

Hymn Virg. 62 adapts *Arg.* 1.497. Note that ἀλλήλοισι with a preposition occurs in the same

metrical *sedes*. Gregory perhaps adapts the end of *Arg.* 1.497 in the following line. Instead of "fit

together in a single form" (μιῇ συναρηρότα μορφῇ), Gregory describes the pre-created matter as

"being bound by dark chains" (ζοφεροῖς δεδμημένα δεσμοῖς). Note the parallel construction of

dative adj. + neuter pl. participle + dative noun. Finally, Gregory's "you divided each realm" (τὰ

ἕκαστα διέκρινας) reworks Apollonius "each realm was divided" (διέκριθεν ἀμφὶς ἕκαστα). The

verb διακρίνω ("to divide") occurs at the same metrical location. Instead of the Orphic harmony

yielding to present strife, Gregory depicts preexistent chaos being brought into order. Christ

brings not *chaos*, but *kosmos*.

Human and Animal Eros: Oppian's *Halieutica* and Ps.-Oppian's *Cynegetica*
I wish finally to consider Gregory's use of the *Halieutica* and *Cynegetica*. Both Oppian and ps.-

Oppian dealt with *Eros* at length. Oppian noted its capacity to lead to intra-species strife in *Hal.*

1.497–501; *Hal.* 4 opened with a short hymn to Eros (*Hal.* 4.11–39) and was devoted to

describing the ways that fishermen exploit fish's erotic desire. Ps.-Oppian's ode to Eros came in

Cyn. 2.410–444, where he described several animals who have sexual desire for animals of other

species. Gregory draws on several of these passages but reverses their tenor in *Hymn Virg.* 107–

116, where he narrates the creation of Eve:

> Πλευρὴν ἐκ λαγόνων μούνην ἔλε, τήν ῥα γυναῖκα
> Δειμάμενος, καὶ **φίλτρον** ἐνὶ **στέρνοισι κεράσσας**,
> Ἀμφοτέροις ἐφέηκεν ἐπ᾽ **ἀλλήλοισι** φέρεσθαι·

Οὐ πᾶσ’ οὐδ’ ἐπὶ πάντας, **ὅρον** δ’ ἐπέθηκε πόθοισιν, [110]
Ὅν ῥα γάμον καλέουσ’, ὕλης ἀμέτροιο χαλινὸν,
Ὡς μὴ **μαιμώωσα**, καὶ **ἄσχετα μαργαίνουσα**,
Προφρονέως **ἀγεληδὸν** ἐπ’ ἀλλήλοισιν ἰόντων,[81]
Ῥήξειεν μερόπων ἱερὸν γένος ἐκ φιλότητος
Ἀζυγέος, πολέμους δὲ καὶ ἔχθεα πᾶσιν **ὀρίνη** [115]
Οἶστρος ἀσημάντοισι φορεύμενος ἀφραδίῃσιν.

He took the rib from Adam's side and made
the wife. He mixed desire in their breasts
and bid them bear themselves to one another,
but not at all without discrimination.
He placed a limit on their loves, what we
call marriage, bridle for unmeasured matter,
lest it go mad, convulsing endlessly,
like animals that read'ly mate in herds,
and wreck the holy race of men through love
unbounded, lest desire unrestrained
should raise up wars and senseless quarrels for all.

Hymn Virg. 108–09 are likely indebted to *Cyn.* 2.398–400, where ps.-Oppian marveled that even irrational beasts confine their sexual desire to other members of their own species. Note particularly the use of an aorist form of κεράννυμι ("to mix") at line end with a direct object meaning "desire" (here πόθος instead of Gregory's φίλτρα, though φίλτρα does appear in Ps.-Oppian's preceding line).

θαῦμα μὲν ἦν κἀκεῖνο δαμήμεναι **ἄφρονα φῦλα**
ἄμμασιν ἱμερτοῖς καὶ ὁμόγνια **φίλτρα** δαῆναι
καὶ **πόθον** οὐ νοέοντα ἐν ἀλλήλοισι **κεράσσαι**, [400]
οἷά περ ἀνθρώποισιν ἐπιφροσύνη τε νόος τε
ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπέτασσεν, ἔρον θ’ ὑπεδέξατο θυμῷ·

And this too is a marvel, that senseless beasts are mastered by the bonds of love and learn to have desire for those of their own kind, that even without reason they mix desire within themselves, just as the mind and thought of people stretch out their eyes and receive desire into their souls.

---

[81] It is not clear how to construe this line; it may be corrupt.

Hymn Virg. 112 echoes several passages in the *Halieutica*. The end of the line (ἄσχετα

μαργαίνουσα, "swelling endlessly") is nearly identical to *Hal.* 1.38, which ends ἄσχετα

μαργαίνοντι, though there Oppian speaks of the "sea swelling endlessly." A better fit

contextually is *Hal.* 4.93, where Oppian describes how fishermen use a female *skaros* fish to catch

her male counterparts.

> εὖτε γὰρ **ἀγρομένους** τε καὶ **ἄσχετα μαιμώοντας**
> θηλείης ἐπὶ λύσσαν ἴδῃ νόος ἀσπαλιῆος,
> ἐν κύρτῳ κατέθηκεν ὁμοῦ λίνον ἠδὲ μόλιβδον, [95]
> ὃς σκάρον ἐμβαρύθων εἴσω σπάσεν·

> For when the mind of the fisherman sees them gathering in a frenzied
> madness for the female, he places the fishing net and lead in the basket,
> which snares with its weight the *skaros* fish.

Note Gregory's use of ἄσχετα in the same metrical *sedes* and his use of a participle of μαιμάω

earlier in the line. Gregory's ἀγεληδὸν ("in flocks") in *Hymn Virg.* 113 develops ἀγρομένους

("gathering", *Hal.* 4.93). In both passages unrestrained sexual passion leads to ruin.

Finally, Gregory's description of the jealous quarrels that erupt from unrestrained *eros*

(*Hymn Virg.* 115–16) echoes *Hal.* 1.497–501, where Oppian describes the quarrels that arise

among fish from jealousy and the desire to mate:

> … οἱ δὲ καὶ εὐνὰς
> καὶ θαλάμους ἀλόχους τε διακριδὸν ἀμφὶς ἔχουσι
> **ζευξάμενοι**· πολλὴ γὰρ ἐν ἰχθύσιν ἔστ' Ἀφροδίτη
> **Οἶστρός** τε Ζῆλός τε, βαρὺς θεός, ὅσσα τε τίκτει [500]
> θερμὸς Ἔρως, ὅτε λάβρον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ κῶμον **ὀρίνει**.
> πολλοὶ δ' ἀλλήλοισι διασταδὸν εἵνεκεν εὐνῆς
> μάρνανται, μνηστῆρσιν ἐοικότες.

> But some fish marry and have their own wives, beds, and chambers. For
> Aphrodite, Desire, and Jealousy, that weighty god, are mighty forces
> among fish. What quarrels tender Love produces when he stirs up in
> their hearts a furious desire for revelry! For many quarrel with one
> another because of sex, like suitors do.

Gregory begins *Hymn Virg.* 115 with a derivative of ζεύγνυμι ("to yoke"), and ends it with ὀρίνει

("stirs up"); *Hymn Virg.* 116 begins also with οἶστρος ("sexual desire").[82] The Oppianic passage

supplements Gregory's depiction of desire by providing vivid examples of the dangers of *eros*.

Gregory's attitude toward *eros* is, unsurprisingly, different from both Oppian and ps.-

Oppian, who had in traditional fashion sung of the omnipotence of the winged god.[83] Instead,

physical *eros* is here yoked and restrained by the institution of marriage, and then ultimately done

away with by the appearance of virginity. Gregory thereby reverses the common charge that

virginity would spell the end of the human race: instead, it is unrestrained passion that is its

greatest threat.

<div align="center">

Erudition: Means and Ends

</div>

After analyzing *Adversus iram* (1.2.25) and *Hymn Virg.* (1.2.1a) in some detail, I now juxtapose

Gregory's approach to erudition with that Callimachus. I consider means (poetic technique) and

ends (larger purposes) in turn.

Means
Prose Sources

Gregory's extensive use of prose sources finds ready parallel in Callimachus' *oeuvre*. Both men

were scholars in their own right in addition to poets (we have only fragments of Callimachus'

prose works). Indeed, Callimachus and his contemporaries were the first generation of poets to

use prose sources in their poetic works. Scholarly treatises lay behind many of Callimachus'

recondite stories and details. This is most evident in the *Aetia*, where Callimachus occasionally

cites his authorities by name.[84] Among the prose sources of both poets, the philosophers deserve

---

[82] *Cf.* also ps.-Oppian's *Cyn.* 3.197–198.

[83] See *Hal.* 4.11–39 and *Cyn.* 2.410–425.

[84] See *Aet.* fr. 75.54–55, where Callimachus cites Xenomedes the mythographer as his source for the story of Acontius and Cydippe.

special mention. Stephens and Acosta-Hughes have shown that Plato loomed large in

Callimachus' poetic consciousness.[85] They rightly read Callimachus' injunction to judge a poem

by its craft (τέχνη) as, at least in part, a response to Plato's denial in the *Ion* that poetry is a *technē*.

Plato shows up in more surprising places too. The first line of Call. *hArt* contains the rare form

ἀειδοντέσσι, which is only otherwise attested in a Platonic "mis-citation" of Homer.[86] Stephens

suggests that here Callimachus has in mind both the Platonic and Homeric contexts. So too, we

might consider Callimachus' *epig.* 8 (8 G.P. = 42 Pf. = *AnthPal* 12.118).

> εἰ μὲν ἑκὼν, Ἀρχῖν᾽, ἐπεκώμασα, μυρία μέμφου,
>   εἰ δ᾽ ἄκων ἥκω, τὴν προπέτειαν ἔα.
> ἄκρητος καὶ ἔρως μ᾽ ἠνάγκασαν, ὧν ὁ μὲν αὐτῶν
>   εἷλκεν, ὁ δ᾽ οὐκ εἴα τὴν προπέτειαν ἐᾶν.
> ἐλθὼν δ᾽ οὐκ ἐβόησα τίς ἢ τίνος, ἀλλ᾽ ἐφίλησα [5]
>   τὴν φλιήν. εἰ τοῦτ᾽ ἔστ᾽ ἀδίκημ᾽, ἀδικέω.

> If I willingly reveled my way to Archis' house, reproach my without end,
> but if against my will I come , forgive my rashness—
> Wine and Love compelled me. The one dragged me forward,
> the other did not allow my rashness to depart.
> On my coming I did not shout, "who is he?" but kissed the doorpost.
> If this is a wrong, I am mistaken.

Here Callimachus cleverly plays with the philosophical notion that an individual is not morally

responsible for acts committed under compulsion (see Arist. *Nic. Eth.* 1135b). He moreover

oscillates between technical and common senses of words. The noun ἀδίκημα means "sin" or

"morally culpable act." We may thus take the final either as, "if this is a wrong, I am mistaken"

or "if this is a wrong, I'm in the wrong."[87] As we have seen, Gregory also responds to

philosophical and theological matters throughout his work. He shows himself knowledgable of

---

[85] Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 2012 23–83

[86] *Cf.* Plato, *Rep.* 424b and Hom. *Od.* 1.351–52. For discussion, see Stephens 2015 *ad loc.*

[87] Interestingly, this epigram is cited in Plutarch's *De cohibenda ira* 5, a treatise that Gregory likely consulted for his *Adv. iram*.

philosophical speculation on anger in the *Adv. iram*. The *Hymn Virg.* shows its author to be an original theologian creatively re-presenting the Christian narrative of sacred history.

Poetic Sources

Allusions are the most significant way that poets demonstrate their knowledge of prior verse. I wish to highlight two kinds. The first, in Richard Thomas's terminology a "correction," occurs when a poet polemically alludes to a specific passage in a prior poet. Thomas characterizes this as the "quintessentially Alexandrian type of reference."[88] These abound in Callimachus. At *hZeus* 18, for instance, Callimachus places Ἐρυμάνθος ("Erymanthus") at line end as Homer does in *Od.* 6.103. However in Callimachus, the Erymanthus is a river, not a mountain. More striking are a portion of Apollo's intra-uterine prophecy in the *hDel* 94. Here the fetal god declares that "nevertheless, I shall speak more sharply than from the laurel tree" (ἀλλ᾽ ἔμπης ἐρέω τι τομώτερον ἢ ἀπὸ δάφνης). Here Callimachus upstages the author of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, for at *Hom. Hymn Ap.* 396 Apollo speaks "from the laurel tree" (ἐκ δάφνης, also at line-end). The comparative (τομώτερον, "more sharply") and the disjunctive particles ἀλλ᾽ ἔμπης ("but nevertheless") further underscore Callimachus' reference to and reconfiguration of the *Hom. Hymn Ap.* Callimachus intentionally upstages the Homeric Apollo, for Callimachus' god not only speaks more fearsomely but does so from the womb.[89] The god promises to soon bathe his bow in the blood of Niobe's children (*hDel* 95–96). I have not noted any corrective allusions in Gregory's *Adv. iram*,[90] but they are prominent in his *Hymn Virg.* Lines 11–12 of the *Hymn Virg.*, as I have shown above, rework Callimachus' *hZeus* 91–92. Gregory turns lines directed toward an infamously promiscuous god into praise for pure Virginity. Even more striking is his reworking of

---

[88] Thomas 1986 185

[89] The humor of Apollo prophesying from within the womb is almost Ovidian.

[90] With the possible exception of his "correction" of Basil in *Adv. iram* 31–45.

Hesiod's *Theog.* 114, where the change of a single letter (χάος to φάος) renders "light" instead of "chaos" as the first thing to come into existence. Gregory thereby "corrects" Hesiod. Scholars working on Christian poetry typically label such instances as *Kontrastimitation*.[91] It is important to realize, however, that these *Kontrastimitationen* are continuations of an Alexandrian practice.

The second type of allusion I wish to consider is the so-called "window allusion," or in Thomas's terminology, the "conflation."[92] In such instances, a poet activates multiple antecedents and incorporates all of them into the new work. These are often difficult to spot in Callimachus, since much of the poetry between him and Homer has been lost. The opening lines of *hZeus* provides, however, a good example. Here Callimachus cites the proverb Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψευσταί ("Cretans are always liars"). The line comes from Epimenides, who in turn is adapting a line from Hesiod's *Theog.* 26. Both Epimenides and Hesiod contribute to the complicated relationship in Call. *hZeus* between truth and poetic fiction. "Cretans always lie" gives Callimachus his reason for rejecting a Cretan birth for Zeus. But the Hesiodic *Urtext* comes from the poetologically significant lines in which the Muses state that they know both how to lie and tell the truth, a theme Callimachus picks up later in the hymn when he expresses ironically his desire to "at least make fabrications in a persuasive manner" (ψευδοίμην ἀΐοντος ἅ κεν πεπίθοιεν ἀκουήν *hZeus* 65).

These sorts of "window allusions" are easier to spot in later poets, since we have much of the poetry they read. Gregory's *Adv. iram* has something of the sort, where an allusion to Sophocles' *Ajax* becomes of a means of jumping into the *Iliad*. The most common conflations in

---

[91] For a recent discussion of *Kontrastimitation* and the allusive practices of Late Antique Latin poets, see Kaufmann 2017.

[92] Thomas 1986 193

Gregory, however, involve prose sources. For instance, the beginning of the *Poem. arc.* mention a "small raft" on which one sets out on a great voyage. As both Edwards and Sykes note, Gregory is here adopting Platonic imagery for his philosophical poetry.[93] But Sykes is also right to note the resonance of Homer, most especially to Odysseus' small raft (σχεδίη) in *Od.* 5, when the hero sets out from Calypso's island and faces shipwreck.[94] Gregory also likes to allude to both scripture and classical sources simultaneously. Indeed the "single reference" to Hesiod's *Theog.* mentioned earlier is actually a conflation, since Gregory uses Genesis to correct his pagan source. The Christian Bible presents a wealth of non-Greek wisdom for a careful poet to exploit and allows Gregory to expand upon a Callimachean practice.

The Ends of Erudition
We now turn to the ends to which Gregory put his learning. Many of his poems, among them the *Adv. iram*, proclaim their pedagogical intent, and I see no reason to doubt that Gregory intended much of his poetry to be genuinely instructive. In the case of *Adv. iram*, Gregory's choice of the iambic meter lends the poem the clarity and accessibility that most modern commentators have noted.[95] No such didactic aim, however, is immediately apparent in Gregory's *Hymn Virg.* It is only once we read its successor, the *Agon*, that Gregory's suasive intent becomes manifest. But even here, Gregory seeks only to persuade the audience of the superiority of Virginity; he offers no practical solutions for living a chaste life. I have argued above that Gregory's contemporaries (especially Gregory of Nyssa) saw this lack of utility as a defect, and I suspect this lay behind

---

[93] See Edwards 2003 54 and Sykes and Moreschini 1997 *ad loc.*

[94] It would seem moreover that by characterizing the *Poemata arcana* as a "great voyage" (μακρὸν πλόον) in 1.1.1 1 and an "ascent to heaven with small wings" in 1.1.1 2 (τυτθαῖς πτερύγεσσι) Gregory asserts both Homeric and Callimachean ambitions for his great didactic sequence.

[95] See Ackermann 1903 30; Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 10; and Crimi 2018 137–38.

Gregory's decision to write the more practical *Praecepta ad uirgines* (1.2.2a) in his retirement. It probably also influenced the stress Gregory placed on "usefulness" in his *carm.* 2.1.39, which we examined in chapter 3.

The manner in which Gregory's didactic intent manifests in the *Adv. iram* cannot be called Callimachean or Alexandrian. Callimachus, so far as we know, wrote no didactic poetry. Aratus and Nicander probably did have a legitimate interest in their subject matter,[96] but neither the *Phaenomena* nor the *Theriaca* can be called practical. Gregory does elevate the iambic didactic genre to some extent, but the transparent practicality of the *Adv. iram* is hardly Alexandrian. The *Hymn Virg.*, by contrast, on generic grounds alone invites sustained comparison with Callimachus' *Hymns*. Gregory's suasive intent is not exactly hidden: he wants to show that virginity is the superior mode of life. But this only becomes explicit in the *Agon*. Callimachus' *Hymns* are less didactic, but even in the Alexandrian poet the didactic element is not altogether absent. The Hesiodic excursus on the just and unjust cities in Call. *hArt* 124–35 is the most extensive example. But Callimachus also comments in *hAp* upon the correct way to write poetry; the Erysichthon story in *hDem* implicitly critiques gluttony and the beginning of *hAth* mocks excessive female adornment. Gregory's didactic intent thus sometimes manifests in an Alexandrian mode, while on other occasions he chooses a more straightforward manner of expression.

In Alexandrian fashion, Gregory also puts his erudition to polemical ends. The final lines of the *Adv. iram* make it clear that the work was directed in part at the clerical elite in Constantinople, who had engineered Gregory's retirement. The work functions as a demonstration of the author's superior *paideia* and spirituality. In the *Hymn Virg.*, we have seen

---

[96] Fakas 2001 and Overduin 2014 represent a popular approach to Aratus and Nicander that stresses their literary ambitions to the exclusion of a legitimate interest in their subject matter. Lightfoot 2014, Jacques 2002 and R. L. Hunter 2008b by contrast see poetic ambitions as compatible with scientific curiosity.

how Gregory corrects predecessors and demonstrates his knowledge of Christian and pagan literature. Callimachus of course also portrayed himself as engaged in literary polemic; the prologue to the *Aetia* is only the most famous example. The end of *hAp* answered aesthetic critique, as did his *Iambi* 1 and 13. Gregory's *Hymn Virg.* displays another sort of polemic, an emulatory impulse in competition with the literary past. Through allusions to Callimachus, Hesiod, and the Oppians, Gregory elusively attacked Greek mores and theology. Erudition thereby becomes paradoxically a means of a distancing oneself from the literary past.

Both Gregory and Callimachus also had larger cultural ends in view. In the 3rd c. BC, Callimachus was working in Alexandria, a recently founded city in a barbarian land. Moreover, his most important patron was a Macedonian king, whom many Greeks of the mainland considered a barbarian. The Ptolemaic dynasty in Egypt exerted military and political dominance; but its cultural cachet was still a work in progress. The Greeks of Ptolemaic Egypt had to contend with Egyptian traditions that stretched back millennia, and an Athens that may have been eclipsed politically, but whose cultural prestige remained immense. Callimachus found himself between these two traditions and set himself two tasks: to recast the narrative of Greek literature so that it climaxed in Egypt, and to incorporate Egyptian myth and ideology into his work, and thereby to forge a new poetic synthesis of the two cultures.[97]

Gregory also found himself in a politically ascendant, but culturally precarious situation. For all the political influence Christianity had gained since the ascension of Constantine, the cultural achievements had still to be created.[98] Gregory's education bequeathed to him an easy

---

[97] I have here relied heavily on the excellent work of Stephens 2003 74–114.

[98] Cameron 2010 has argued that the self-perceived cultural inferiority of the Christians in the fourth century actually led to them "out-classicize" their pagan contemporaries.

familiarity with a vast and self-confident Greek tradition. Like Callimachus, he needed to infuse

this Greek tradition with non-Greek wisdom (iChristianity) and reorient this long line of

eloquence so that it climaxed in the new Christian world. We saw this at work in Gregory's

sequence of *chreiae* in *Adv. iram*, where pagan virtue culminates not in Julian's Neoplatonic

paganism, but the Christian piety of Julian's predecessor Constantius II. The analogy between

Gregory and Callimachus is not perfect. Gregory's Christianity was no doubt more essential to

his identity than Callimachus' status as a Cyrenean turned "Egyptian." But Gregory's precarious

cultural position means that in some respects, he had more in common with Callimachus or the

Augustan poets than with the more recent authors of the Second Sophistic, for whom the cultural

task was to assert the ongoing relevance of Hellenism in a world empire dominated by Rome.

The task of Gregory and Callimachus, by contrast, was to appropriate Greek literature for the

benefit of a new "barbarian" world. Such comparisons allow us to better contextualize the

Christian response to classical *paideia* in the fourth century. Christians were not the first

practitioners of Greek eloquence that needed to incorporate a new "barbarian wisdom" or to

reshape the literary tradition according to new political and religious ends. The antagonism

between Christianity and Hellenism could be quite stark, but we have precedents, not only in

Jewish authors like Philo, but also within the Greek tradition itself for the cultural project in

which Gregory was a leading light.

Appendix to Chapter 4: The Compositional History and Date of *Hymn Virg.* and the *Agon*

Though the *Hymn Virg.* is joined in the manuscripts with its successor, the *Agon*, Sundermann and Sicherl have shown that we have two poems, not one.[1] Not only does the poem neatly divide after line 214 into the *Hymn Virg.* and the *Agon*, but external evidence indicates that originally the two pieces were treated as separate poems. We possess a Syriac translation of only the *Hymn Virg.* without the *Agon*. Moreover, Jerome mentions only the *Agon* without the hymn.[2] While the *Agon* certainly does grow out of and depends upon the *Hymn* (McDonald persuasively highlights numerous instances where the *Agon* presupposes the *Hymn Virg.*[3]), I regard this as development within a poetic sequence, rather than evidence of one poem. These close links do suggest, however, that the poems were composed originally at the same time.

Gregory's mention of Julian's death in the *Agon* (1.2.1b 460) establishes a *terminus post quem* for the poem (363 AD). Jan Szymusiak and Carmen-Marie Szymusiak-Affholder dated the poem precisely to 371 and 372 respectively, without solid evidence.[4] Sundermann was uncertain over the date of the poem,[5] while Zehles and Zamora dated the poem to the 380s.[6] More recently, McGuckin has suggested the virginity poems should be dated to Gregory's stay at the shrine of Thekla in Seleukia (375–78), but he only provides.[7]

---

[1] See Sundermann 1991 4 and Sicherl 2002 313.

[2] *liber, hexametro versu, Virginitatis et nuptiarum contra se disserentium* ("A work in hexameter in which Virginity and the Married Life compete with one another" *De viris illustribus* 117).

[3] See McDonald 2019.

[4] See Szymusiak 1963 55 and Szymusiak-Affholder 1971.

[5] See Sundermann 1991 19.

[6] See Zehles and Zamora 1996 2–4.

[7] See McGuckin 2006 203.

Zehles and Zamora have provided the most evidence for their proposed date. They have analyzed the lines that appear in both the *Poemata arcana* and the *Hymn Virg.* and judged that the *Hymn Virg.* was written after the *Poemata arcana*. As the *Poemata arcana* can be dated with fair certainty to Gregory's retirement,[8] they judge that the *Hymn Virg.* must also date from this period.

The lines that appear in both poems are:

- *Hymn Virg.* 15–19 are identical to *Poem. arc.* 6.8–12.
- *Hymn Virg.* 31–34 are identical to *Poem. arc.* 6.13–16.
- *Hymn Virg.* 48–50 are identical to *Poem. arc.* 6.17–19.
- *Hymn Virg.* 56–99 overlap substantially with *Poem. arc.* 7.55–77.
- *Hymn Virg.* 137–154 overlap substantially with *Poem. arc* 8.32–52.

In each case, they Zehles and Zamora have argued, wrongly in my view, for the priority of the lines in *Poemata arcana*. They are correct that *Hymn Virg.* 15–19 and 48–50 originated in the *Poemata arcana*, but the reverse is true for the other overlapping passages. I posit therefore a more complicated picture: Gregory used many lines that he had written for the *Hymn Virg.* for his *Poemata arcana*, but then subsequently edited the *Hymn Virg.* In doing so, he introduced some lines that had been written first for the *Poemata arcana*. Scholars have detected in the *Orations* similar evidence of Gregory editing his work in retirement.[9] Moreschini has observed similar editing in *De rebus suis* (2.1.1),[10] and I argue in chapter five that the Gregory edited in similar fashion his *Carmen lugubre* (*carm.* 2.1.45). The earlier version of the *Hymn Virg.* probably dates from the late 360s or 370s, since the mention of Julian would be more salient then than later, and because the *Hymn Virg.* and *Agon* probably predate Nyssen's *On Virginity*, which can be dated safely to the early 370s. But let us first consider the lines repeated in the *Hymn Virg.* and the *Poem. arc.*

---

[8] Sykes and Moreschini 1997 63–67

[9] See McGuckin 2001 1.

[10] Bady, Tuilier, and Bernardi 2004 LI

Hymn Virg. **15–19, 31–34, and 48–50**

I here place *Hymn Virg.* 11–55 followed by *Poem. arc.* 6.1–19. Repeated lines are printed in bold.

Hymn Virg. **11–55**

Παρθενίη, μέγα χαῖρε, θεόσδοτε, δῶτερ ἐάων,
Μῆτερ ἀπημοσύνης, Χριστοῦ λάχος, οὐρανίοισι
Κάλλεσιν ἀζυγέεσσιν ὁμόζυγε · ἀζυγέες γὰρ,
Πρῶτα Θεὸς, μετέπειτα Θεοῦ χορὸς αἰὲν ἐόντος.
Ἤτοι ὁ μὲν πηγὴ φαέων, φάος οὔτ' ὀνομαστὸν, [15]
Οὔθ' ἑλετὸν, φεῦγόν τε νόου τάχος ἐγγὺς ἰόντος,
Αἰὲν ὑπεκπροθέον πάντων φρένας, ὥς κε πόθοισιν
Ἑλκώμεσθα πρὸς ὕψος ἀεὶ νέον · οἱ δέ τε φῶτα
Δεύτερα ἐκ Τριάδος βασιλήϊον εὖχος ἐχούσης.
Πρώτη παρθένος ἐστὶν ἁγνὴ Τριάς. Ἐκ μὲν ἀνάρχου [20]
Πατρὸς Υἱὸς ἄναξ, οὔτ' ἔκτοθεν ὁρμηθέντος
(Αὐτὸς γὰρ πάντεσσιν ὁδὸς καὶ ῥίζα καὶ ἀρχὴ),
Οὔτε πάϊν θνητοῖσιν ὁμοίϊα γειναμένοιο,
Ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκ σέλαος σέλας ἔρχεται. Ἐκ δ' ἄρα Παιδὸς,
Οὐκέτι παῖς ἀγαπητὸς ὁμοίϊον εὖχος ἐφέλκων · [25]
Ὥς κεν ὁ μὲν μίμνη γενέτης ὅλος, αὐτὰρ ὅγ' Υἱὸς
Οἷον καὶ μούνοιο μονώτατος · εἰς ἓν ἰόντε
Πνεύματι σὺν μεγάλῳ, τό ῥα πατρόθεν εἶσιν ὁμοῖον,
Εἷς Θεὸς ἐν τρισσοῖσιν ἀνοιγόμενος φαέεσσι.
Τοίη μὲν Τριάδος καθαρὴ φύσις. Ἐκ δ' ἄρα κείνης, [30]
Ἄγγελοι αἰγλήεντες, ἀειδέες, οἵ ῥα θόωκον
Ἀμφὶ μέγαν βεβαῶτες, ἐπεὶ νόες εἰσὶν ἐλαφροὶ,
Πῦρ καὶ πνεύματα θεῖα δι' ἠέρος ὦκα θέοντες,
Ἐσσυμένως μεγάλῃσιν ὑποδρήσσουσιν ἐφετμαῖς.
Τοῖσι μὲν οὔτε γάμος, οὔτ' ἄλγεα, οὐ μελεδῶναι, [35]
Οὐ παθέων κλόνος αἰνὸς ἀτάσθαλος · οὐ μελέεσσι
Σχίζοντ', οὐδὲ δόμοισιν · ὁμόφρονες ἀλλήλοισιν,
Αὐτῷ τ' αὐτὸς ἕκαστος. Ἤη φύσις, ἕν τε νόημα,
Εἷς πόθος ἀμφὶ ἄνακτα Θεὸν μέγαν. Οὐδέ τι παισὶ
Τέρπουντ', οὔτ' ἀλόχοισι, γλυκὺν πόνον ἀμφιέποντες · [40]
Οὐ πλοῦτος κείνοισιν ἐράσμιος, οὐδ' ὅσα θνητοῖς
Γαῖα φέρει κακίης μελεδήματα. Οὐκ ἀρόουσιν,
Οὐ πελάγη πλώουσιν ἀτειρέος εἵνεκα γαστρὸς,
Γαστέρος ἀρχεκάκοιο · τροφὴ μία πᾶσιν ἀρίστη
Δαίνυσθαι μεγάλοιο Θεοῦ λόγον, ἠδὲ φαεινῆς [45]
Ἕλκειν ἐκ Τριάδος σέλας ἄπλετον. Οἰόβιοι δὲ
Ζώουσιν καθαροῖο Θεοῦ καθαροὶ θεράποντες,
Ἁπλοῖ τε, νοεροί τε, διαυγέες, οὔτ' ἀπὸ σαρκῶν
Ἀρχόμενοι (σάρκες γὰρ ἐπεὶ πάγεν, αὖθις ὀλοῦνται),
Οὔτ' ἐπὶ σάρκας ἰόντες, ὅπερ δ' ἐγένοντο, μένοντες. [50]

Τοῖς μέτα παρθενίη θεοείκελος, οἶμος ἑτοίμη
Πρὸς Θεὸν, ἑσπομένη τε νοήμασιν Ἀθανάτοιο
Νωμῶντος μεγάλοιο σοφῶς οἰήϊα κόσμου ·
Ἐν δὲ καὶ οὐρανίδην, χθόνιον, μεγαλήνορα, θνητόν,
Ἀνθρώπων μογερῶν ἱερὸν γένος, εὖχος Ἄνακτος. [55]

Poem. arc. 6.1–26

Οἵη δ᾽ ὑετίοιο κατ᾽ ἠέρος εὐδιόωντος,
Ἀντομένη νεφέεσσιν ἀποκρούστοις περιωγαῖς,
Ἀκτὶς ἠελίοιο πολύχροον ἶριν ἑλίσσει,
Ἀμφὶ δέ μιν πάντη σελαγίζεται ἐγγύθεν αἰθὴρ,
Κύκλοισιν πυκινοῖσι καὶ ἔκτοθε λυομένοισι · [5]
Τοίη καὶ φαέων πέλεται φύσις, ἀκροτάτοιο
Φωτὸς ἀποστίλβοντος ἀεὶ νόας ἥσσονας αὐγαῖς.
Ἤτοι ὁ μὲν πηγὴ φαέων, φάος οὔτ᾽ ὀνομαστὸν,
Οὔθ᾽ ἑλετὸν, φεῦγόν τε νόου τάχος ἐγγὺς ἰόντος,
Αἰὲν ὑπεκπροθέον πάντων φρένας, ὥς κε πόθοισι [10]
Τεινώμεσθα πρὸς ὕψος ἀεὶ νέον. Οἱ δέ τε φῶτα
Δεύτερα ἐκ Τριάδος βασιλήϊον εὖχος ἐχούσης,
Ἄγγελοι αἰγλήεντες, ἀειδέες, οἵ ῥα θόωκον
Ἀμφὶ μέγαν βεβαῶτες, ἐπεὶ νόες εἰσὶν ἐλαφροὶ,
Πῦρ καὶ πνεύματα θεῖα δι᾽ ἠέρος ὦκα θέοντες [15]
Ἐσσυμένως μεγάλῃσιν ὑποδρήσσουσιν ἐφετμαῖς,
Ἁπλοῖ τε, νοεροί τε, διαυγέες, οὔτ᾽ ἀπὸ σαρκῶν
Ἐρχόμενοι (σάρκες γὰρ ἐπεὶ πάγεν αὖθις ὀλοῦνται),
Οὔτ᾽ ἐπὶ σάρκας ἰόντες, ὅπερ δ᾽ ἐγένοντο μένοντες.
Ἤθελον εἰπεῖν πάμπαν ἀτειρέες · ἀλλ᾽ ἄνεχ᾽ ἵππον [20]
Καὶ μάλα θερμὸν ἐόντα, νόου ψαλίοισιν ἐέργων.
Καί ῥ᾽ οἱ μὲν μεγάλοιο παραστάται εἰσὶ Θεοῖο ·
Οἱ δ᾽ ἄρα κόσμον ἅπαντα ἑαῖς κρατέουσιν ἀρωγαῖς,
Ἄλλην ἄλλος ἔχοντες ἐπιστασίην παρ᾽ ἄνακτος,
Ἄνδρας τε, πτόλιάς τε, καὶ ἔθνεα πάνθ᾽ ὁρόωντες, [25]
Καὶ λογικῶν θυέων ἐπιίστορες ἡμερίοισι.

I agree with Zehles and Zamora that *Hymn Virg.* 15–19 originated in *Carm. arc.* 6. They may be removed from the *Hymn Virg.* without hurting the sense. Indeed, removing them results in a nice anaphora (πρῶτα … πρώτη), a technique certainly favored by Gregory.[11] By contrast, the lines are indispensable in *Carm. arc.* 6, where they develop the opening simile of the sunbeam and

---

[11] See my section entitled, "Repetitions" in chapter three.

introduce the following section on angels. Likewise, I think Zehles and Zamora are right to see *Carm. arc.* 6.17–19 as the source for *Hymn Virg.* 48–50. The lines may be removed from the *Hymn Virg.* without any harm, but they are essential in *Carm. arc.* 6, where the exposition of angelic substance is a central theme.

The *Hymn Virg.*, however, must be the original context of *Hymn Virg.* 31–34. They continue the sentence that begins after the bucolic diaeresis in *Hymn Virg.* 30 and the context demands some description of angelic beings, especially as virgins were frequently said in this sort of literature to live lives "like the angels."[12] Zehles and Zamora acknowledge the syntactical connection, but wrongly assert that the verses are dispensable in terms of content.[13] The lines work nicely in *Carm. arc.* 6 13–15, but may be removed without any harm to the syntax or content. The complicated interrelationship of the two poems has already become evident.

Hymn Virg. 56–99 and Poem. arc. 7.53–83
Hymn Virg. 56–109

> Εἰ δ᾽ ἄγε νῦν ἐρέω μυστήρια κεδνὰ Θεοῖο,
> Παρθενίη τε χρόνοισιν ὅπως πυμάτοισιν ἔλαμψεν.
> **Ἦν ποτ᾽ ἔην**, ὅτε πάντα κελαινὴ νὺξ ἐκάλυπτεν.
> Οὐδ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἔην ἠοῦς ἐρατὸν φάος · οὐδὲ κέλευθον
> Ἠέλιος πυρόεσσαν ἐπέσσυτο ἀντολίηθεν. [60]
> Οὐ μήνη κερόεσσα φαείνετο, νυκτὸς ἄγαλμα.
> Πάντα δ᾽ ἅμ᾽ ἀλλήλοισι φορούμενα, μὰψ ἀλάλητο
> Πρωτογόνου χάεος ζοφεροῖς δεδμημένα δεσμοῖς.
> Ἀλλὰ σύ, Χριστὲ μάκαρ, Πατρὸς μεγάλου φραδίῃσι
> Πειθόμενος τὰ ἕκαστα διέκρινας εὖ κατὰ κόσμον. [65]
> Ἤτοι μὲν πρώτιστα φάος γένεθ᾽, ὥς κεν ἅπαντα
> Ἔργα πέλοι χαρίεντα φάους πλέα. Αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
> Οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα κυκλώσαο, θαῦμα μέγιστον,
> Ἠελίῳ μήνῃ τε διαυγέα. Τοῖσιν ἔειπας,
> Τῷ μὲν ἄρ᾽ ἠριγένειαν ἐπ᾽ ἀνθρώποισι φαείνειν [70]

---

[12] For examples in Methodius and Ps.-Basil, see *Symp.* Logos 8.2, 9.5; *De vera virginitate* 51–53. See Ranke-Heinemann 1956 for a general treatment.

[13] "*inhaltlich entbehrlich*" Zehles and Zamora 1996 2

Φωτὸς ἀπειρεσίοιο ῥοαῖς, καὶ ὥρας ἑλίσσειν ·
Τῇ δὲ κνέφας σελάειν, καὶ δεύτερον ἦμαρ ὀπάζειν.
Τῷ δ᾽ ὑπὸ γαῖαν ἔθηκας ἐμὸν ἔδος, ἐν δὲ θάλασσαν
Γαίης ἀγκαλίδεσσιν ἔδησας, γῆν δὲ θαλάσσῃ
Ὠκεανοῦ κόλποισι περίρρυτον. **ὡς**[14] **δὲ τὰ πάντα** [75]
Κόσμος ἔην, γαίη τε, καὶ οὐρανὸς, ἠδὲ θάλασσα,
Οὐρανὸς οὐρανίοισιν ἀγαλλόμενος φαέεσσι,
Πόντος δὲ πλωτοῖς, πεζοῖς δέ τε γαῖα πελώρη,[15]
Ἀθρήσας τότ᾽ ἔπειτα καὶ ἄρμενα πάντα νοήσας,
Τέρπετο Παιδὸς ἄνακτος ὁμοφρονέουσιν ἐπ᾽ ἔργοις. [80]
Δίζετο καὶ σοφίης ἐπιΐστορα μητρὸς ἀπάντων,
Καὶ χθονίων βασιλῆα θεουδέα, καὶ τόδ᾽ ἔειπεν ·
Ἤδη μὲν καθαροὶ καὶ ἀείζωοι θεράποντες
Οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν, ἁγνοὶ νόες, ἄγγελοι ἐσθλοὶ,
Ὑμνοπόλοι, μέλποντες ἐμὸν κλέος οὔποτε λῆγον ·[85]
Γαῖα δ᾽ ἔτι ζώοισιν ἀγάλλεται ἀφραδέουσι.
ξυνὸν ἔτ᾽ ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐμοὶ γένος εὔαδε πῆξαι
Θνητῶν τ᾽ ἀθανάτων τε νοήμονα φῶτα μεσηγὺ,
Τερπόμενόν τ᾽ ἔργοισιν ἐμοῖς, καὶ ἐχέφρονα μύστην
Οὐρανίων, χθονίων τε μέγα κράτος, ἄγγελον ἄλλον [90]
Ἐκ χθονὸς, ὑμνητῆρά τ᾽ ἐμῶν μενέων τε νόου τε.
Ὥς ἄρ᾽ ἔφη, καὶ μοῖραν ἑλὼν νεοπηγέος αἴης,
Χείρεσιν ἀθανάτῃσιν ἐμὴν ἐστήσατο μορφήν.
Τῇ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἑῆς ζωῆς μοιρήσατο · ἐν γὰρ ἔηκε
Πνεῦμα, τὸ δὴ θεότητος ἀειδέος ἐστὶν ἀπορρώξ. [95]
Ἐκ δὲ χοὸς πνοιῆς τε βροτὸς γένετ᾽, ἀθανάτοιο
Εἰκών · ἧ γὰρ ἄνασσα νόου φύσις ἀμφοτέροισι.
Τοὔνεκα καὶ βίοτον τὸν μὲν στέργω διὰ γαῖαν,
Τοῦ δ᾽ ἔρον ἐν στήθεσσιν ἔχω θείην διὰ μοῖραν.
Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ θεῖον μὲν ἐπὶ χθονὶ πλάσμα φαάνθη, [100]
Καὶ χθονὸς, ἐν γυάλοισιν ἀειθαλέος παραδείσου,
Τῷ δ᾽ οὔπω τις ἀρωγὸς ὁμοίϊος ἔσκε βίοιο,
Δὴ τότε μητιέταο Λόγου τόδε θαῦμα μέγιστον ·
Τὸν βροτὸν, ὅνπερ ἔτευξεν ἑοῦ θηήτορα κόσμου,
Ῥίζαν ἐμὴν, καὶ σπέρμα πολυσχιδέος βιότοιο, [105]
Ἄνδιχα μοιρήσας μεγάλῃ ζωαρκέϊ χειρὶ,
Πλευρὴν ἐκ λαγόνων μούνην ἕλε, τήν ῥα γυναῖκα
Δειμάμενος, καὶ φίλτρον ἐνὶ στέρνοισι κεράσσας,
Ἀμφοτέροις ἐφέηκεν ἐπ᾽ ἀλλήλοισι φέρεσθαι ·

---

[14] Caillau prints Ὥς.

[15] Caillau prints here a full stop.

***Poem. arc.* 7.53–83**

Ἡμέτερον δ' ἀΐοις ψυχῆς πέρι μῦθον ἄριστον.
Ἔνθεν ἑλὼν, τέρψιν δὲ μικρὴν ἀναμίξομεν οἴμῃ.
Ἦν ποτε ἦν ὅτε κόσμον ἐπήξατο νοῦ Λόγος αἰπὺς, [55]
Ἑσπόμενος μεγάλοιο νόῳ Πατρὸς, οὐ πρὶν ἐόντα.
Εἶπεν ὅδ', ἐκτετέλεστο ὅσον θέλεν. **Ὡς δὲ τὰ πάντα**
Κόσμος ἔην, γαίη τε καὶ οὐρανὸς ἠδὲ θάλασσα,
Δίζετο καὶ σοφίης ἐπιίστορα μητρὸς ἀπάντων,
Καὶ χθονίων βασιλῆα θεουδέα, καὶ τόδ' ἔειπεν · [60]
«Ἤδη μὲν καθαροὶ καὶ ἀείζωοι θεράποντες
Οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν ἁγνοὶ νόες, ἄγγελοι ἐσθλοὶ,
Ὑμνοπόλοι μέλποντες ἐμὸν κλέος οὔποτε λῆγον ·
Γαῖα δ' ἔτι ζώοισιν ἀγάλλεται ἀφραδέεσσι.
Ξυνὸν δ' ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐμοὶ γένος εὔαδε πῆξαι [65]
Θνητῶν τ' ἀθανάτων τε νοήμονα φῶτα μεσηγὺ,
Τερπόμενόν τ' ἔργοισιν ἐμοῖς, καὶ ἐχέφρονα μύστην
Οὐρανίων, γαίης τε μέγα κράτος, ἄγγελον ἄλλον
Ἐκ χθονὸς, ὑμνητῆρα ἐμῶν μενέων τε, νόου τε.»
Ὡς ἄρ' ἔφη, καὶ μοῖραν ἑλὼν νεοπηγέος αἴης, [70]
Χείρεσιν ἀθανάτῃσιν ἐμὴν ἐστήσατο μορφὴν,
Τῇ δ' ἄρ' ἑῆς ζωῆς μοιρήσατο. Ἐν γὰρ ἔηκε
Πνεῦμα, τὸ δὴ θεότητος ἀειδέος ἐστὶν ἀπόρρώξ.
Ἐκ δὲ χοὸς πνοιῆς τε πάγην βροτὸς ἀθανάτοιο
Εἰκών · ἣ γὰρ ἄνασσα νόου φύσις ἀμφοτέροισι. [75]
Τούνεκα καὶ βίοτον τὸν μὲν στέργω διὰ γαῖαν,
Τοῦ δ' ἔρον ἐν στήθεσσιν ἔχω θείαν διὰ μοῖραν.
Ἥδε μὲν ἀρχεγόνοιο βροτοῦ δέσις. Αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
Σῶμα μὲν ἐκ σαρκῶν, ψυχὴ δ' ἐπιμίσγετ' ἀΐστως,
Ἔκτοθεν εἰσπίπτουσα πλάσει χοός. [80]

In *Poem. arc.* 7 (*De anima*), Gregory inserts narrative detailing the creation of man in order to illustrate his own theory of soul. In the *Hymn Virg.* the lines follow the creation of the physical universe and precede the creation of Eve. *Poem. arc.* 7.55 begins in the same manner as *Hymn Virg.* 58, which also introduces a creation narrative. In *Poem. arc.* 7 Gregory largely elides the creation of the physical universe. He does use, however, the same line and a half in the summary in 57–58 as he does in *Hymn Virg.* 75–76. *Poem. arc.* 59–77 then overlap precisely with *Hymn Virg.* 81–99.

The digressive formula used to introduce the narrative in *Poem. arc.* 7.53–54 and the indispensability of the lines from the *Hymn Virg.*, where Adam's creation must be interposed

between that of the universe and Eve, indicate that the lines were originally composed for the *Hymn Virg.* Zehles and Zamora acknowledge these,[16] yet they insist that the lines were originally composed for the *Poem. arc.* 7 on the basis of the apparent asyndeton between *Hymn Virg.* 80–81 and the better syntactical integration of *Poem. arc.* 58–59.[17] However, the phrase δίζετο καί that begins *Hymn Virg.* 81 should probably be regarded as an instance of anastrophe, in which a connecting καί has been placed in an uncustomary location. Callimachus used this technique relatively frequently.[18] Even if we find asyndeton more likely than anastrophe, Gregory uses ayndeton frequently enough that its presence should not outweigh the contextual factors mentioned above.[19]

Hymn Virg. 137–155 and Poem. arc. 8.32–52
Hymn Virg. 128–155:

> Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κόλποι τε καὶ εὐρέα πείρατα γαίης,
> Ἀντολίη τε, δύσις τε, νότου πλευρὴ, βορέου τε
> Πλῆσθεν ἐφημερίων, ὕβριν δ' ἐξέζεσεν ἰλὺς, [130]
> Καὶ πολλοῖσι πάρος παιδεύμασι πλάσμα δαμασθὲν
> Γλώσσαις τεμνομένησι, καὶ ὕδασι, καὶ πυρὸς ὄμβροις,
> Καὶ γραπτοῖο νόμοιο διδάγμασιν, ἠδὲ προφήταις,
> Οὐκ ἔθελε πρώτης κακίης ἀπὸ δεσμὰ τινάξαι,
> Ἀλλ' αἰεὶ στερεοῖσιν ἐν ἄμμασιν εἴχετο σαρκὸς, [135]
> Μαχλοσύναις τε, μέθαις τε καὶ εἰδώλοισι μεμηνὸς,
> **Ὑστάτιον τοιῆσδε φίλον γένος ἔμμορε τιμῆς**
> **Νεύμασιν ἀθανάτοιο Πατρὸς, καὶ ἔργμασι Παιδός.**
> Χριστὸς, ὅσον βροτέῳ ἐνὶ σώματι κάτθετο μοίρης
> Οὐρανίης, λεύσσων κακίης ὕπο θυμοβόροιο [140]
> **Δαπτόμενον, σκολιόν τε βροτῶν μεδέοντα δράκοντα,**
> Ὥς κεν ἀναστήσειεν ἐὸν λάχος, οὐκέτι νοῦσον
> Ἄλλοισιν ἐφέηκεν ἀρηγόσιν, (οὐ γὰρ ἐπαρκὲς

---

[16] Zehles and Zamora 1996 3.

[17] Zehles and Zamora 1996 3 follow Wyss 1946 167.

[18] See my remarks in chapter 3 in the section "Syntax."

[19] I have noted at least five other instances in the *Hymn Virg.* (61, 69. 104, 139, and 156). A more thorough search would undoubtedly turn up more examples. Asyndeton is more common in argumentative sections, like *Poem. arc.* 2 (see 5, 13, 18, and 19).

Τοῖς μεγάλοις παθέεσσι μικρὸν ἄκος ʼ) ἀλλὰ κενώσας
Ὃν κλέος, οὐράνιός τε καὶ ἄτροπος οὐρανίοιο [145]
Εἰκών, ἀνδρομέοις τε καὶ οὐ βροτέοισι νόμοισι,
Σεμνοῖς ἐν σπλάγχνοισιν ἀπειρογάμοιο γυναικὸς
Σαρκωθείς, ὦ θάμβος ἀφαυροτάτοισιν ἄπιστον,
Ἦλθε Θεὸς θνητός τε, φύσεις δύο εἰς ἓν ἀγείρας,
Τὴν μὲν κευθομένην, τὴν δ᾽ ἀμφαδίην μερόπεσσιν, [150]
Ὧν Θεὸς ἡ μὲν ἔην, ἡ δ᾽ ὕστατον ἄμμιν ἐτύχθη,
Τῆμος, ὅτ᾽ ἐν σπλάγχνοισι μίγη Θεὸς ἀνδρομέοισιν ·
Εἷς Θεὸς ἀμφοτέρωθεν · ἐπεὶ θεότητι κερασθείς,
Καὶ βροτὸς ἐκ θεότητος ἄναξ καὶ Χριστὸς ὑπέστη.
Καινὴ δ᾽ ἔπλετο μίξις, ἐπεὶ προτέρην ἀθέριξα. [155]

Poem. arc. **8.31–59:**

Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν μετόπισθ᾽. Οἱ δ᾽ ὡς νόμον εἶχον ἄτιμον,
Ὑστάτιον τοιῆσδε βροτῶν γένος ἔμμορε τιμῆς,
Νεύμασιν ἀθανάτοιο Πατρὸς, καὶ ἔργμασι Παιδός ·
Χριστὸς ὅσον βροτέων ἐνὶ σώματι κάτθετο μοίρης
Οὐρανίης, λεύσσων κακίης ὕπο θυμοβόροιο [35]
Δαπτόμενον, σκολιόν τε βροτῶν μεδέοντα δράκοντα,
Ὥς κεν ἀναστήσειεν ἑὸν λάχος, οὐκ ἔτι νοῦσον
Ἄλλοισιν ἐφῆκεν ἀρηγόσιν (οὐ γὰρ ἐπαρκὲς
Τοῖς μεγάλοις παθέεσσι μικρὸν ἄκος) · ἀλλὰ κενώσας
Ὃν κλέος ἀθανάτοιο Θεοῦ Πατρὸς Υἱὸς ἀμήτωρ [40]
Αὐτὸς καὶ δίχα πατρὸς ἐμοὶ ξένος υἱὸς ἐφάνθη ·
Οὐ ξένος, ἐξ ἐμέθεν γὰρ ὅδ᾽ ἄμβροτος ἦλθε βροτωθεὶς
Παρθενικῆς διὰ μητρὸς, ὅλον μ᾽ ὅλος ὄφρα σαώσῃ.
Καὶ γὰρ ὅλος πέπτωκεν Ἀδὰμ διὰ γεῦσιν ἀλιτρήν.
Τοὔνεκεν ἀνδρομέοισι καὶ οὐ βροτέοισι νόμοισι, [45]
Σεμνοῖς ἐν σπλάγχνοισιν ἀπειρογάμοιο γυναικὸς
Σαρκωθεὶς (ὦ θάμβος ἀφαυροτάτοισιν ἄπιστον!)
Ἦλθε Θεὸς θνητός τε, φύσις δύο εἰς ἓν ἀγείρας,
Τὴν μὲν κευθομένην, τὴν δ᾽ ἀμφαδίην μερόπεσσιν
Ὧν Θεὸς ἡ μὲν ἔην, ἡ δ᾽ ὕστατον ἡμῖν ἐτύχθη. [50]
Εἷς Θεὸς ἀμφοτέρωθεν, ἐπεὶ θεότητι κερασθεὶς,
Καὶ βροτὸς ἐκ θεότητος ἄναξ καὶ Χριστὸς ὑπέστη ·
Ὥς κεν Ἀδὰμ νέος ἄλλος ἐπιχθονίοισι φαανθεὶς,
Τὸν πάρος ἐξακέσαιτο, πετάσματι δ᾽ ἀμφὶ καλυφθεὶς
(Οὐ γὰρ ἔην χωρητὸς ἐμοῖς παθέεσσι πελάσσαι), [55]
Καὶ πινυτὸν δοκέοντα ὄφιν σφήλειεν ἀέλπτως,
Ὡς μὲν Ἀδὰμ πελάσοντα, Θεῷ δέ τε ἀντιάσοντα,
Τῷ πέρι κάρτος ἔμελλεν ἑῆς ἄξειν κακότητος,
Τρηχείην περὶ πέτραν ἁλίκτυπον ὥς τε θάλασσα.

Hymn Virg. 137–49 overlap with *Poem. arc.* 8.82–40 and 45–52, with the exception of *Hymn Virg.* 152, which does not appear in *Poem. arc.* 8. In the both poems, the lines follow description of Israelite disobedience in the Old Testament. The *Hymn Virg.* then narrates Christ's life on earth, while *Poem. arc.* 8 meditates on the Adam/Christ typology before describing the coming of the Magi following Christ's birth. In both instances, the opening line beginning with ὑστάτιον (*Hymn Virg.* 137 and *Poem. arc.* 8.32) are syntactically integrated with a preceding temporal clause.

Several features of the passages suggest that the lines were originally composed for the *Hymn Virg.* The preceding temporal clause in the *Hymn Virg.* is quite long, running from 128–136, while the clause in *Poem. arc.* 8.31 occupies only half a line. It would be easier to write a half-line to introduce an extant group of verses than an elaborate 9 line temporal clause. More importantly, the lines can not easily be removed from the *Hymn Virg.* We need a description of the virginal conception. Yet Zehles and Zamora argue instead for the priority of *Poem. arc.* 8. They suppose that *Poem. arc.* 8.40–44 would have fit nicely in *Hymn Virg.* since they touch on the virgin birth. If Gregory had taken the lines from the *Hymn Virg.* to incorporate into *Poem. arc.* 8, they surmise, there would have been no reason to insert five lines about the virgin birth. Of course, this raises the question of why Gregory would do the reverse– Why would he remove lines about the virgin birth when inserting them into a hymn praising Virginity? At this point, Zehles and Zamora imagine that Gregory removed *Poem arc.* 8.40–44 because he felt them to be a doublet to the lines that followed (*Poem arc.* 8.45–48). But then why did Gregory keep these apparently repetitive lines in *Poem. arc* 8?

The re-use is better explained if we take the *Hymn Virg.* as the prior text. The expansion in *Poem. arc.* 8.40–44 is due primarily to Gregory's concern with Apollinarianism. In *Poem. arc.* 8, Gregory introduced the virginal conception of Christ primarily to emphasize that Christ assumed a complete human nature, *contra* Apollinaris, who had asserted that divine *logos* in effect

eradicated Jesus' human mind. Christ's assumption of an entire human nature is foundational to Gregory's theology and a central concern of his later years;[20] *Poem. arc.* 8.40–44 climax in a description of Christ's assumption of the entire human nature: "in order that as a complete human being he might save me in my entirety, for Adam fell in his entirety by his sinful taste." *Hymn Virg.* 152, which summarizes the incarnation in Mary's womb, is omitted in *Poem. arc.* 8 because it is unnecessary after the expansion in *Poem. arc.* 8.40–44.

The upshot of this careful analysis is a more nuanced account of the compositional history of 1.2.1(a/b).[21] Most of the reused lines may be plausibly explained as instances where Gregory has taken verses from the *Hymn Virg.* and reused them in the *Poemata arcana*. There are several cases, however, where it is clear that the reverse has occurred. I therefore posit that Gregory wrote the *Hymn Virg.* and the *Agon* relatively early in his career, probably in the late 360s or early 370s. This fits nicely with several pieces of circumstantial evidence: Gregory nowhere in 1.2.1a/b adopts the persona of an old man, as he does throughout the poems composed in his retirement, like *Carm.* 1.2.2a or 1.2.29. Furthermore, the reference to Julian's apostasy and death in 1.2.1b 460 is more effective if the emperor's demise is a relatively recent occurrence. Finally, I consider it more likely that Gregory's *Hymn Virg.* and *Agon* preceded Gregory of Nyssa's *De virginitate* than the reverse, for reasons I detailed in the body of the chapter. The *Hymn Virg.* was, however, edited in Gregory's retirement after the composition of the *Poemata arcana*.[22] Around the same time, he probably composed the *Praecepta* (1.2.2a) as a successor. That Gregory revisited

---

[20] Sykes wrongly rejects Apollinarianism as the target in *Poem. arc.* 8.40–44. See Sykes and Moreschini 1997 *ad loc.*

[21] Though the *Hymn Virg.* and *Agon* are two separate poems, they are so tightly knit together that they were almost certainly written at the same time.

[22] Sykes and Moreschini 1997 65–67 date the *Poemata arcana* to 381–82 on the basis that they precede the sharp break with Apollinaris. The lines above, however, suggest a later date, at least for the later poems.

1.2.1a/b in his retirement and then penned a successor (the *Praecepta ad virgines*) shows that these works were felt to constitute an important piece of his literary legacy.

Chapter 5: ΓΝΩΘΙ ΣΑΥΤΟΝ. Self-Awareness.

In the present chapter I take as my subject Gregory's poetic self-awareness. His richly variegated

corpus presents many avenues for such an investigation. Gregory's relatively frequent

programmatic passages, like *carm.* 2.1.34a 69–92, or *carm.* 2.1.39, show the Cappadocian self-

consciously articulating and defending his role as a poet. Moreover, in his so-called

autobiographical verse,[1] Gregory himself becomes the theme of his song. Rather than attending

to these aspects of Gregory's work, I have selected an avenue that has received less scholarly

attention: Gregory's self-conscious creation of poetic *corpora*. My contention is that, following

Callimachean precedent, Gregory edited his poems into coherent sequences united both

thematically and by formal features like ring-composition and reprised lines. Indeed, I maintain

Gregory's striking practice of "intratextuality," that is, frequently alluding or referring to other

works in his own poetry, is part of a larger poetic and editorial strategy meant to connect

together disparate parts of his variegated *oeuvre*. I shall argue, then, that even if Gregory never

succeeded in uniting all of his poems into a coherent *Gesamtwerk*, he nevertheless edited his verse

much more carefully than has typically been acknowledged.

That Gregory consciously created some groupings of related poems has been

acknowledged for some time. Gregory's *Poemata arcana* (1.1.1–5, 7–9) are the chief example. Not

only are they transmitted together,[2] but the poems exhibit such unity that Keydell has they

constitute a single poem.[3] Keydell went too far, but he was right to recognize that the sequence

---

[1] Gregory plays a pivotal role in the development of autobiography, for which see Misch 1907 383–401. Recently scholars have rightly drawn attention to the problems of the term "autobiography" for use with Gregory's work. See for instance Abrams Rebillard 2013 and Storin 2017.

[2] See Sykes and Moreschini 1997 ix.

[3] See Keydell 1951. For more recent analyses that treat the poems as a sequence, see Faulkner 2010 and Daley 2012.

constitutes an aesthetic unity, as Sykes and Moreschini have noted.[4] Francesca Piottante has also

persuasively shown that *carm.* 2.1.34a/b and 2.1.38, which we will consider below, form an

aesthetic unity.[5] It has been difficult, however, for scholars to identify other recognizable

sequences. The lack of a critical edition of the entire *oeuvre* is the greatest stumbling block.

Caillau's edition, reproduced in the *PG* 37–38, generally presents an accurate enough text.

However, Caillau's now canonical order for the poems is deeply problematic.[6] The volume is

arbitrarily divided into 5 groups: 1.1 contains "Theological Poems"; 1.2 "Moral Poems"; 2.1

"Personal Poems" and 2.2 "Epistolary Poems", which are followed by epigrams and epitaphs. He

organized without regard for meter or the manuscript tradition the personal and epistolary

poems by putative date; the theological and moral poems by subject. Even the *Poemata arcana*

were broken up by the insertion of an iambic poem on providence (*carm.* 1.1.6).

Yet if Caillau's ordering of the poems is flawed, it is not clear how we might remedy the

situation. The manuscript tradition is itself quite varied; there is no one stream of the tradition

that transmits all of the poetry. On the basis of sequence, Werhahn has divided the manuscript

tradition of Gregory's poetry into twenty distinct *Gedichtgruppe*.[7] Each group has a fairly standard

order for their poems, but order sometimes varies, and not each manuscript of a given group

transmits all the group's poems. Moreover, a poem may appear in more than one group.

Werhahn has shown moreover that the Byzantine scholars behind our manuscripts organized

Gregory's verse by meter. Most *Gedichtgruppe* either carry poems in hexameter and elegiac couplets

or poems in iambic and lyric meters, but not both. This division of the poetry into groups

---

[4] See Sykes and Moreschini 1997 55 and Moreschini 1997.

[5] Piottante 1999 26–27

[6] See, *e.g.*, Bady 2008 338.

[7] Sicherl, Höllger, and Werhahn 1985 17–34

organized by meter, however, is probably not original to Gregory. The earliest textual evidence

we have for Gregory's poems are Syriac translations that were completed around the year 600;

here, iambic and hexametric poems freely mix, which suggests that the division between iambic

and hexametric poems characteristic of the Greek tradition occurred only after this point.[8] It is

unsurprising in such circumstances that scholars have been disinclined to search for an authorial

order. McGuckin expresses well the scholarly consensus: "[Gregory] carefully sifted through his

Orations and *Letters* for publication, but does not seem to have done as much for his poetry."[9]

There is in fact some evidence from Gregory's own pen that he never finished editing his

poetry. Simelidis points to 2.1.50 53–54:

> εὐρὼς δ᾽ ἀμφὶ βίβλοισιν ἐμαῖς, μῦθοι δὲ ἀτέλεστοι,
>   οἷς τίς ἀνὴρ δώσει τέρμα, φίλα φρονέων;
>
> My books are moldy, words are incomplete;
> what friend is there to make them more replete?

Simelidis remarks, "Gregory seems to wonder who is going to continue the semi-finished

poems."[10] Simelidis is most likely right that by μῦθοι ("words") Gregory refers to poems, though

it is possible he refers to prose orations.[11] Yet even if Gregory means his poetry, the implication is

that Gregory was in the process of editing his poems, even if he had not completed the task.

Moreover, I suspect that when Gregory calls some of his works "incomplete" (ἀτέλεστοι) he

means not that individual poems are half-finished, but that these have not yet been revised and

placed in a unified sequence. Bernardi has found evidence that *carm.* 2.1.1, though originally

---

[8] Sicherl 2011 3

[9] McGuckin 2001 376n.29

[10] Simelidis 2009 154 n. 69

[11] The lines that immediately precede refer to public ecclesiastical duties: performing the eucharist (49–50) and giving festival orations for martyrs (51–52). Abrams Rebillard 2003 405 understood μῦθοι to refer to homilies. Ricceri 2013 *ad loc.* notes that Gregory could have meant either orations or poems.

written in the 370s, was subsequently edited during Gregory's retirement in the 380s.[12] I have

argued in chapter four that *carm.* 1.2.1 (a/b) was similarly written in the 360s or 370s and then

revised in the 380s. I take it that Gregory intended to carry out similar revisions across much of

his corpus, but was likely unable to complete the task before he died. We do well to remember,

however, that poems may be exquisitely structured and carefully wrought even if the author is

not fully satisfied; we need only consider Virgil's *Aeneid* or Ovid's *Fasti*. The lines from *carm.*

2.1.50 should not be taken as evidence of Gregory's haphazard editing but as a spur for scholars

to reconstruct, as far as the evidence permits, Gregory's editorial design.

Identifying poetic sequences is hardly a straightforward process, and I consider many of

my arguments below to be suggestive essays rather than definitive pronouncements. Bady has

persuasively shown that the *acolouthia* of the manuscripts sometimes present traces of an authorial

design.[13] I have thus paid close attention to the transmission of the poems analyzed. Yet the lack

of uniformity in the *acolouthia* of the manuscript tradition invites us to draw connections between

poems that do not appear together. Not only did the division between epic/elegiac and iambic

groups not occur until after 600 AD,[14] but there is every reason to suspect that in some cases

Gregory paired poems in different metrical schemes. For instance, Gregory writes three poems

against bishops: 2.1.13 in hexameters, 2.1.10 in elegiacs, and 2.1.12 in iambs.[15] Though I doubt

---

[12] See Bady, Tuilier, and Bernardi 2004 LI and notes on lines 612–15.

[13] Bady 2008

[14] Sicherl 2011 3

[15] *Carm.* 2.1.13 (hexametric) and 2.1.10 (elegiac) are both entitled εἰς ἐπισκόπους in L, while in L *carm.* 2.1.12 (iambic) entitled εἰς ἑαυτὸν καὶ περὶ ἐπισκόπων. Bady 2008 345 has shown that L preserves titles more likely to reflect authorial intent, for many are written in the first person (*e.g.* εἰς ἐμαυτόν) rather than the third (*e.g.* εἰς ἑαυτόν). Bady does not note, however, that this pattern holds true only for the epic/elegiac poems. The titles of the iambic poems are written in the third person, which suggests that the Byzantine scholars behind L had access to a better tradition for the epic/elegiac poems than for the

they stood beside one another in an authorial sequence, Gregory nevertheless invites us to read them alongside each other by treating the same theme in three different manners. We will see further connections between poems in different metrical schemes below.

Given the state of the manuscript tradition, I have relied heavily on internal formal criteria for positing sequences, especially the openings and closings of poems. Like the Alexandrian poets, Gregory was fond of ring-structure, both within poems and across larger sequences. When the opening of one poem is answered by the close of another, this is one important indication that they should be read together, as it is when the beginning of one poem reprises a theme, motif, or phrase from the end of another poem. Bady has used precisely these criteria to argue that many of sequences present in L reflect Gregory's editorial intent.[16] Moreover, Gregory's penchant for reusing lines and motifs likewise creates connections between different parts of the *corpus*. I have also relied on historical context, for poems composed contemporaneously with one another were often intended to be read together. I have thus selected for analysis a group of elegiac poems composed primarily between the middle of 381 and Easter 382. The nature of the evidence is such that there is seldom a smoking gun; yet the accumulation of various internal and external clues are persuasive when taken in sum. Before examining Gregory's work, however, I first wish to illustrate from more well-known poets the tools that Gregory used to order his work. For that task, we turn to Callimachus and Ovid.

---

iambic. This also suggests that the original title of 2.1.12 was probably something like εἰς ἐπισκόπους, given the thematic connections with 2.1.10 and 2.1.13.

[16] See Bady 2008, especially his remarks on the epigrammatic corpus on 342.

Poetic *Corpora*
Callimachus

The only work of Callimachus to come down to us in direct manuscript tradition are his *Hymns* (to Zeus, Apollo, Artemis, Delos, Athena, and Demeter, in this order). Scholars have pointed to a number of formal and thematic features that show evidence of Callimachus' arrangement of the collection.[17] Stephens notes, for instance, that *hAth* and *hDem* both feature vignettes of their respective goddesses punishing transgressors.[18] The placement of the *hAp* after the *hZeus* binds closely together the two gods and their respective human clients, kings and poets. This is reinforced by the placement of poets at the end of a list of types of people over which kings preside in *hZeus* 74–78 and *hAp* 29, where Apollo sits at Zeus' right hand. The connections between Apollo and Artemis are reinforced by the placement of the *hArt* between the *hAp* and the *hDel*, both of which deal extensively with the Delphic god. Artemis appears at *hAp* 60–64, where Apollo uses horn that she had gathered to construct a cultic site. The sibling rivalry comes into play again in *hArt* 7, where she asks from Zeus the honor of many names (πολυωνυμίη), so that her brother will not challenge her. Callimachus had made much of Apollo's many names in the prior hymn (see especially *hAp* 68–70). These thematic connections are supported by numerous intertextual echoes. Ukleja notes that in *hAp* 55–57 human beings follow Apollo's lead to construct cities (Φοίβῳ δ' ἑσπόμενοι πόλιας διεμετρήσαντο). Zeus tells Artemis in *hArt* 36 that she will also construct cities (πόλιας διαμετρήσασθαι). At no other point does Callimachus use the rare accusative plural (πόλιας) of the noun πόλις ("city"). He no doubt wishes us to connect the two passages. When Callimachus notes the wealth of Artemis' temple in Ephesus, he asserts its superiority to Delphi: ῥέα κέν Πυθῶνα παρέλθοι ("One would easily pass by Pytho" *hArt*

---

[17] See most recently Stephens 2015 12–14 and Ukleja 2005 21–108.

[18] Stephens 2015 13

250). In *hAp* 35 Callimachus earlier invoked Delphi as the prime example of Apollo's wealth: Πυθῶνί κε τεκμήραιο). Ukleja rightly notes the choice of the name Pytho for Delphi is no accident, but a spur for the audience's memory that further unites the two hymns.

The poet also explores poetological concerns through these internal cross-references. For instance, at *hArt* 136–37 the poet asks the goddess to keep both himself and his *philoi* true (πότνια, τῶν εἴη μὲν ἐμοὶ φίλος ὅστις /εἴην δ' αὐτός, ἄνασσα, μέλοι δέ μοι αἰὲν ἀοιδή). This passage may be fruitfully juxtaposed with *hZeus* 65– 69, where the poet instead asks the god to show propitious signs to his *philoi*. Instead of asking for honesty, he expresses with his tongue in his cheek the desire to craft fiction in a persuasive manner (ψευδοίμην ἀίοντος ἅ κεν πεπίθοιεν ἀκουήν. *hZeus* 65). Callimachus thus assumes for himself the power of Hesiod's muses, who know both how to lie and to tell the truth.[19]

We see similar cross-references within the *Aetia*. The most significant occur between the beginning and end of the work and form ring-structures. The epilogue of the *Aetia* (fr. 112) mentions the Graces along with the Muses' consecration of Hesiod, both themes that Callimachus had treated at the beginning of the work (fr. 2–3). The overlap in diction makes it clear that the ring-structure is intentional. Compare *Aet.* fr. 112.5–6 κείνῳ τῷ **Μοῦσαι** πολλὰ **νέμοντι** βοτὰ / συν μύθους ἐβάλοντο **παρ' ἴχνιον ὀξέος ἵππου** ("to whom the Muses, when he was herding many animals, / contributed stories near the footprint of the swift horse" tr. Harder) with fr. 2.1–2: ποιμένι μῆλα **νέμοντι παρ' ἴχνιον ὀξέος ἵππου** / Ἡσιόδῳ **Μουσέων** ἑσμὸς ὅτ' ἠντίασεν ("When a swarm of Muses met the shepherd Hesiod, who was tending / his

---

[19] Hes. *Theog.* 27–28. See discussion in Stephens 2015 on *hZeus* 65.

flocks near the footprint of the swift horse" tr. Harder modified). Callimachus was thus one important model for the ring-structuring common in Hellenistic and later verse.[20]

The ending of the *Aetia* (fr. 112) recalls the end of the *hZeus* and looks forward to the *Iambi*. The hymnic farewell in *Aet.* fr. 112.8 "And farewell to you also Zeus" (χαῖρε, Ζεῦ, μέγα καὶ σύ) recalls the similar farewell at *hZeus* 91 (χαῖρε μέγα, Κρονίδη πανυπέρτατε). Callimachus' request that Zeus preserve the house of his lords (σάω δ' ἐμὸν οἶκον ἀνάκτων. fr. 112.8) alludes also to the end of the *hZeus*, for there Callimachus observed that "nothing on earth is more divine than Zeus' kings" (ἐπεὶ Διὸς οὐδὲν ἀνάκτων / θειότερον. Note ἀνάκτων at line end) and subsequently adduced the wealth of his ruler (ἡμετέρῳ μεδέοντι 86) as proof that Zeus distributes more wealth to some kings than others. Indeed, the present tense imperative σάω ("continue to preserve") encourages the reader familiar with Callimachus' work to recall the wealth mentioned at the end of the *hZeus*. Harder observes that the mention of the "foot-pasture of the Muses" in fr. 112.9 is probably meant to be juxtaposed with *Aet.* fr. 1.27, where Apollo instructs the poet to drive his chariot on untrodden paths. The "foot-pasture" refers to Callimachus' *Iambi*, which follow the *Aetia* in this papyrus (P.Oxy. 1011) and hence presumably in the original edition of Callimachus' poetic *oeuvre*.[21] Though the imperfect preservation of Callimachus' work precludes full appreciation, it is clear that the Alexandrian poet carefully established connections between different parts of his poetic corpus.

Ovid

Ovid gives special prominence to the formal features we have just observed in Callimachus' work: internal cross-references, especially at the beginning and end of works or books. Indeed in

---

[20] See Kranz 1961 for detailed analysis of the *sphragis* and ring-structure. For analysis of ring-structures in Meleager and Catullus, see Van Sickle 1981.

[21] See Harder 2012 *ad loc.* and Gutzwiller 1998 184 for discussion.

his treatment of the poetic *sphragis* Kranz regards Ovid's practice as the culmination of the technique.[22] Though Gregory probably did not read Ovid,[23] his work is worth a brief examination because Ovid's internal cross-references are so prominent and his work so well preserved. The Simonan poet also provides a useful *comparand* for Gregory. Both men were deeply influenced by Callimachus and regarded these internal cross-references as a Callimachean practice, for both frequently allude to the Alexandrian at the beginning and end of poems.

Ovid's *Amores* begin with a curious epigram in which the poetic books (*libelli*) inform the reader that the author has cut them down from five to three books. At once we see evidence for the editing that was a typical part of an Alexandrian poet's career. The *Amores* are replete with intricate cross-references;[24] of particular relevance here is the final poem of the work, 3.15, where the poet forswears elegy for greater themes (*pulsanda est magnis area maior equis* "we must strike a greater field with great horses" i.e. take up a new theme).[25] Ovid then bids farewell to his "unwarlike elegies" (*imbelles elegi… ualete*). By moving from pedestrian to equine travel, Ovid reverses Callimachus' movement from greater to lesser themes at the end of the *Aetia*.

The *Ars amatoria* subsequently begins with a number of references back to the *Amores*. Instead of the suffering lover of the *Amores* our poet is now the teacher of love (*praeceptor amoris*, 1.17). He states that the god Love will yield to him (*et mihi cedet Amor*, 1.21), unlike in *Am.* 1.2, where the poet decided to yield to love (*cedamus Am.* 1.2.10). Indeed, the poet's warlike posture continues: he promises revenge on the god who so wounded him (*Ars am.* 1.24). We then get a

---

[22] See Kranz 1961 101–105 (On Callimachus) and 122–24 (On Ovid). See Holzberg 2002 for a general introduction to Ovid's work and the evolution of his poetic *persona(e)*.

[23] For a brief discussion of Gregory's Latinity, see the introduction to this volume.

[24] See, for instance, Oliensis 2014.

[25] For the *Amores*, *Ars amatoria*, and *Remedia amoris*, I cite Kenney 1994. For the *Fasti*, I cite Alton, Wormell, and Courtney 1997; for the *Metamorphoses*, Tarrant 2004.

dense complex of humorous allusions to Callimachus. He announces that he will not lie and say that his skills were given to him by Apollo (like Callimachus in *Aet.* fr. 1), or that the muses appeared to him while shepherding flocks (like Hesiod, but a scene that Callimachus also refers to at the beginning and end of the *Aetia*). He asserts that he will speak the truth (*vera canam Ars am.* 1.30; *cf.*ψευδοίμην Call. *hZeus* 65), then summons Venus to preside over his song (*coeptis, mater Amoris, ades!*) and tells chaste and married women to stay far away by using the language typically used in hymns to warn off the wicked (*este procul, vittae tenues*, 31; *cf.* ἑκάς ἑκάς ὅστις ἀλιτρός *hAp* 2). Our poet will sing of "safe love and permitted tricks" (*nos Venerem tutam concessaque furta canemus*). This is a playful reversal of the opening to Callimachus' hymn for the virgin goddess: Ἄρτεμιν (οὐ γὰρ ἐλαφρὸν ἀειδόντεσσι λαθέσθαι) / ὑμνέομεν. ("We will sing of Artemis, for it is no trifling theme for a poet to forget"). Ovid cleverly alludes to an array of Callimachean passages while using the master's sign-posting technique.

Ovid's Callimachean *persona* and his intricate cross-references to other Ovidian works are not simply a feature of his erotic poetry. They play a large role in his *Fasti*, his work most formally indebted to Callimachus' *Aetia*. After a dedication to Germanicus Caesar, Ovid opens the work proper by summoning Janus as patron deity of January. He frames the ensuing conversation between himself and the two-faced deity as a Callimachean initiation scene: *haec ego cum sumptis agitarem mente tabellis, / lucidior uisa est quam fuit ante domus* ("After I had taken up my tablets and was thinking things over in my mind, the house became more bright than it had been" *Fast.* 1.93–94). The scene recalls Apollo's appearance to Callimachus as a young man, just after he had taken up his writing-tablet (καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρώτιστον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα *Aet.* fr. 1.21).

Ovid waits until book 2 to place explicitly the work in relation to his prior elegy. In *Fast.* 2.3–8 he tells his "elegies" that they are going on to a greater work (*nunc primum uelis, elegi,*

maioribus itis 2.2). Until recently the verse-form had been used for short, less substantial poetry

(*exiguum, memini, nuper eratis opus* 2.3). Indeed, his elegiac couplets had been his helpers in love

"when the early youth played with its proper meter" (*cum lusit numeris prima iuventa suis* 2.6). Now

our poet sings sacred matters: who would have expected this turn of events? (*idem sacra cano… /*

ecquis ad haec illinc crederet esse uiam? 2.7–8). Ovid's characterization of his erotic work as *exiguum*

("small") recalls Callimachus' preference for smaller scale work; the mention of "first youth"

(*prima iuuentas*) points us once more to the prologue to the *Aetia*.

Ovid even incorporates Callimachean sign-posting into his long epic work, the

Metamorphoses. In the first four lines, Ovid introduces the theme of the fifteen-book epic and

situates it within his larger corpus:

> *In nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas*
> *corpora; di, coeptis (nam vos mutastis et illa)*
> *aspirate meis primaque ab origine mundi*
> *ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen.*
>
> My mind leads me to speak of forms changed into new bodies. O gods,
> breathe upon my undertakings, for you have changed even these, and
> draw out a continuous song from the origin of the world to my own
> times.

The four lines are dense and richly textured. Just where one would expect the conclusion of an

elegiac couplet from the master of Roman elegy, Ovid instead finishes a second hexametric line

by observing that the gods have changed his undertakings. He thereby emphasizes the generic

change from elegiac to epic. The *perpetuum carmen* of *Met* 1.4 is another pregnant phrase. One first

thinks of "enduring or lasting," and Ovid certainly means this. The beginning of the long poem is

answered at the end of book 15 by a statement of the immortal fame which the poet will enjoy

from the work (*Met.* 15.870–76). But *perpetuum* also corresponds to the Greek διηνεκής

("continuous"),[26] which Callimachus uses to describe the poetry preferred by his gauche critics (ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς *Aet.* fr. 1.3). By embracing "continuous song" Ovid marks his departure from Alexandrian precedent.[27] And yet by using the verb *deducere* in *Met.* 1.4 he signals his debt to Callimachus. Compare Virgil's adaption of Callimachus' skinny muse at *Ecl.* 6.5: *deductum dicere carmen*. Ovid thus advertises both his allegiance to and departure from Callimachean precedent. Not only does Ovid embrace Callimachus' practice of sign-posting, but Ovid frequently alludes to Callimachus while doing so. We shall see that Gregory does the same.

Gregory's poetic *corpuscula*
Introduction

I have selected for detailed consideration seven elegiac poems out of a larger body of work that Gregory produced or edited after his return to Nazianzus in the summer of 381 but before Easter 382.[28] This is only a selection, however, of a much larger body of work that Gregory produced during this fertile period of his life.

- Pre-Silence Poems
    - 2.1.10 *Ad Constantinopolitanos sacerdotes et ipsam urbem.*[29]
    - 2.1.15 *De seipso post reditum ex urbe Constantinopolitana.*[30]
    - 2.1.16 *Somnium de Anastasiae ecclesia.*[31]
- Revised

---

[26] See Bömer 1969 *ad loc.*

[27] Gregory ends his *De rebus suis* 2.1.1 with similar play on the ambiguities of the adjective διηνεκής, as we saw in chapter two.

[28] In addition to the poems mentioned below, I regard the following as an (incomplete) list of Gregory's work from this period: *Carm.* 1.2.24, 1.2.25, 2.1.1 (revised), 2.1.3–9, 11, 12, 13.

[29] For the date, see Simelidis 2009 152–55.

[30] I am not aware of anyone other than Caillau who has yet dated this poem to specifically to this period. The reference to the church Anastasia makes most sense, I think, before he resumes episcopal duties in Nazianzus. The *topos* of arrival that opens the poem is most salient in the months following his return from the capital.

[31] The focus in the poem on his prior church in the capital makes most sense before he has resumed episcopal duties in Nazianzus, as does the assertion that he "is beyond earthly thrones" (99).

- – 2.1.45 *De animae suae calamitatibus carmen lugubre*.[32]
- Silence Poems
  - – 2.1.34a *In silentium ieiunii A* 150 ll.
  - – 2.1.34b *In silentium ieiunii B* 60 ll.
  - – 2.1.38 *Hymnus ad Christum post silentium in Paschale*. 52 ll.[33]

In positing that 2.1.10, 15, and 16 should be read as a sequence, I have departed from the manuscript tradition. 2.1.10 and 2.1.16 are transmitted in group 1, though not in the sequence in which I have placed them,[34] while 2.1.15 is transmitted in groups 5 and 6.[35] 2.1.45 is also transmitted in group 1, typically preceded by a group of poems on Virginity (1.2.1a/b, 2a/b, 5) and then succeeded by a series of epic/elegiac autobiographical pieces that include 2.1.10 and 2.1.16 (2.1.10, 17, 32, 42, 43, 16, 13, 10). The silence poems, by contrast, are transmitted together in group 5 (2.1.34a, 34b, and 38 occur in order). I have focused most acutely on elegiac poems, for in my judgment the dense cross-references indicate that Gregory wished them to be read as, at the very least, a group, if not a sequence. Nevertheless, I have also drawn connections between these and other Gregorian poems of different metrical schemes. It seems likely to me whether Gregory had a larger ordering beyond the rather small sequences posited above, and that this larger ordering included poems of different metrical schemes. As seen above, the division of Gregory's poems into groups organized by metrical scheme only occurred several hundred years after his death. If Gregory did have a larger order with poems of different meters,

---

[32] Like *carm.* 2.1.1 and 1.2.1(a/b), the compositional history of 2.1.45 is complicated. McGuckin 2001 219 places it in 373, rightly noting that line 216 indicates Gregory's father is still alive. Yet Gregory also refers to his gray hair (162), a feature much more typical of the "old-man" *persona* which he adopts in work written in the 380s.

[33] Gregory sets *carm.* 2.1.34a/b in his silence fast, and 2.1.38 at its end. This abstinence from speech occurred during the Lenten season of 382. See Lietzmann 1904 72–73 and Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 2–4.

[34] In L, *carm.* 2.1.10 comes after *carm.* 2.1.16 and 2.1.13.

[35] See Sicherl, Höllger, and Werhahn 1985 18.

he would been following Callimachean precedent, for the Alexandrian was famous for the variety

of metrical schemes and genres in his oeuvre (Callimachus defended this πολυείδεια in *Iamb.* 13).

Even if this larger ordering is unrecoverable, pieces of a collection may be profitably analyzed

even if some are missing. The *Aetia* is an excellent example: though scholars have largely had to

stitch the poem together from papyrus fragments and citations from later literature, they have

nevertheless elucidated many connections both within this work and to others in Callimachus'

corpus.

Before beginning the literary analysis, let us sketch briefly the historical context of these

poems. Contributions by Brad Storin, John McGuckin, and Neil McLynn have elucidated this

portion of Gregory's life.[36] Gregory returned home to Nazianzus in the summer of 381. Though

he had been close to being consecrated as the titular archbishop of Constantinople, he was

outmaneuvered politically at the council of Constantinople by both theological enemies and

allies. He retired instead of facing perhaps worse humiliation. Upon his return home, not only

had his reputation been damaged in the capital, but ecclesiastical affairs were also tense in

Cappadocia. Gregory's father, Gregory the Elder, had been the titular bishop of Nazianzus.

While his father was still alive, Gregory had performed episcopal duties in his father's see as an

auxiliary bishop. But at the death of the elder Gregory in 375, Gregory handed over

administrative affairs to the local priests rather than push to have himself consecrated as his

father's titular successor. Now that he was back in Nazianzus, the Cappadocian bishops were

pushing for him to resume episcopal ministry, since rival groups like the Apollinarians were

attempting to have one of their partisans consecrated to the post. Yet Gregory did not want to

resume episcopal ministry– for one, it would give ammunition to his opponents in the capital

---

[36] See Storin 2011 McGuckin 2001 371–402, and McLynn 1997, McLynn 2006, and McLynn 2015.

who had asserted Gregory's ineligibility to become bishop of Constantinople because he was already a bishop of another see. It was only at some point in the following year that Gregory yielded to the pressures of the neighboring bishops to resume episcopal duties in Nazianzus;[37] within a year he subsequently orchestrated a successful hand-off to a successor.

During this period, Gregory engaged himself in a sustained literary campaign whose purpose was to rehabilitate his reputation, especially in Constantinople, as Storin and McGuckin have shown.[38] This is most evident in his long iambic attack on wicked bishops (*carm.* 2.1.12) and his long iambic *apologia* (*carm.* 2.1.11). Yet the same polemical intention lay behind even a number of ostensibly didactic poems from this period, like *Adv. iram* (1.2.25), as we saw in chapter four. It is in this volatile period of Gregory's life the poems in our sequence were composed or revised.

The Pre-Silence Poems
2.1.10 (*Ad Constantinopolitanos sacerdotes*)[39]

Our sequence begins with an elaborate address of the clergy and city of Constantinople (1–6). The priests are addressed as "those that conduct bloodless offerings, and servants of the great unity in trinity" (Ὦ θυσίας πέμποντες ἀναιμάκτους, ἱερῆες, / καὶ μεγάλης μονάδος λάτριες ἐν Τριάδι 1–2). Gregory then calls upon the imperial authorities as "laws and kings who take pride in piety" and "the resplendent seat of great Constantine" (ὦ νόμοι, ὦ βασιλῆες ἐπ᾽ εὐσεβίῃ κομόωντες / ὦ Κωνσταντίνου κλεινὸν ἕδος μεγάλου 3–4). His final address is for the

---

[37] McGuckin 2001 382 and Gallay 1943 219–20 have Gregory returning to public ministry at some point relatively late in 382. Storin 2011 argues largely on the basis of *carm.* 2.1.38 that Gregory returned to episcopal ministry on Easter day 382; Storin calls this this poem a sort of festal oration. It is unlikely that Gregory would perform a poem from the pulpit: rather, we should imagine the original setting, if there was one, to be a private gathering. It is *carm.* 2.1.19, not 2.1.38, that discusses in bitter terms his return to episcopal ministry in Nazianzus (*cf.* Gr. naz. *ep.* 138 and 139).

[38] See Storin 2011 and McGuckin 2001 376–84.

[39] I cite *carm.* 2.1.10 according to Simelidis 2009. An English translation may be found in Abrams Rebillard 2003.

city itself, whom Gregory addresses somewhat ironically as a city that far surpasses others

(ὁπλοτέρη Ῥώμη, τόσσον προφέρουσα πολήων, / ὁσσάτιον γαίης οὐρανὸς ἀστερόεις 5–6).

After this elaborate introduction, the poet announces his theme: his own sufferings at the hands

of Envy:[40]

> ὑμέας εὐγενέας ἐπιβώσομαι, οἷά μ’ ἔοργεν
>   ὁ φθόνος · ὡς ἱερῶν τῆλε βάλεν τεκέων,
> δηρὸν ἀεθλεύσαντα, φαεσφόρον οὐρανίοισι
>   δόγμασι, καὶ πέτρης ἐκπροχέαντα ῥόον. [10]

> I shall loudly proclaim to all you of noble birth just how much Envy has
> harmed me, how it cast me far away from my holy children, though I
> had worked hard for them, bearing the light of heavenly teaching, myself
> a flow of water from the rock.

The poet then briefly recounts the injustices that he has suffered. Immediately after his work in

the city had begun to be successful, he was made an object of pity by being ejected, while another

took his place and enjoyed his labors (11–14 a reference to Nectarius). He defends his

impartiality as archbishop (19–20) and attributes his forced retirement to “minds incapable of

deep thought” (κουφονόοισιν ἀπέχθομαι 23). But then he consigns these sufferings to the depths

of Lethe, stating that he will instead “happily flee kingdoms, cities, and priests” (πάνθ’ ἄμυδις,

βασίλεια, καὶ ἄστεα, καὶ ἱερῆας / ἀσπασίως προφυγὼν 27–28) and “rise above them and

take delight in stillness” (Αὐτὰρ ἔγωγε / ἔνθεν ἀφορμηθεὶς, τέρψομαι ἀτρεμίη 25–26). This

withdrawal from public life is precisely what he desired when “God summoned me through

dreams of the night and the terrible fears of the cruel sea” (εὖτε Θεός μ’ ἐκάλεσσε καὶ

ἐννυχίοισιν ὀνείροις, / καὶ πόντου κρυεροῦ δείμασιν ἀργαλέοις. 29–30). The poem ends with

a seal: “This is the *logos* of Gregory, whom the land of the Cappadocians has nurtured, who

---

[40] I use “Envy” to translate the Greek φθόνος, capitalizing it because for Gregory φθόνος is principally an appellation for Satan.

stripped off everything for Christ" (Οὗτος Γρηγορίοιο λόγος, τὸν θρέψατο γαῖα /

Καππαδοκῶν, Χριστῷ πάντ᾽ ἀποδυσάμενον 35–36).

Several features of the poem have led me to propose that this is the first poem in a

sequence. The vocatives are fitting for the beginning of any work or cycle.[41] Yet the opening

seems too labored for a poem of only 36 lines: 6 lines of vocatives, followed by 4 lines introducing

the theme. The programmatic force of lines 7–10, cited above, is precisely the audacity one

expects at the beginning of a Callimachean sequence. Gregory alludes here to Ex. 17:6, where

God had provided water from a rock for the Israelites while they wandered in the desert. By

calling himself "a stream flowing from the rock," Gregory strongly identifies himself with Christ,

for St. Paul identified the rock in the Exodus narrative as a typological reference to Christ.[42] Not

only does Gregory suffer like Christ, but is himself spiritual nourishment for God's people.

Finally, the *sphragis* in the final couplet is also fitting for the beginning or ending of a poetic

sequence.

Still more significant are Gregory's references to other poems in the sequence. When

Gregory mentions in lines 29–30 that God had saved him from the sea and called him through

dreams he alludes to events that he narrates elsewhere. The shipwreck is recounted in 2.1.11

121–209 and 2.1.1 307–21. *Carm.* 2.1.1, originally composed in the 370s, was revised sometime

in the 380s;[43] the edits may date to this period. In any event, 2.1.11 (*De vita sua*) was composed

within a year of the present poem. By "dreams of the night" Gregory refers to the dream in

---

[41] Demosthenic orations typically begin ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι ("O Men of Athens!" See *Olynthiac* 1–3). The prologue to Callimachus' *Aetia* does not immediately begin with direct address of critics, but is not long postponed (fr. 1.7).

[42] See 1 Cor 10:4.

[43] See Bady, Tuilier, and Bernardi 2004 LI and notes on 2.1.1 612–15.

which Chastity and Prudence appeared to him and called him to a life of virginity (2.1.45 197–268), which we will examine at length below. The final cross-reference occurs in line 34, when Gregory promises to devote his silence to God (θύσω καὶ σίγην). Silence might first seem to his audience to refer to his retirement from public ministry. Yet Gregory's subsequent abstinence from speech during the Lent of 382 suggests either that Gregory was already planning this ascetic demonstration during the composition of 2.1.10 or that he subsequently edited 2.1.10 in light of the literary output of the Lent of 382. In either case, Gregory has connected this work closely with the poems on his silence (2.1.34a/b and 2.1.38). We are thus justified in reading 2.1.10 as part of a larger whole.

2.1.15 *De seipso post reditum ex urbe Constantinopolitana*[44]

The temporal setting of *carm.* 2.1.15 is Gregory's return to Nazianzus from the capital. The repetition of ἔρχομαι ("I come or arrive") at the beginning of lines one and three establishes the work as an *epibaterion*, a poem of arrival.[45] Gregory's poem has a twist, however, for the opening is polyvalent. Either Gregory arrives at home, having left behind public life and the great swell of the sea; or, Gregory arrives in heaven after leaving behind the troubles of earthly life. It is the latter option that Gregory picks up at the end of the poem (51–52), but the ambiguity is likely intentional, for he has used the language typical of an arrival or homecoming work. Ovid used a similar technique in his *Metamorphoses* by playing on the dual meaning of

---

[44] The best edition remains that of Caillau, reprinted in *PG* 37.1250–53. An English translation may be found in Abrams Rebillard 2003.

[45] Gregory appears to play with *Theogn.* 1.511–522. *Cf.* ἤλυθες…ἤλυθες in Theocr. *Id.* 12.1–2, which Gregory adapts in the first two lines of *carm.* 2.1.54, for which see Simelidis 2009 41. For an ancient discussion of the "speech of arrival" see Menander Rhetor 2.3, ed. Russell and Wilson 1981. For modern discussion see Cairns 1972 17–33 and his analysis of Theoc. *Id.* 12.

perpetuum ("long-lasting" or "continuous") in 1.4. Only the former meaning is reprised at the end of the long epic.

A number of features connect *carm.* 2.1.15 with 2.1.10. The sea imagery of the opening two lines fits nicely with 2.1.10 30, where Gregory noted that God saved him from the terrors of the sea, and with 2.1.10 32, where he stated that he has moored his ship in a steadfast harbor. The seal of 2.1.10, where Gregory said that he was nourished by the earth of Cappadocia, is not simply picked up by the location of Gregory's arrival, but in 2.1.15 10, where he recalls that he "made resplendent the trinity [in Constantinople…]," as soon as he "arrived from foreigners of noble stock [that is, from Cappadocia]" ([Τρίας] ἦν ἀναφαίνων, / ἄχρι καὶ ἀλλοδαπῶν ἤλυθον εὐπατριδῶν). Envy, a ubiquitous theme in his late poetry, is responsible in both poems for his departure from the capital (2.1.10 8, 31; 2.1.15 15–16). In both poems he laments that he was taken from his flock in Constantinople while they were still immature in their devotion to the Nicene faith (2.1.10 12 2.1.15 16–18). He reiterates God's role in bringing him to the capital (2.1.10 15: οὗ με θεός τ' ἐπέβησε; 2.1.15 37 ἐπεὶ Θεὸς ὧδε κελεύει). At the end of the poem he bids farewell to Anastasia, his church in the capital. Gregory describes the church as the "renowned seat of Anastasia" (κλεινὸν Ἀναστασίης … ἕδος 49), thereby reprising the language he used in 2.1.10 4 for the "renowned seat" of the great Constantine (κλεινὸν ἕδος). By mentioning his death at the end of the poem, he creates a ring with the opening. Gregory's confidence that he will be able to pray for the church even after is death is quite striking: the poet depicts himself as confident of divine vindication.

2.1.16 *Somnium de Anastasiae ecclesia*[46]

Carm. 2.1.16 opens with the poet asleep: εὗδον δὴ γλυκὺν ὕπνον (1). A dream brings to the slumbering poet images of Anastasia, his small church in the capital (1–2). Gregory is seated on the bishop's throne (not in an imperious manner, he assures us) and flanked by clergy (7–12). Crowds of people are thronging outside the church and the roads leading to the church are full of people hoping to hear him preach (13–28). The oneiric audience is filled with people of all sorts: pagans and christians, men and women. Some wish to hear a profound and finely wrought speech (ὑψιθέοντα καὶ εὔστροφον 25), others something more down to earth and accessible (χθαμαλὸν καὶ ἐπίδρομον 23). When Gregory speaks, all are moved by his words, even pagans (37–40). But soon the crow of the cock rouses him from sleep and his beloved Anastasia disappears (48). Gregory then turns to lament: with his beloved church gone he is left only with pain and terminal old-age (γῆρας ἀνιγρόν 51. *Cf.* ἢ τότ᾽ ἀνιγρή Call. *Aet.* fr. 75.14, where Cydippe wastes away). His beloved church is now in the hands of another. Though he had presided over many large churches while in Constantinople, he misses none so much as his Anastasia (62). After an elaborate priamel that amplifies his woe still further (67–76), he promises to always remember his church (77–78). At this point, the dream from the first section transforms into a day dream. He states that he often imagines Anastasia in his mind. In doing so he cleanses with his tears this incorporeal church in his mind even though she is far-away (79–82). He then addresses each part of the church (virgins, musicians, lovely choruses, widows, orphans, travelers, the weak) and reaffirms his promise to never forget them (83–88). He caustically bids farewell to those who should have helped him when he was in Constantinople (the emperor) and then asserts that he is beyond earthly thrones (95–100). The poem ends with a prayer for salvation to the

---

[46] I have used the edition of Caillau 1842 as reprinted in *PG* 37.1254–61. An English translation may be found in Abrams Rebillard 2003.

Trinity and a seal describing the poem as the "lament of Gregory who yearns for Anastasia"

(Γρηγορίου γόος οὗτος Ἀναστασίην ποθέοντος 103).

The most significant cross-references are those at the beginning and end of the poem.

The dream of Anastasia recalls Gregory's farewell to his beloved church at the end of 2.1.15 (line

49). Near the end of the poem, the farewells to the emperor and Constantinopolitan clergy in

lines 95–97 correspond to Gregory's address of the same groups at the beginning of the sequence

in 2.1.10 1–6. The seal in the final two lines of 2.1.16 (103–04) corresponds formally with the

similar seal at the end of 2.1.10, but more importantly creates a ring structure with the theme

introduced at the beginning of the sequence in 2.1.10: the separation of Gregory from his church

by Envy. Compare 2.1.16 103–104 "This is the lament of Gregory as he yearns for Anastasia,

from whom envious weakness separated him" (Γρηγορίου γόος οὗτος Ἀναστασίην

ποθέοντος, / τῆς ποτέ μιν φθονερὴ νόσφισεν ἀδρανίη) with 2.1.10 7–8: "[I will shout] how

much harm Envy did to me, how it cast me from from my holy children" (οἷά μ' ἔοργεν / ὁ

φθόνος, ὡς ἱερῶν τῆλε βάλεν τεκέων). The ring structure strongly suggests that Gregory

intends the three poems to work as a sequence.

Gregory alludes to a number of other passages through the course of 2.1.16. The dream

narrative in 1–46 bears a number of similarities with the consecrating dream recounted in 2.1.45,

which I will analyze in further detail below. The verb δοκέεσκον is used at the same metrical

location to begin the narration of the dream. Compare 2.1.16 7 ἔζεσθαι δοκέεσκον "I seemed to

be sitting" and 2.1.45 231 Δοιαί μοι δοκέεσκον "two female figures seemed…"). In both

passages Gregory places the noun ὄνειρος ("dream") at the end of a hexameter and pairs it with

a form of the verb ἵστημι (ὄνειρος / στῆσεν 2.1.16 1–2; παρίστατο τοῖος ὄνειρος 2.1.45 229).

In both, the poet rejoices (2.1.16 46 γήθεον; 2.1.45 251 μέγ' ἐγήθεον). The priamel in 2.1.16

67–76 may be paired wit the same trope in 2.1.45 3–8, which we will examine in further detail below. The lament in second half of the poem reprises many of the themes from 2.1.10 and 2.1.15. As always, Envy is present; *cf.* 2.1.16 53: Ὦ φθόνε, τίπτε μ' ἔοργας ("O Envy, why have you done me harm?") with 2.1.10 7–8: οἷά μ' ἔοργεν / ὁ φθόνος ("…how much harm Envy has done me"). Disease too: *cf.* 2.1.16 65 with 2.1.10 16 and 2.1.15 15. At 2.1.16 58 and 76 he complains that his church belongs to another, as he had at 2.1.10 13–14. With this part of the sequence he comforts his supporters in the capital, defends his effectiveness as bishop, but also renounces in interest in reclaiming the see. With the farewells to his human opponents he marks a transition to the topic of 2.1.45: the difficulties of his own spiritual life.

2.1.45 *Carmen lugubre*[47]

Carm. 2.1.45 is an extensive work: 350 lines in elegiac couplets. The poem begins with lament: "How greatly I have suffered from my hard fate! What lament would be equal? What fount of tears sufficient? What songs?" (Δύσμορος οἷα πάθον; τίς μοι γόος ἄξιος ἔσται; / Τίς πηγὴ δακρύων ἄρκιος; οἷα μέλη; 1–2). Gregory then introduces the theme of the poem: lament for his own soul (3–10). The better part of the next two hundred lines (11–197) is dedicated to philosophical comparisons between the life of the spirit and the life of the flesh. The former begets a life of ascesis, the latter a life of pleasure. At line 197 Gregory begins to recount episodes from his youth. He recalls how his mother vowed to consecrate her child for divine service if God would grant her a son. He then narrates at length a dream in which Chastity and Prudence appear to him and call him to a celibate life (201–268) and follows it with the effect it had on his conduct (269–312). He concludes with prayers to the Trinity (313–50).

---

[47] The edition of reference remains that of Caillau, as reprinted in *PG* 37.1353–78. Matteo Agnosini is presently engaged in a critical edition and commentary on the work. Gilbert 2001 and Abrams Rebillard 2003 have rendered the poem into English.

The opening of the poem is rather sudden, but this is softened significantly if the poem is read as part of a sequence. The lament in lines 1–2 follows nicely from the end of 2.1.16. Gregory uses the noun γόος ("lament") in both places. Gregory them employs an elaborate priamel to develop further the theme of the poem:

> οὔτε μόρον παίδων τις ἑῶν ἐκλαύσατο τόσσον,
>   ἤ κεδνῶν τοκέων, ἠὲ φίλης ἀλόχου,
> οὐ πάτρην γλυκερὴν μαλερῷ πυρὶ τεφρωθεῖσαν, [5]
>   οὐ νούσῳ στυγερῇ ἄψεα τειρόμενα,
> ὅσσον ἐγὼ ψυχὴν ὀλοφύρομαι αἰνὰ παθοῦσαν,
>   (Φεῦ τάλας!) ὀλλυμένης εἰκόνος οὐρανίης.

> No man hath mourned his children's death with such
> severity, nor that of parents or
> beloved wife, nor homeland turned to ash,
> nor limbs that waste away as victims of
> disease, so much as I bewail my soul,
> (Alas!) for she hath suffered terribly
> as heaven's image disappears within.

Though the priamel at first seems formulaic, it too looks back to the end of 2.1.16. First, at 2.1.16 67–76 Gregory used the same trope to mourn the loss of his church. Moreover, this priamel develops a number of themes from the first three poems. The familial language recalls Gregory's lament in the prior poems for Anastasia; note that Gregory oscillates between a number of different familial metaphors to depict his relationship with his church. His parishioners are preeminently his spiritual children: Gregory ends 2.1.15 by promising to pray for his "children" (ὑπὲρ τεχέων) even after his death. But Gregory also treats the church as a spouse of sorts. His repeated complaint that his church is now in the hands of another leader (*e.g.* 2.1.16 75) refashions the epigrammatic *topos* of the beloved in the hands of a rival. The mention of "dear parents" in line 4 (κεδνῶν τοκέων) may be taken to refer to the clergy in the capital, whom he characterizes as "old men" (γεραιοί) in 2.1.16 9. After all, St. Paul admonished Timothy in 1

Tim 5:1 to treat older men as fathers and younger men as brothers.[48] Even Gregory's mention in line 5 of a "homeland razed to the ground by fire" may refer figuratively to the plight of his Anastasia, for in Gregory's priamel in 2.1.16 67–76 he depicted the separation from his congregation as an exile and displacement from homeland. His audience would appreciate the irony, for by departing his "spiritual" homeland (Anastasia) Gregory has actually just returned to his physical homeland, Cappadocia. The mention of disease (νοῦσος) in 2.1.45 6 of course recalls Gregory's complaint in 2.1.15 15 that "disease and envy cast me out" (ἀλλά μ' ἔπεμψε φθόνος καὶ νοῦσος ὀπίσσω). Thus what seems at first to be a formulaic opening actually develops a number of important themes from the earlier poems. The end of 2.1.45 also connects to these earlier poems. At 2.1.45 347–48, Gregory prays that God would deliver him from enemies and painful cares into the harbor of God's kingdom (καί μ' ἐκ δυσμενέων τε καὶ ἀργαλέων μελεδώνων, / εὔδιον ἐς λιμένα σῆς βασιλείας ἄγοις). Compare 2.1.10 31–32: ἐκ μεγάλου δὲ / χείματος ἐν σταθερῷ πεῖσμα βάλον λιμενί ("I have cast my cable from a great storm into a sure harbor"). *Cf.* also the nautical imagery at 2.1.15 1–2. The thematic connections nicely knit together the different works of the sequence.

The most important cross-reference is the dream narrative to which Gregory alluded in 2.1.10 29. This account at 2.1.45 201–02, where Gregory notes that "after this he sent me a divine passion for the prudent life in visions of the night" (ἔπειτα δὲ θεῖον ἔρωτα / φάσμασιν ἐννυχίοις σώφρονος ἧκε βίου). In hymnic fashion he enjoins the godly to listen, but for wicked souls to plug their ears (203–04). He thus characterizes what follows as a divine epiphany. The narrative proper commences in line 205: Gregory was was a tender child (παῖς ἀπαλὸς), but not

---

[48] Πρεσβυτέρῳ μὴ ἐπιπλήξῃς ἀλλὰ παρακάλει ὡς πατέρα, νεωτέρους ὡς ἀδελφούς.

extremely young.[49] He had already received training in virtue from his pious parents (209–10).[50] After these preliminaries, the dream narrative itself begins at 229–30. Two female figures appear to him in resplendent clothing, standing next to one another. Gregory describes them as of like age and beautiful, yet their beauty does not consist in outward adornment. No gold nor hyacinth adorns their necks, nor do they where finely wrought silks nor *chitones* of soft linen, nor do they wear make-up. They do not have contrived hair, but each a simple *peplos* that extended to their ankles which is bound by a girdle. Their heads and cheeks are covered with a veil. They remain silent, but then kiss Gregory (αἱ δὲ με καὶ φιλέεσκον 253), after which Gregory asks them who they are. They reveal themselves to be Chastity (ἁγνεία) and Prudence (σωφροσύνη). They then instruct Gregory to ascend with them to the light of the immortal Trinity (259–62).

With this dream Gregory implicitly compares himself to other poets, most especially Callimachus, who narrated a dream in which he was transported to Helicon and conversed with the Muses (*Aet.* fr. 2). The passage is not well-preserved but we do have a *diegesis* (fr. 2d) that tells us that Callimachus "conversed along with the Muses" (συμμείξας ταῖς Μούσαις) "just as his beard began to grow" (ἀρτιγένειος). The invitation of the Virtues for Gregory to "mix your mind with our souls and your torch with our torches" (μίξον τεὸν ἡμετέρῃσι / καὶ πραπίδεσσι νόον, καὶ δαΐσιν δαΐδα 259–60) may owe something to the mixture language of Callimachus' passage, if by συμμείξας the summary reflects Callimachus' language. Gregory's self-

---

[49] We are probably meant to suppose he is in his late teens, as line 267 suggests that he had begun rhetorical training. See McGuckin 2001 62, who I think rightly corrects the interpretation of Gallay 1943 28.

[50] When describing his mother and father, Gregory reuses several lines from his epitaphic sequences for his parents. *Cf.* 2.1.45 217–18 with *AnthPal* 8.17 1–2; 2.1.45 219–20 with *AnthPal* 8.18. Callimachus had something something similar with his self-epitaph, *epigr.* 29 (G.-P.).

characterization as a child (παῖς) also leads us to think of Callimachus' consecration scene with Apollo in *Aet.* fr. 1.

Yet Gregory's dream is as much an epiphany of the beloved as a consecration to a certain way of life or poetry. The dream of the beloved is not an uncommon trope in erotic epigram; Gregory here appropriates the motifs and vocabulary of this genre in a striking manner.[51] Meleager *epigr.* 117 (G.P.) well illustrates the *topos* and the vocabulary from which Gregory drew. Meleager is afflicted by a dream of a smiling boy of eighteen years still wearing his *chlamys* (ὀκτωκαιδεκέτους **παιδὸς** ἔτ᾽ ἐν χλαμύδι 2). He tries to touch the boy's tender skin, but his hopes are disappointed. The poet ends the epigram by addressing his own soul and telling it to stop yearning for mute images in dreams (7–8). Gregory employs similar language for his dream. His status as a tender boy (ἁπαλὸς παῖς 205) makes him a fitting object of desire (cf. Meleag. *epigr.* 117.2–3). Both use the noun φάσμα ("vision") for their dreams. *Cf.* 2.1.45 202 "visions of the night" (φάσμασιν ἐννυχίοις) with Meleager's "winged vision" (πτηνοῦ φάσματος 117.6). Both speak of desire (πόθος). *Cf.* 2.1.45 230 "desire for virginity" (πόθον ἀφθορίης); Meleagr. *epigr.* 117.5 "desire of the memory" (μνήμης πόθος).

Gregory's description of Prudence and Chastity likewise owes much to the vocabulary of erotic epigram. On their appearance the Virtues "seemed to be flashing like lightening" (δοκέεσκον … στράπτειν 231–32; *cf.* Meleager *epigr.* 105.1 ἤστραψε γλυκὺ κάλλος). He observes that no hyacinth nor gold adorn their necks (*cf.* Rufinus' description of a woman's neck in *AnthPal* 5.15.4 or Posidippus' descriptions of necklaces in *epigr.* 6–7, ed. Bastianini and Austin 2002). Nor did the Virtues wear silks or soft linens, nor make-up or false hair. Instead they are

---

[51] For other instances of Gregory's appropriation of erotic epigram, see Simelidis 2009 43–44.

modestly clothed with a blush on their cheeks (παρειαί… καλὸν ἔρευθος 245–47). Gregory's

comparison of the Virtues' silent lips to dewy roses strikingly reverses Dioscorides' praise of a

woman's "rose-colored talkative lips" (ἐκμαίνει χείλη με ῥοδοόχροα ποικιλόμυθα *epigr.* 1.1 (G.-

P.) =*AnthPal* 5.56). The Virtues embrace Gregory with numerous kisses (αἱ δέ με καὶ φιλέεσκον

253), which again recalls an epigrammatic *topos*, this time that of the beloved's kiss (*cf.* Meleager

epigr. 41.4; 59.1; Rufinus in *AnthPal* 5.14).

Yet in the scene Gregory also reverses a number of epigrammatic *topoi* and raises the

register. First, Gregory describes fully-clothed figures; in Dioscorides *epigr.* 1 (G.-P.) the woman is

nude, as is the woman depicted in *AnthPal* 5.48 (Rufinus). The Virtues invite Gregory to "mix

your mind with ours and your torch with our torch" so that they may ascend to God (μίξον τεὸν

ἡμετέρησι / καὶ πραπίδεσσι νόον, καὶ δαΐσιν δαΐδα 259–60). The verb μίγνυμι ("mix") carries

sexual connotations in Greek, but the verb is so used in epic, not in epigram, where the verb is

normally used to refer to the mixing of wine.[52] Gregory has replaced the lamp (λύχνος), a

common companion for the epigrammatic lover during his nocturnal escapades (*e.g.* Meleager

epigr. 11 and 23) with the torch (δαΐς), a symbol of marriage (*e.g. Il.* 18.492). When Gregory

describes his warm joy at beholding the figures he uses language more redolent of epic (ἰάνθην in

253 from ἰαίνω) rather than the verb θάλπω more common in epigram (*e.g.* Meleager *epigr.*

117.4).[53] Moreover, if Gregory's dream is depicted in highly literary fashion, he goes out of his

---

[52] For μίγνυμι in Homer, see the *LfGRE s.v.* For epigrammatic examples of μίγνυμι used with wine, see Meleagr. *epigr.* 12.2 and 127.4.

[53] A TLG search for the lexeme ἰαίνω presents only five instances of the verb in the *AnthPal*. Of these, only one occurs in an erotic context (*AnthPal* 12.95= Meleager *epigr.* 77 ed. G.-P.) By contrast, the verb θάλπω occurs 16 times, 6 of which are in erotic contexts: 2.1 166 (Christodorus), 5.165, 166, 173 (all Meleager), 5.210 (Asclepiades).

way to assert the dream is more than literary fiction.[54] Gregory notes that the dream caused an

immediate change in his conduct; afterwards, he began spending time with those who had

consecrated themselves to a chaste life (271–282). Gregory uses the dream to depict himself as

both a consummate literary artist and a virtuous ascetic. When Gregory alludes to this passage in

2.1.10, then, he draws our attention to a carefully wrought scene of poetic consecration, a scene

that emphasizes both Gregory's knowledge of the literary past and his skill in refashioning it.

The Silence Poems
2.1.34a (*In silentium ieiunii* A)[55]

Gregory sets *carm.* 2.1.34a and b[56] during his fast of silence in Lent 382. In the first

couplet he instructs his tongue to check itself (ἴσχεο γλῶσσα φίλη 1); the poet instead exhorts

his pen to write down the words of his silence and announce to the eyes the thoughts of his heart

(σὺ δέ μοι, γραφίς, ἔγγραφε σιγῆς / ῥήματα καὶ φθέγγου ὄμμασι τὰ κραδίης). Lines 3–11

comprise one intricate sentence in which Gregory describes the reasons for his silence:

> Ἡνίκα σάρκας ἔδησα, Θεοῦ βροτέοις παθέεσσι
>   μύστιν ἄγων θυσίην, ὥς κε θάνω βιότῳ,
> ἤμασι τεσσαράκοντα, νόμοις Χριστοῦ βασιλῆος, [5]
>   εὖτε καθαιρομένοις σώμασιν ἔσπετ' ἄκος,
> πρῶτα μὲν ἀτρεμίη νόον ἥδρασα, οἷος ἀπ' ἄλλων
>   ναιετάων, ἀχέων ἀχλὺν ἐφεσσάμενος,
> εἴσω πᾶς ἑαλεὶς, φρένας ἄκλοπος· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
>   ἀνδρῶν εὐαγέων δόγμασιν ἑσπόμενος, [10]
> χείλεσι θῆκα θύρετρα.

---

[54] For poetic consecrations as literary fiction, *cf.* Ovid's amusing disclaimer at *Ars. am.* 1.25–30, discussed above.

[55] I cite 2.1.34 (a/b) according to Kuhn 2014. I have also consulted Piottante 1999. White 1996 and Abrams Rebillard 2003 have rendered the poem into English.

[56] The two poems are presented as one in Caillau's edition. The introduction to second poem makes it reasonably clear that we have two poems, not one. There the poet exhorts his audience, "come now, listen to another *logos* of my silence." (Εἰ δ' ἄγε, καὶ λόγον ἄλλον ἐμῆς ἀΐοιτε σιωπῆς). Moreover, six of the ten principal witnesses insert a division after 2.1.34a 150. See Piottante 1999 36–37 and Kuhn 2014 9–11 for more information. Bady 2008 345 wrongly rejects the division between the two poems.

> When I bound my flesh, bringing a first-fruits sacrifice through the human sufferings of God so that I might die to this life by following the example of Christ the King, during these forty days when healing comes to bodies undergoing purification, I first set my mind on stillness by dwelling all alone. I set aside my cloud of woes and drew completely within myself, unswerving in my soul. Thereafter, I followed the teachings of holy men and placed doors upon my lips.[57]

There are here a few important allusions to the poems already analyzed. Gregory's desire to "die to life" in line 4 picks up a theme he had used at the beginning and end of 2.1.15. More importantly, the poem provides concrete fulfillment to his promise in 2.1.10 34 to "consecrate his silence" (θύσω καὶ σιγήν). The preparatory time of solitude before the silence fast also looks back to the end of 2.1.10; compare the use of ἀτρεμίη ("stillness") in line 7 above with 2.1.10 26, where Gregory told us that he would "arise from these earthly cares and take delight in stillness" (ἔνθεν ἀφορμηθεὶς τέρψομαι ἀτρεμίη). His desire to "die to this life" in line 4 recalls the beginning of 2.1.15, where he announces that he has arrived home after leaving "life" behind, and his declaration here in lines 7–8 that he has fled human company picks up his "happy flight"

---

[57] I have adopted prose instead of the customary verse for translating this exceedingly complicated sentence, since translators have varied widely on how to render it. Crimi and Costa 1999 and Kuhn 2014 make βροτέοις παθέεσσι, while Abrams Rebillard 2003 makes it an instrumental dative referring to Gregory's suffering: "performing a sacrificial mystery rite of God through mortal suffering." Both have something right. We should take θεοῦ with βροτέοις παθέεσσι (as Kuhn and Crimi), but render this as an instrumental dative (as Rebillard), for Gregory here paraphrases Romans 12:1 διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ παραστῆσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν ("[I exhort you] to offer your bodies through the mercies of God as a living sacrifice, pleasing and holy to God"). Gregory renders διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν θεοῦ ("through the mercies of God") as a concrete reference to Christ's passion θεοῦ βροτέοις παθέεσσιν ("through the human sufferings of God"). Crimi and Kuhn also rightly render the εὖτε in line 6 as temporal rather than causal (*cf.* Abrams Rebillard 2003 and White 1996). All four scholars have taken ἀχέων ἀχλὺν ἐφεσσάμενος in line 8 as a reference to Gregory "wearing" his cloud of woes. I suspect, however, that Gregory means here that he has "set his cloud of woes aside," which fits better with the ascetic context. That is, we should take ἐφεσσάμενος as a transitive use of ἐφίζω rather than as a late form of ἐπιέννυμι. *Cf.* 2.1.19 78–79, "so that after setting aside this end-of-life suffering, I would not be overcome by expectations of ill" (ὄφρα κε μὴ χαλεπῇσι σὺν ἐλπωρῇσι δαμείην / ἐξοδίην κακότητα ἐφεσσάμενος βιότοιο.) *Cf.* Simelidis 2009 *in.* 2.1.19 79, who observes the difficulty of the phrase and suggests a different interpretation, taking θεός from line 77 as the subject of the participial clause in line 79.

from human society in 2.1.27–28. I note finally line 8, where Gregory states that he fixed his mind on stillness "after setting down his cloud of woes." We should regard this not simply as a statement of ascetic triumph but as a Callimachean transition to a new theme. Gregory announces that he has set aside the theme of lament that was ubiquitous in 2.1.15, 16, and 45. These connections to the more polemical poems show that Dunkle was mistaken in denying an apologetic aspect to the poem.[58] Though Gregory does not mention here his troubles in Constantinople as vocally as he does elsewhere (though see his stern words to fellow priests at 2.1.34a 91–92), he nevertheless carefully connects 2.1.34a to a broader defense of his conduct in the capital and capacities as a bishop.

Gregory's Callimachean transition to a new theme is emphasized by the opening of the poem with a thematically appropriate allusion to the *Aetia* of Callimachus, something we often saw in Ovid. The opening phrase, ἴσχεο γλῶσσα φίλη ("my tongue, check yourself!") is inspired by fr. 75 4–9 of the *Aetia*, where Callimachus stops himself from recounting an inappropriate story about Hera:

> Ἥρην γάρ κοτέ φασι—κύον, κύον, ἴσχεο, λαιδρέ
> θυμέ, σύ γ᾽ ἀείσῃ καὶ τά περ οὐχ ὁσίη · [5]
> ὤναο κ̣άρτ᾽ ἔνεκ᾽ οὔ τι θεῆς ἴδες ἱερὰ φρικτῆς,
> ἐξ ἂν ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶν ἤρυγες ἱστορίην.
> ἦ πολυιδρείη χαλεπὸν κακόν, ὅστις ἀκαρτεῖ
> γλώσσης · ὡς ἐτεὸν παῖς ὅδε μαῦλιν ἔχει.

> For they say that Hera once– dog, dog, check yourself, impudent
>   soul, you will sing even what is against divine law;
> you are very lucky that you did not see the rites of the fearsome goddess,

---

[58] Misconstruing the manuscript evidence, Dunkle 2008 388 regards 2.1.34b as a later addition to 2.1.34a (the manuscript evidence instead suggests that 2.1.34a, 34b, and 38 are each a part of a poetic sequence, see Piottante 1999 29–30). Dunkle instead pairs 2.1.34a with 2.1.38. He is correct that the silence of 2.1.34a finds its culmination in 2.1.38, where Gregory ends his fast from speech. But this is because they both have been placed within a larger sequence, of which the polemical 2.1.34b is an important part. Though Dunkle wants to separate the ascetic 2.1.34a from its successor, 34b, for Gregory ascetic purification and *apologia* go hand in hand.

> because otherwise you would have belched out that information too.
> Truly much knowledge is a difficult evil for whoever is not the master
>   of his tongue: this man is really a child with a knife. (tr. Harder,
> modified)

Like Gregory, Callimachus observes the danger of not holding one's tongue. Because Gregory

changes the wording from his model, scholars have missed the Callimachean appropriation and

the humorous strand woven into the opening.[59] Gregory is serious about his silence, but he is also

well-aware of the humor of the setting: one of the most talented rhetoricians of his period has

stopped talking. He is in fact quite adept at τὸ σπουδογελοῖον, the literary technique of mixing

humor and earnestness.[60] The prominent role Gregory gives to the Callimachean intertext is

further confirmed by a more extensive allusion to the same passage near the end of 2.1.34b (39–

42, considered below).

These lines from the *Aetia* are especially significant, for they underscore the porous

boundary in Callimachean poetry between ethics and aesthetics. Ostensibly the force of the

passage is ethical or religious: Callimachus is about to commit a religious crime by narrating an

improper story. Yet the crime would be even more an act of aesthetic impiety; Callimachus uses

the incident to highlight both his great erudition (πολυιδρείη) and his facility for selecting

aesthetically appropriate narratives. Great learning without poetic discernment, expressed as

control over the tongue, leads to ill. Gregory's religious outlook is quite different, but he

nevertheless appropriates Callimachus' fusion of the ethical and the aesthetic. Gregory's fast of

silence is not simply about spiritual purification, but purification through carefully wrought and

highly erudite poetic compositions. Gregory does, of course, reorder the relationship between the

---

[59] "*L'inizio è sollenne*" Piottante 1999 *ad loc.* Abrams Rebillard 2003 150 is right to note that ἴσχεο is Homeric, but Homer has here been recast through an allusion to Callimachus.

[60] See Gowers 2012 for a brief treatment of the technique in Latin literature.

ethical and the aesthetic. If Callimachus relativized sacrality in favor of poetological concerns,

Gregory responds by reframing aesthetic beauty within a larger theological framework, one in

which humanity's fundamental task is the praise of ultimate Beauty.[61] For Gregory, true poetic

beauty derives from contemplation and praise. Nevertheless, it is precisely Gregory's desire to

write Callimachean poetry that accounts for something quite puzzling at first glance: an

elaborate and programmatic *recusatio* in the middle of a poem ostensibly about an ascetic practice.

In this programmatic passage (2.1.34a 69–92), Gregory declares himself to be an

"instrument of God" (ὄργανόν εἰμι θεοῖο 69) who brings a hymn to the Lord (ὕμνον ἄνακτι

φέρω 70).[62] Gregory does not sing of Troy, the voyages of the Argo, the hunt of the Calydonian

boar, or of mighty Heracles (71–72). Nor does he sing of how the earth and seas fit together, of

the gleaming of stones nor the course of the heavens (73–74). Nor does he sing of the mania of

erotic desire or of the beauty of boys (75–76). He thus rejects heroic epic, traditional didactic

poetry like that of Dionysius and Aratus, and the erotic epigram and elegy of those like Meleager

and Theognis.[63] Instead he will sing of the great triune God, the angelic choirs, of the harmony

of the cosmos, and of Christ's sufferings (77–84). He will sing of humanity's composite nature, of

the law of God, and of providence (85–89). The poet undertakes this project to inspire religious

awe in his audience (89–90). He ends the section by stating, "I have my tongue as a harp of these

themes" (τόσσων γλῶσσαν ἔχω κιθάρην 91).

---

[61] For festal praise as the ultimate end of humanity, see 2.1.45 25–34.

[62] On this passage, see Simelidis 2009 35 and Hollis 2002 47.

[63] Piottante 1999 suggests lyric poetry as the referent for 75–76, but I think homoerotic epigram and elegy are more likely in view (a suggestion already made by Kuhn 2014 *ad loc.*). The meter (elegiac couplets) is much closer to the hexametric genres just mentioned, and the lyre was by no means limited to lyric poetry. *V.* Call. *hZeus* 78, where poets in general are called "those who understand well the ways of the lyre."

This passage is tightly structured. In the *recusatio*, Gregory presents a hierarchy of the most significant epic and elegiac genres, placed in descending order by prestige. We move from heroic epic in the first couplet, to didactic epic in the second, and finally to pederastic epigram and elegy in the third. When the poet then lists his own theme, each couplet in the first part in the *recusatio* is answered by two couplets in his positive program. That is, his refusal to write heroic epic is juxtaposed with his promise to sing of the Trinity and the angels (77–80), the most lofty subject for a Christian poet. Though he refuses to sing of how the earth fits into the sea, the gleaming of stones, or the course of the heavens, he will sing of the "harmony of the cosmos" (κόσμου θ' ἁρμονίην). For Gregory, unlike prior didactic authors, the heavens and the earth must be spoken of together, for one day they will be united in the consummation of all things (81–82). The rejection of gleaming stones in line 74 gives way to the glory of Christ, who mixed heavenly and earthly form (83–84). The rejection of erotic epigram is answered in 85–88 where Gregory writes that he sings of his "mixture" (μίξις). By this he means humanity's composite nature: part earthly and part divine (85–86); but the sexual connotations of the Greek noun μίξις answer nicely the rejection of the erotic in lines 75–76. This program is in turn framed by the imagery of musical instruments. Tellingly, Gregory begins by calling himself the instrument of God (ὄργανόν εἰμι θεοῖο 69), but ends by stating that his tongue is the instrument (τόσσων γλῶσσαν ἔχω κιθάρην 91). This synecdoche is of great theological significance– for Gregory, the essential task of humanity is doxology, the praise of the triune God.

Gregory connects this program tightly to two other works outside of this elegiac sequence: it looks back to the iambic *carm.* 2.1.12 (*De se ipso et de episcopis*) and forward to the hexametric *Poemata arcana*. Gregory wrote *carm.* 2.1.12 in the summer of 381, less than a year before *carm.* 2.1.34a. In 2.1.12 309–26, he invites his rivals to instruct him in a number of points of Christian doctrine: the trinity and angels, the heaven and earth, providence, the soul and body, the Old

and New Testaments, the ministry of Christ on earth, and the general resurrection and judgment. The list of subjects and their order is identical to what we find in 2.1.34a 69–92 and furthermore nearly identical to the list of topics and their order in Gregory's great didactic sequence the *Poemata arcana*.[64] Moreschini and Piottante have noted the coincidences but both were uncertain about how to interpret them. Moreschini simply notes that he is unsure whether *carm.* 2.1.12 was written before or after the *Poemata arcana*, while Piottante is uncertain whether Gregory refers at all to the *Poemata arcana* in 2.1.34a.[65] In fact, Gregory binds these works tightly together. Recall that when the theological themes are listed in the earliest work, 2.1.12, they are part of a challenge to his rivals: he sarcastically invites his opponents "not to deprive him" if the Spirit has given them insight into such things (μή με στερήσῃς 2.1.12 323–26). Thus, when Gregory announces in 2.1.34a that he will himself sing of such themes, he implies that none of his rivals were able to rise to his challenge in 2.1.12. Yet Gregory's program of Christian teaching finds fulfillment only in the long hexametric sequence, the *Poemata arcana*. Not only is the sequence of themes nearly identical, but Gregory opens the *Poem. arc.* with the same nautical imagery he uses to close 2.1.34a. *Carm.* 2.1.34a ends "This is my voyage; you should spur yourself on to another. Each one should find his harbor by a different type of wind" (οὗτος ἐμὸς πλόος

---

[64] The subjects are treated in the following poems: trinity (*Poem. arc.* 1–3); the angels (*Poem. arc.* 6, also part of *Poem. arc.* 4); the two *cosmi* (*Poem. arc.* 4); providence (*Poem. arc.* 5); soul and body (*Poem. arc.* 7); the two testaments (*Poem. arc.* 8); Christ's incarnation, death, resurrection, ascension (*Poem. arc.* 8).

[65] See Moreschini 1988 59 and Piottante 1999 90. In a more substantial treatment of the *Poem. arc.*, Moreschini 1997 732 makes the oddly erroneous statement: "*Non abbiamo, purtroppo, dichiarazioni programmatiche, da parte del Nazianzeno, circa la sua intenzione di scrivere in versi.*" Even if we restrict this to the *Poem. arc.*, as Lieggi 2009 37 does with perhaps too much charity, Moreschini has missed the programmatic significance of 2.1.34a for the *Poem. arc.*

ἐστί · σὺ δ' ἐς **πλόον** ἄλλον ἐπείγῃ. / ἄλλος ἀπ' ἀλλοίου πνεύματος ὅρμον ἔχοι. 149–50).[66]

Poem. arc. 1 begins: "I know that we are setting out on a great voyage in a small raft" (οἶδα μὲν

ὡς σχεδίῃσι μακρὸν **πλόον** ἐκπερόωμεν 1.1.1 1). Note the use of the noun πλόος ("voyage") in

the same metrical location as in 2.1.34a 149. Scholars have been tempted to make the program

in 2.1.34a apply to Gregory's broader poetic corpus;[67] though it has broader implications, the

program most concretely answers a challenge set forth in 2.1.12 309–26 and prepares his

audience for the *Poemata arcana*.

2.1.34b (*In silentium ieiunii* B)
At 60 lines, the second lenten poem is much shorter than its predecessor. With the first two lines,

Gregory clearly situates it as a successor to 2.1.34a: "Come now, listen to another work of my

silence, both enemy and friend alike" (Εἰ δ' ἄγε, καὶ λόγον ἄλλον ἐμῆς ἀΐοιτε σιωπῆς, / ὅστις

ἀπεχθαίρων, ὅς τε φίλα φρονέων. 2.1.34b 1–2). Gregory then juxtaposes the spiritual vigor of

an earlier part of his life (3–24) with his present spiritual challenges (35–54). The summary of his

modus vivendi in 3–24 recalls Gregory's description of his youthful spiritual progress in 2.1.45 301–

312. There the focus was on what Gregory rejected (the typical pursuits of youth like parties, nice

clothing, and indecent poetry). In 2.1.34b the focus is instead on what Gregory embraced:

intensive study of the scriptures (7–10) and ascetic discipline that bound his desires for food and

sex and checked anger and mockery. Compare, for instance, 2.1.34b 14: "I fixed my gaze on

---

[66] The mention of a "different sort of wind" (ἀπ' ἀλλοίου πνεύματος) may also be a reference to the ongoing debates about the nature of the Holy Spirit, for Gregory mentions at the end of 2.1.38 a prospective work on the Holy Spirit.

[67] Pellegrino 1932 29 feels the need to explain the absence of the autobiographical poetry from the list; Moreschini 1988 55 denies that this program ever was fully realized. Lieggi 2009 235 goes still further and makes the section a manifesto for Gregory's entire life.

prudence" (ὄμμα δ' ἐνὶ βλεφάροις πῆξα σαοφροσύνῃ) with 2.1.45 310: "I placed my neck under austere prudence" (αὐχέν' ὑπὸ στερεῇ θῆκα σαοφροσύνῃ).

The lament in the second half of the poem reprises a number of themes from 2.1.10, 15, and 16. Disease and old age return again in line 25 (*cf.* 2.1.16 51; 2.1.10 16). More interesting is his return to the Envy motif in 37–42. He states that *logos* (probably here meaning his facility with words) has, against his expectation, caused him much vexation. Indeed, it has made him an object of envy for everyone, even his allies (πᾶσί μ' ἔθηκε φίλοισιν ἐπίφθονον 39). In good Callimachean fashion he addresses Envy but then checks himself:[68]

> … ῏Ω φθόνε, καὶ σύ
>   Ἐξ ἐμέθεν τι λάβοις. Ἴσχεο, γλῶσσα φίλη
> Βαιὸν δ' ἴσχεο, γλῶσσα· τό δ'ἐς τέλος οὔ σε πεδήσω.
>   Οὐ τόσον ἐξ ἐμέθεν λήψεθ' ὁ μισολόγος.
>
> O Envy thou may'st also take from me
> something— but check thyself my tongue, my tongue,
> do check thyself for just a little while.
> I shall not bind thee till the end; for he
> who hates my speech will not get such from me.

By checking himself Gregory adapts the same technique that Callimachus used at *Aet.* fr. 75.4–9, to which Gregory alluded at the beginning of 2.1.34a.[69] He promises that Envy will soon receive his own word, but he checks himself for the moment, because his tongue is bound to silence.[70] After a story about Polycrates, the tyrant of Samos (introduced in Alexandrian fashion by the verb πυνθάνομαι, "I have heard" 43), Gregory concludes his two silence poems with a prayer to the Logos. He asks the Word to restrain Envy, deliver him from evil tongues, and lead him to

---

[68] Callimachus apostrophizes Envy and Blame (Φθόνος and Μῶμος) at at *hAp* 111–13.

[69] Gregory does something similar also at *Poem. arc.* 3.49.

[70] Gregory probably here refers to one of his poems written against the devil, with whom he identifies envy (φθόνος). 2.1.50 (*Contra diabolum in morbum*) or 2.1.55 (*Diabolum a se depellit*) are both possibilities.

illumination. Then he will sing from his mouth a harmonious song (ἦχον ἐναρμόνιον ἀπὸ στομάτων 57–58). His mention of "harmonious song" looks back to his warning to his fellow priests not to "let forth an inharmonious noise" (2.1.34a 91–92). The final couplet enjoins the human audience to receive this "talking memento of my silence" (ὥς κεν ἔχοιτε / ἡμετέρης σιγῆς μνημόσυνον λαλέον. 60). This conclusion creates a nice ring structure with the opening to 2.1.34a: Compare 2.1.34a 1 ἴσχεο γλῶσσα φίλη ("check yourself, my tongue") with ἀλλὰ Λόγε φθόνον ἴσχε ("now, my Word, check Envy" 2.1.34b 55). The speech of the pen in 2.1.34a 1 is answered by the juxtaposition between the mouth and hand in 2.1.34b 58–60). The two poems are a tight unit which in turn look forward to 2.1.38, the paschal hymn that brings his abstinence from speech to an end.

2.1.38 (*Hymnus ad Christum post silentium in Paschale*)[71]

This 52-line elegiac hymn constitutes the festal "harmonious song" (ἦχον ἐναρμόνιον) to which Gregory referred at 2.1.34b 58. He begins with Christ, "I will address you, Lord Christ, first of all with my mouth, since I have now offered the speech to the air that I long restrained" (Χριστὲ ἄναξ, σὲ πρῶτον, ἐπεὶ λόγον ἠέρι δῶκα, / δηναιὸν κατέχων, φθέγξομ᾽ ἀπὸ στομάτων 1–2). "I will address with my mouth" (φθέγξομ᾽ ἀπὸ στομάτων) answers his promise to Christ to "sing to you with my mouth" (μέλψομ᾽ ἀπὸ στομάτων) at the end of 2.1.34b (58). Now the poet's mouth, instead of his hand, pours forth the intentions of his mind (3–4). Gregory then initiates the first section of hymnic praise, which runs from lines 5–30.

At line 31 Gregory begins an interlude in which he revisits the themes of his silence. Still addressing Christ, he writes, "For you, I have both bound my tongue and released my speech to

---

[71] *Carm.* 2.1.38 has been critically edited by Frangeskou 1984 and Piottante 1999. My citations follow Piottante's edition, unless otherwise noted. Abrams Rebillard 2003 has rendered the poem into English.

the ear. Yet I pray that you would allow me to do both in a holy manner" (σοὶ καὶ γλῶσσαν ἔδησα, καὶ οὔασι μῦθον ἔλυσα · / λίσσομαι ἀλλὰ πόροις ἀμφότερ' εὐαγέως 29–32).[72] He continues the theme of proper speech from lines 1–4 in 33: he will speak, but only what is fitting (φθέγξομαι, ὅσσ' ἐπέοικεν · ἃ δ' οὐ θέμις οὐδὲ νοήσω 33). The highly compressed holodactylic line is strongly Callimachean in flavor, as is the rare postpositive use of the conjunction ἀλλά in 32.[73] Thematically it compresses Callimachus' self-rebuke in *Aet.* fr. 75 4–9, to which we saw Gregory allude in 2.1.34 a/b: it is better not even to know impious things, lest one err in speech.[74] He then provides a series of metaphors to elucidate further: his speech will resemble a pearl after cleaning off the mud, gold that has been cleansed of sand, a rose separated from its thorns, or wheat separated from its husk (34–36). His tongue, in uttering this first poem after his silence, has dedicated it to Christ as the first-fruits of his ascetic labor (Ταῦτά σοι ἡμετέροιο θαλύσια, Χριστέ, πόνοιο / γλῶσσ' ἀπερευγομένη πρῶτον ἀνῆψεν ἔπος 37–38) Gregory here uses the rare verb ἀπερεύγομαι (lit. "to disgorge or gush forth"), thereby alluding once more to *Aet.* fr. 75.7, where Callimachus used the synonymous verb ἐξερεύγομαι for the "gushing up" of impious stories. Gregory probably also has in mind 2.1.34a 50, where he used to

---

[72] Frangeskou 1984 *ad loc.* is right understand it to mean that Gregory has now released his own speech for others' ears, *i.e.*, that Gregory is now speaking again with his mouth. Gregory was fond of using body parts to represent his different kinds of speaking: his silence poems were "works of the hand" (2.1.34a 155), while the present hymn is spoken "from the mouth" (2.1.38 2). Lieggi 2009 244 proposes a dual interpretation in which the line also means that Gregory has released his speech by binding his tongue: "*in quanto le due azione descritte … possono essere considerate o come due azioni distinte e conseguenziali, oppure come la presentazione della stessa azione con differenti modalità espressive.*" This is, however, an impossible construal of the Greek, which explicitly notes speech released "for the ear" (οὔασιν).

[73] Callimachus *hZeus* 87 similarly ends a form νοέω, there the aorist subjunctive instead of the future indicative. For postpositive ἀλλά, see Call. *hZeus* 18: Λάδων ἀλλ' οὔπω μέγας ἔρρεν ("The great Ladon river, however, was not yet flowing").

[74] See especially *Aet.* fr 75.4 θυμέ, σύ γ' ἀείσῃ καὶ τὰ περ οὐχ ὁσίη · ("Soul, you will sing even what is against divine law").

the simple form (ἐρεύγομαι) to refer to lascivious speech "gushing up", and to 2.1.45 47, where the tongue "gushed forth anger." Gregory mixes Callimachus and the epistle of James (3:1–18) to emphasize the double power of the tongue both to praise and to curse.

Scholars have missed the aesthetic dimension of this interlude and its thematic continuity with the program of 2.1.34a.[75] This is suggested in part by the highly Callimachean line 33 with its paraphrase of *Aet.* fr. 75.5–7. More importantly, there is strong thematic overlap between this interlude and the program of 2.1.34a 69–92, where Gregory rejected pagan themes in favor of Christian subjects. There, improper speech is represented concretely by the "wrong" kinds of poetry (heroic and didactic epic, pederastic epigram and elegy). Thus Gregory's promise to speak "only what is fitting" and "not even to know what is impious" concisely epitomizes the program of 2.1.34a. Gregory's ascetic and literary toils are once more closely connected.

After the interlude Gregory returns to hymnic paschal praise: "Today the mighty Christ is risen from the dead" (σήμερον ἐκ νεκύων Χριστὸς μέγας 39). After lauding Christ for his death, razing of hell, and resurrection, he concludes by stating once more that he has "breathed forth" a song after releasing his lips from silence (σήμερον ἦχον ἔπνευσα μεμυκότα χείλεα σιγῇ / λύσας · 49–50). He asks Christ to receive him as a chorus-leading harp (ἀλλά μ' ἔχοις ὑμνοπόλον κιθάρην 50), before concluding with a promise to sing something for the Holy Spirit: "Within, I have consecrated my mind to Mind (*i.e.* the Father), my speech to the Word; hereafter, I will also consecrate something to the mighty Spirit, if he wish it" (Νῷ νόον ἔνδον ἔρεξα, λόγῳ Λόγον · αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα / ῥέξω καὶ μεγάλῳ Πνεύματι, ἢν ἐθέλῃ. 51-52). As Frangeskou and Piottante note,[76] the epithets for God the Father (νοῦς) and God the Son (λόγος) correspond to

---

[75] See Frangeskou 1984 *ad loc.* and Piottante 1999 *ad loc.*

[76] See Frangeskou 1984 *ad loc.* and Piottante 1999 *ad loc.*

the opening invocation of Christ in line 5, "Word of the Great Mind" (μεγάλοιο Νόου Λόγε). Gregory's mention of a forthcoming a work "for the mighty Spirit" (μεγάλῳ Πνεύματι) is probably another reference to his *Poemata arcana*, especially *Poem. arc.* 3 (*De spiritu*), which he was perhaps then presently composing.[77] At the end of *Poem. arc.* 1, Gregory attacks those who deny the divinity of the Spirit (35–39) and *Poem. arc.* 3, devoted to the Holy Spirit, has in its third line a call for humanity to "bow in awe before the mighty Spirit" (Πνεῦμα μέγα τρομέωμεν). Gregory again carefully connects this elegiac sequence with the *Poemata arcana.*

References to Others Poems

Though I have primarily drawn attention to the internal coherence of the sequence, Gregory has taken efforts to connect these poems to a larger body of work. We have already mentioned the *Poemata arcana* (*Carm.* 1.1.1–5, 7–9); I have argued that the elegiac sequence here examined responds to the challenge issued to Gregory's rivals in 2.1.12 while also pointing forward to the hexametric *Poemata arcana*. In turn, our elegiac poems function as a sequel to another hexametric poem: the 217 line *carm.* 2.1.13 (*Ad episcopos*).[78] Gregory signals the connection by opening both poems with the same line: "O priests who offer bloodless sacrifices!" (Ὦ θυσίας πέμποντες ἀναιμάκτους ἱερῆες. 2.1.10 1 and 2.1.13 1). *Carm.* 2.1.13 is biting and satirical,[79] and Gregory

---

[77] The *Poem. arc.* are consistently dated to Gregory's retirement, though the precise dating varies. Sykes puts the poem at the end of 381 or beginning of 382, on the basis of a lack of the lack of hard-hitting polemic against Apollinarian Christology. See Sykes and Moreschini 1997 67. Evidently his views had changed, however, because Moreschini 1997 736 states that he agrees with the view of Sykes, who dated the poems after 382 because of their anti-Apollinarian views. There is, however, anti-Apollinarian polemic in *Poem. arc.* 8.39–50: see my appendix to chapter four. 382 is thus a reasonable date for the composition of the *Poemata arcana*, given the close connections with 2.1.34a and his opposition to Apollinarian theology, which began in earnest that year.

[78] In this case, the manuscript tradition would support reading 2.1.10 as a sequel to 2.1.13, for 2.1.10 succeeds 2.1.13 in *Gedichtgruppe* 1.

[79] Meier 1989 16 characterizes hexameter as the wrong metrical choice for such a theme, but hexametric satire was a much practiced genre in Latin. Gregory had plenty of avenues for learning of such poetry,

depicts himself as openly angry. He remarks in lines 18–26 that he is speaking against his will

(οὐκ ἐθέλων 19) and unable to restrain his wrath (οὐ δύναμαι χαδέειν ἐντὸς χόλον 24) are

answered by the greater self-control exhibited in the elegiac sequence, especially in 2.1.34a,

where Gregory states that it is a great benefit to restrain angry speech, for this restrains anger too.

In both passages he uses the imagery of swelling waves for anger (*cf.* οἶδμα χόλοιο 2.1.34a 133;

κῦμα βιώμενεν ἔνδοθι λάβρῳ / πνεύματι 2.1.13 20) and the language of childbirth (ὠδίνοντα

κατίσχῃς / μῦθον 2.1.34a 131-32; ῥηγνυμένης ὠδῖνος ἀνὰ στόμα 2.1.13 23). The opening of

carm. 2.1.38 probably also refers back to this passage: *cf.* "since I have given word to the air" (ἐπεὶ

λόγον ἠέρι δῶκα 2.1.38 1). I would imagine that 2.1.13 was written early after his return to

Nazianzus in 381, while the elegiac sequence was conceived a bit later as a sort of sequel, perhaps

in the fall or winter of 381/382.

Conclusion

I have argued in this chapter that these seven elegiac poems (*carm.* 2.1.10, 15, 16, 45, 34a/b and

38) constitute a coherent sequence. This may be seen especially in how the beginnings and

endings of the poems build upon others in the sequence, but also in the other cross-references,

repeated lines, and reprised motifs. In crafting sequences of this sort Gregory has followed

Callimachean precedent, even if the result is not quite so tidy as we find in other exemplars of the

practice, like Ovid. Gregory has, I argue, put considerably more editorial energy into his poetic

oevre than has yet been recognized, even if he never managed to compile all of his poems into an

aesthetically unified *Gesamtwerk*. The present chapter is only one small sounding into a vast sea;

there are many other issues which might be investigated in the future, especially whether

---

even if he did not read it himself. See the introduction to the present volume for a discussion of his
Latinity.

Gregory constructed sequences of poems with varied metrical schemes and genres. I have selected for detailed analysis only poems in elegiac couplets, yet we have seen that the elegiac sequence points to works in other metrical schemes. The poetic program in the elegiac poem 2.1.34a (69–92) responds to a challenge issued to rivals in the iambic 2.1.12 (309–26), but also looks forward to the *Poemata arcana* (1.1.1–5, 7–9), a didactic sequence in hexameters. The theme of repressing anger, so prevalent in our sequence, looks back to Gregory's angry outburst in the hexametric *carm.* 2.1.13 and is treated from a didactic perspective in 1.2.25 *Adv. iram*, an iambic poem contemporaneous with 2.1.34a/b. Moreover, there are several short iambic poems (2.1.35–37) which are also set during Gregory's fast of silence in 382. These contain noteworthy cross-references to the contemporaneous 1.2.25 (*Adv. iram*).[80] It seems likely to me that these were part of a parallel sequence of iambic poems, though perhaps Gregory unified them into one large sequence. In any event, it is clear that Gregory set out to imitate and emulate the generic variety and flexibility (πολυείδεια) of Callimachus, which the Alexandrian defended in *Iamb.* 13.[81] Other aspects of self-awareness would be worth analyzing in another setting, especially the striking manner in which Gregory himself becomes the subject of his song. We could fruitfully juxtapose Gregory's laments with, for instance, the exile poetry of Ovid. Yet even this small effort, together with the chapters that precede, sheds important light on Callimachus' reception in the fourth century AD by illuminating the literary art of a man who was, in his own estimation, born to bear the pen.[82]

---

[80] Compare 2.1.37 5 "the wise bound my tongue" (γλῶσσην ἔδησαν οἱ σοφοὶ) with 1.2.25 543 "but you have loosed my speech" (οἱ δὲ λύσαντες λόγον); and 2.1.36 11 "these letters are also from my silence" (καὶ ταῦτα σιγῆς γράμματα) with 1.2.25 543 "these are also from my silence" (καὶ ταῦτα σιγῆς).

[81] For *Iamb.* 13, see discussion in Kerkhecker 1999 250–70 and Acosta-Hughes 2002 60–103.

[82] See *carm.* 2.1.41 (*Adversus Maximum*) 55: "you're writing against a man whose nature it is to write!" (γράφεις κατ᾽ ἀνδρὸς ᾧ γράφειν ἐστὶν φύσις).

1.1.3 (*Poem. arc.* **3:** *De spiritu*) **29.**

βαιὸν τοῖσδ' ὑπέλαμψε, τὸ δὲ πλέον **ἡμὶν** ἔλειπεν.

Moreschini prints the oxytone form of the dative second person plural pronoun. I have not yet

been able to consult the manuscripts, but I presume most of them transmit the unmetrical ἡμῖν.

Moreschini prints the Sophoclean ἡμὶν, which is not attested in epic. Though it is conceivable

that Gregory used a tragic form here, it would be better to emend either to the properispomenon

ἧμιν or the reading of L, ἄμμιν, both of which are attested in Homer.[1]

2.1.1 *De rebus suis* **294.**

Νῦν δὲ δὴ ἐξαπόλωλε **κειμήλια** πάντ' ἀπ' ἐμοῖο
ψυχῆς.

Tuilier and Bady have printed the unmetrical κειμήλια ("heirlooms" or "inheritance"), which

must be scanned ˘ ¯ ˘ ˘, even though the syllable κει- is by nature long. There is one other

instance where a stream of the tradition of Gregory's poetry presents κειμήλια with a short first

syllable. At 2.2.6 108, the majority of the manuscripts (C, Mq and Lb) carry either κειμήλιον or

κιμήλιον . L, by contrast, reads **γαμείλιον** ("wedding gift"), the source of the editor's **γαμήλιον**.

The reading of L is perhaps a scholarly conjecture, for several scholars have suspected its scribe

of engaging in scholarly emendation.[2] Yet if **γαμήλιον** is his conjecture, then it is a remarkably

good one, for *carm.* 2.2.6 is presented as a wedding gift for a young bride. At *De rebus suis* 294,

Gregory is clearly indebted to *Il.* 18.290: νῦν δὲ δὴ ἐξαπόλωλε δόμων κειμήλια καλά ("But

now all the lovely heirlooms have disappeared from the house"). According to the TLG, *DRS* 294

is the only other hexametric line attested that begins νῦν δὲ δὴ ἐξαπόλωλε. There are two

---

[1] For ἧμιν, see for example *Il.* 17.417; for ἄμμιν see *Od.* 12.275.

[2] Simelidis 2009 91

solutions to the problem. First, we may suppose that Gregory wrote κιμήλια instead of κειμήλια. This does not fix the false quantity, but it would suggest that Gregory deliberately shortened the vowel. Such an adaptation, however, would be quite clumsy, for comparison with the Homeric source would immediately reveal the false quantity. Rather, I suspect that κειμήλια has intruded improperly from the *Iliad* into *DRS* 294, much in the way that bits of Matthew found their way into the textual transmission of Mark and Luke. I propose instead that Gregory wrote θεμείλια ("foundations"). The sense works well, "But now all the foundations have disappeared from my soul." Reading θεμείλια here would also increase the resonance with *DRS* 322 θεμείλια σείετο πάντα, where the foundations of Greece are shaken in an earthquake, and *DRS* 359 καὶ νηοῦ μεγάλοιο θεμείλια χερσὶ βάληται, where the foundations of Solomon's temple are destroyed by the Babylonians. If I am correct, the corruption of θεμείλια to κιμήλια occurred quite early. Not only would be mutation be easier in uncial, but Hesychius' entry for κιμήλιον almost certainly derives from this passage.[3]

2.1.1 *De rebus suis* 313–14

> Νηὸς ἐνὶ πρύμνῃ κείμην, Θεὸν ὑψιμέδοντα
> κικλήσκων **λιτῇσι**. Τὸ δ' ἄφρεε κῦμ' ἐπὶ νῆα.

The ι in λιτῇσι is short by nature, but must be scanned long as printed in Tuilier and Bady's edition. Gregory generally scans this word classically (*De vita sua* 1075, 1329, 1330; *carm.* 1.1.35 1; 2.2.4 204; 2.2.5 222; and *AnthPal* 8.37 4). The ι is scanned long, however, at *AnthPal* 8.56 3 and *carm.* 2.2.3 345. Words beginning with λιτ- were difficult for late antique poets because the ι in the adjective λιτός, -ή, -όν ("small or wretched") was long while the ι in the noun λιτή ("prayers") was short. Nonnus' only false quantity in the entire *Dionysiaca*, according to Alan

---

[3] For Gregory's works as source material for later lexica, see Simelidis 2009 48n84 75–76.

Cameron,[4] was with the adjective λιτά: ἀγρονόμων **λιτὰ** δεῖπνα, φιλοξείνῳ δὲ νομῆι (*Dion.* 17.59). It would be easy to emend λιτῆσι to εὐχῆσι, though difficult to explain how the corruption occurred in the first place. We might also write κικλήσκον <δὲ> λιτῆσι, for it would be easy for the δέ to fall out once the main verb was corrupted to a participle. Postponing the δέ until after the third word of the clause would hardly be regular, though Gregory did postpone conjunctive particles on occasion.[5]

2.1.1 *De rebus suis* 353
… πάτρην δ᾿ἐπὶ **θείαν** ὁδεύῃ.

The α in θείαν is long by nature. Gregory not infrequently scans the final alpha of a noun or adjective short, even when it is long by nature. This is, however, a liberty he more frequently uses in iambic than hexametric verse. Of Sicherl's examples of this practice, only five occur in hexametric or elegiac poems.[6] Gregory scans this particular adjective (θείαν) as a trochee also at 2.1.10 147 (iambic) and 2.1.34a 49 (elegiac). It is tempting, however, to emend to the synonym δῖαν. The sense is more or less the same and Homer uses it in this *sedes* in *Il.* 9.662, 21.43, 24.32 and *Od.* 19.50, 540. Gregory uses δῖαν at 2.1.22 9 (σπεύδων ἐς χθόνα δῖαν, ἐμὸν λάχος, ὥσπερ ὑπέσης, "hurrying toward the blessed land, my lot, just as you promised"). It would be easy for the rare δῖαν to be replaced by the more common θείαν, as by Gregory's period δ was pronounced as a voiced dental fricative (the *th* in "this") instead of a voiced alveolar plosive (the 'd' in "do").[7]

---

[4] Cameron 2006 339.

[5] *Cf. DRS* 63 οὔ με **γ**άμος δ᾿ ἐπέδησε. *Cf.* also the section in chapter three on syntax.

[6] Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 27

[7] Gignac 1976 75

2.1.32 (*De vitae huius vanitate atque incertitudine*) 7

> Ἤθελον ἠὲ πέλεια τανύπτερος, ἠὲ χελιδὼν
> ἔμμεναι, ὥς κε φύγοιμι βροτῶν βίον, ἤ τιν' ἔρημον
> ναιετάειν θήρεσσιν ὁμέστιος (οἳ γὰρ ἔασι
> πιστότεροι μερόπων), καὶ ἡμάτιον βίον ἕλκειν,
> νηπενθῆ, νήποινον, ἀκηδέα · ἓν τόδ' ἄθηρον [5]
> μοῦνον ἔχειν, θεότητος ἴδριν νόον, οὐρανοφοίτην,
> ὥς κε γαληνιόωντι βίῳ φάος αἰὲν **ἀγείρω** ·
> Ἤ τινος ἠερίης σκοπιῆς καθύπερθεν ἀερθεὶς,
> βρονταῖον πάντεσσιν ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἀῦσαι ·

According to the edition of Simelidis,[8] the manuscripts all transmit a form of ἀγείρω in line 7.

Yet, "so that I may in a peaceful life gather light" is a strange locution, and unprecedented so far

as I can gather from the TLG. I suspect that Gregory instead wrote ἐγείρω ("raise"). We would

then understand φάος in line 7 to refer to the eye: "so that in a life of repose I may continually

raise my eye [towards heaven]." This fits nicely with the emphasis on the visual in lines 8–9,

where the poet takes up an aerial vantage point (ἠερίης σκοπιῆς) and looks down on the rest of

humanity.

2.1.39 (*In uersus suos*) 58–62
I print here the edition of De Blasi:[9]

> Πρὸς ταῦτα νῦν γινώσκεθ' ἡμῖν, οἱ σοφοί,
> τῶν **ἔνδον** εἰ δ' ἥττησθε, τῶν αὐτῶν λόγων
> πλεῖστον τὸ **χρῆμα** καὶ τὰ παιζόντων **λόγοι** [60]
> χωρεῖτε. μακρὸν δ' οὐδὲν οὐδ' ὑπὲρ κόρον
> ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἄχρηστον ὡς ἐγῷμαι παντελῶς.

In line 59, De Blasi has removed the punctuation that Caillau placed after τῶν ἔνδον. However,

the εἰ δέ that follows shows that τῶν ἔνδον belongs with the prior line, and that a new sentence

begins.[10] We should thus punctuate with a full stop after ἔνδον, as did Caillau.

---

[8] Simelidis 2009

[9] De Blasi 2018

[10] A sense pause before the second princeps is attested in 8% of iambic lines, according to West 1982 41.

In line 60, I would punctuate after χρῆμα and then take the following καί as adverbial ("even") rather than conjunctive ("and"). The end of the line (τὰ παιζόντων λόγοι) is nonsensical, as De Blasi notes.[11] Emending the nominative plural (λόγοι) to the dative plural (λόγοις) restores the sense of the lines. Gregory asserts the utility of his verse (τῶν αὐτῶν λόγων / πλεῖστον τὸ χρῆμα "there is great utility in the words themselves!") and then bids his opponents to accept even the things characteristic of those who play with words (καί τὰ παιζόντων λόγοις / χωρεῖτε), *i.e.* stylistic adornment and tropes. The lines that follow offer further support for this interpretation, for there are several verbal parallels with Gregory's discussion of tropes in *ep.* 51.5. Compare the following:

carm. 2.1.39	*ep.* 51
μακρὸν δ' οὐδὲν	οὔτε μακρότερα γραπτέον…
οὐδ' ὑπὲρ κόρον	τὸ δ'ἄπληστον
οὐδ' ἄχρηστον … παντελῶς	ἔστι δὲ μέτρον τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἡ χρεία

---

[11] De Blasi 2018 *ad loc.*

Abbreviations

Lampe = Lampe, G. W. H. 1961. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford.

LfGRE = Snell, B. et al. 1955–2010. *Lexikon des frühgiechischen Epos.* 25 vols. Göttingen.

LSJ = Liddell, H. G. R., and H. S. Jones. 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon.* Oxford.

OCD = Hornblower, S., A. Spawford, and E. Eidinow. 2012. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 4th ed. Oxford

PG = Migne, J. P. 1857–66. *Cursus completus patrologiae Graecae.* 167 vols. Paris.

SVF = von Arnim, Hans. 1903–05. *Stoicorum ueterum fragmenta.* 4 vols. Stuttgart.

Abbreviations of Greek patristic authors follow those of Lampe. For classical authors I have followed the abbreviations of *OCD*, with the follow exceptions: I have abbreviated Callimachus as "Call." and have referred to Callimachus' *Hymns* in the following manner:

hZeus = Hymn 1 (to Zeus)
hAp = Hymn 2 (to Apollo)
hArt = Hymn 3 (to Artemis)
hDel = Hymn 4 (to Delos)
hAth = Hymn 5 (on the bath of Athena)
hDem = Hymn 6 (to Demeter)

Abbreviations for journals follow those of *L'année philologique*.

Bibliography

Abrams Rebillard, S. 2003. "Speaking for Salvation : Gregory of Nazianzus as Poet and Priest in His Autobiographical Poems." PhD thesis, Brown University.

———. 2013. "The Speech Act of Swearing : Gregory of Nazianzus's Oath in Poema 2.1.2 in Context." *JECS* 21 (2): 177–207.

Ackermann, W. 1903. *Die didaktische Poesie des Gregorius von Nazianz*. Leipzig: G. Fock.

Acosta-Hughes, B. 2002. *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 2009. "Ovid and Callimachus: Rewriting the Master." In Knox, P.E.ed., *A Companion to Ovid*, 236–51. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781444310627.ch17.

Acosta-Hughes, B., and Stephens, S. 2012. *Callimachus in Context: From Plato to the Augustan Poets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511919992.

Agosti, G. 2009. "Cristianizzazione della poesia greca e dialogo interculturale." *CrSt* 30: 313–35.

———. 2013. "Sulle immagini bucoliche nell'epigramma greco tardoantico." In Garambois-Vasquez, F. and Vallat, D.eds., *La lierre et la statue. La nature et son espace littéraire dans l'épigramme gréco-latine tardive*, 237–50. Saint-Etienne.

———. 2017. "(Re)Constructing a Christian Community Through Its Poetry." In *Shadowy Characters and Fragmentary Evidence: The Search for Early Christian Groups and Movements*, 233–50. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

———. 2019. "Greek Epigram in Late Antiquity." In Henriksén, C.ed., *A Companion to Ancient Epigram*, 597–614. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Agosti, G., and Gonnelli, F. 1995. "Materiali per la storia dell'esametro nei poeti cristiani greci." In Fantuzzi, M. and Pretagostini, R.eds., *Struttura e storia dell'esametro greco*, 289–409. Roma: Gruppo editoriale internazionale.

Ahrens, E. 1937. *Gnomen in Griechischer Dichtung (Homer, Hesiod, Aeschylus)*. Martin Luther-Univ. Halle-Wittenberg.

Alton, E.H., Wormell, D.E.W., and Courtney, E. 1997. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum libri sex*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Amato, E. 2002. "Note esegetiche e testuali alla Descriptio orbis di Dionisio d'Alessandria. 1." *Arctos* 36: 7–17.

Ambühl, A. 2005. *Kinder und junge Helden: Innovative Aspekte des Umgangs mit der literarischen Tradition bei Kallimachos*. Leuven: Peeters.

Asper, M. 1997. *Onomata allotria: Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos*. Stuttgart: Steiner.

———. 2016. "Distinctive Readings: Callimachus and Roman Knights." *Philologia Antiqua* 9: 21–32. doi:10.19272/201604601003.

Aubineau, M. 1966. *Gregoire de Nysse: Traité de La Virginité*. Sources Chrétiennes 119. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Bacci, L. 1996. *Gregorio Nazianzeno. Ad Olimpiade: carm. II,2,6.* Poeti cristiani 2. Pisa: Edizioni ETS.

Bady, G. 2008. "Ordre et desordre des poèmes de Grégoire le Theologien." In *Motivi e forme della poesia christiana antica tra scrittura e tradizione classica*, 337–48. Rome: Institutum patristicum Augustinianum.

Bady, G., Tuilier, A., and Bernardi, J., ed. 2004. *Gregoire de Nazianze, Oeuvres Poetiques: Tome I, 1re Partie. Poemes Personnels*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Barchiesi, A. 2011. "Roman Callimachus." In *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, 511–33.

Bartley, A.N. 2003. *Stories from the Mountains, Stories from the Sea: The Digressions and Similes of Oppian's Halieutica and the Cynegetica*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Bastianini, G., and Austin, C. 2002. *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia*. Milan: LED.

Beckby, H. 1965. *Anthologia graeca: Griechisch-Deutsch*. Munich: Heimeran.

Benoît, A. 1876. *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze: sa vie, ses œuvres et son époque*. Marseilles / Paris.

Bernardi, J. 1990. "Un regard sur la vie étudiante à Athènes au milieu du IVe s. après Jésus-Christ." *REG* 103: 79–84.

Bernays, U. 1905. *Studien zu Dionysius Periegetes*. Munich: LMU Munich.

Beuckmann, U. 1988. *Gregor von Nazianz, Gegen die Habsucht (Carmen 1,2,28): Einleitung und Kommentar*. Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums 6. Paderborn: F. Schöningh.

Blowers, P.M. 2016. "Beauty, Tragedy and New Creation: Theology and Contemplation in Cappadocian Cosmology." *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 18 (1): 7–29. doi:10.1111/ijst.12136.

Bowie, E.L. 1989. "Greek sophists and Greek poetry in the second Sophistic." *Aufsteig Und Niedergang Der Römischen Welt* II N° 33 (11): 209–58.

Bömer, F. 1969. *Metamorphosen, I-III: Kommentar*. Wissenschaftliche Kommentare Zu Griechischen Und Lateinischen Schriftstellern. Heidelberg: Winter.

Brügger, C. 2017. *Homer's Iliad. the Basel Commentary. Book XXIV*. Edited by S. Douglas Olson. Translated by Benjamin W. Millis and Sara Strack. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Burgsmüller, A. 2005. *Die Askeseschrift des Pseudo-Basilius: Untersuchungen zum Brief "Über die wahre Reinheit in der Jungfräulichkeit"*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 28. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Caillau, D.A.B., ed. 1842. *S. patris nostri Gregorii Nazianzeni omnia quae extant opera*. Vol. vol. 4: Carmina et epistula. Paris: P. Mellier.

Cairns, F. 1972. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh University Press.

Cameron, A. 1993. *The Greek Anthology: From Meleager to Planudes*. Clarendon Press.

———. 1995. *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 2006. "Poetry and Literary Culture in Late Antiquity." In Swain, S. and Edwards, M.eds., *Approaching Late Antiquity*, 327–54. Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199297375.001.0001.

———. 2010. *The Last Pagans of Rome*. Oxford University Press.

Casanova, A. 1999. "Gregory of Nazianzus, de Rebus Suis 424ff. and de Uita Sua 68ff. : Echoes of Epic and Dramatic Poetry in His Mother's Prayer." In *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church. 2*, 145–53.

Cataudella, Q. 1928. "Il prologo degli Αἴτια e Gregorio Nazianzeno." *RF* (56): 509–10.

Centanni, M. 2007. "Il Christos Paschon di Gregorio di Nazianzo: tragedia classica e cristiana." In Isetta, S. and Bertone, T.eds., *Letteratura cristiana e letterature europee: atti del convegno : Genova, 9-11 dicembre 2004.*, 59–67. Letture patristiche 11. Bologna.

Chantraine, P. 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la lange Grecque*. Paris.

Citroni, M. 2011. "Arte Allusiva: Pasquali and Onward." In Acosta-Hughes, B., Lehnus, L., and Stephens, S.eds., *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, 534–65.

Colonna, A. 1964. "De Oppiani vita antiquissima." *Bollettino Del Comitato Per La Preparazione Dell'Edizione Nazionale Dei Classici Greci E Latini* 12: 33–40.

Conca, F. 2000. "Gli Epigrammi Di Gregorio Nazianzeno." *Κοινωνία* 24 (1): 47–66.

Consolino, F.E. 1987. "Σοφίης ἀμφοτέρης πρύτανιν. Gli epigrammi funerari di Gregorio Nazianzeno (AP VIII)." *Athenaeum* 65: 407–25.

Conte, G.B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation. Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 44. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

———. 1989. "Love Without Elegy: The Remedia Amoris and the Logic of a Genre." *Poetics Today* 10 (3): 441–69. doi:10.2307/1772900.

———. 2014. *Dell'imitazione: furto e originalità*. Edizioni della Normale.

Conte, G.B., and Barchiesi, A. 1989. "Imitazione e arte allusiva : Modi e funzioni dell'intertestualità." In *Lo spazio letterario di Roma*, 81–114.

Costanza, S. 1991. "Motivi callimachei nel proemio dei Cynegetica di Oppiano d'Apamea." In *Studi di filologia classica in onore di Giusto Monaco*, 1: Letteratura greca:479–89. Palermo: Univ. di Palermo Fac. di Lettere e Filosofia.

Cribiore, R. 2005. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 2009. "Education in the Papyri." In Bagnall, R.S.ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, 320–37. Oxford Handbooks. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Crimi, C. 1972. "Il problema delle « false quantities » di Gregorio Nazianzeno alla luce della tradizione manoscritta di un carme, I,2,10 De virtute." *Siculorum Gymnasium : Rassegna Della Facoltà Di Lettere E Filosofia Dell'Università Di Catania* XXV: 1–26.

———. 2018. "Nazianzenica XXII. Variazioni sull'ira in Gregorio (carm. I.2.25; or. 18)." In Cipolla, P.B.ed., *Metodo e passione. Atti dell'incontro di studi in onore di Giuseppina Basta Donzelli*, 131–44. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.

Crimi, C., and Costa, I. 1999. *Gregorio Nazianzeno. Poesie*. Collana di testi patristici 150. Roma: Città nuova.

Crimi, C., Kertsch, M., and Guirau, J. 1995. *Gregorio Nazianzeno. Sulla virtù: carme giambico: [I,2,10]*. Poeti cristiani 1. Pisa: ETS.

Criscuolo, U. 2007. "Sugli epigrammi di Gregorio di Nazianzo." In Lozza, G. and Tempesta, S.M.eds., *L'epigramma greco : problemi e perspettive*, 19–52. Cisalpino.

Daley, B. 2006. *Gregory of Nazianzus*. Routledge.

———. 2012. "Systematic Theology in Homeric Dress: Poemata Arcana." In Beeley, C.A.ed., *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus: Essays on History, Theology, and Culture*, 3–12. CUA Studies in Early Christianity. Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press.

De Blasi, A. 2018. "Gregorio di Nazianzo. εἰς τὰ ἔμμετρα (carme II 1, 39)." PhD thesis, Padua: Università degli Studi di Padova.

De Stefani, C., and Magnelli, E. 2011. "Callimachus and Later Greek Poetry." In Acosta-Hughes, B., Lehnus, L., and Stephens, S.eds., *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, 534–65. Leiden: Brill.

Demoen, K. 1996. *Pagan and Biblical Exempla in Gregory Nazianzen : A Study in Rhetoric and Hermeneutics*. Corpus Christianorum. Series Lingua Patrum; 2. Turnhout: Brepols.

Diggle, J. 1984. *Euripides' Fabulae*. Vol. 1. Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford University Press.

Domiter, K. 1999. *Gregor von Nazianz, De humana natura (c. 1, 2, 14): Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Patrologia 6. Frankfurt am Main ; New York: Peter Lang.

Döpp, S. 1996. "Das Stegreifgedicht des Q. Sulpicius Maximus." *ZPE* (114): 99–114.

Dunkle, B. 2008. "Proclaiming the Silence: Models and Motives for Gregory Nazianzen's Carmen 2.1.34a." In *Motivi E Forme Della Poesia Christiana Antica Tra Scrittura E Tradizione Classica*, 383–89. Rome.

———. 2012. *St. Gregory of Nazianzen: Poems on Scripture*. Popular Patristics Series 46. Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.

Edwards, P. 2003. "Ἐπισταμένοις ἀγορεύσω: On the Christian Alexandrianism of Gregory of Nazianzus." PhD thesis, Brown University.

Effe, B. 1977. *Dichtung und Lehre. Untersuchungen zur Typologie des antiken Lehrgedichts*. Zetemata 69. Munich: Beck.

Eliot, T.S. 1920. "Tradition and the Individual Talent." In *The Sacred Wood*, 47–59. London: Methuen.

Elm, S. 2012. *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church : Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome*. The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 49. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fajen, F. 1999. *Halieutica*. Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Commentare. Stuttgart ; Leipzig: Teubner.

Fakas, C. 2001. *Der hellenistische Hesiod: Arats Phainomena und die Tradition der antiken Lehrepik*. Serta Graeca 11. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Fantuzzi, M., and Hunter, R. 2005. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Faulkner, A. 2010. "St. Gregory of Nazianzus and the Classical Tradition : The Poemata Arcana Qua Hymns." *Philologus* 154 (1): 78–87.

Floridi, L. 2013. "The Epigrams of Gregory of Nazianzus Against Tomb Desecrators and Their Epigraphic Background." *Mnemosyne* 66 (1): 55–81. doi:10.1163/156852511X584973.

Fontaine, J. 1977. "Unité et diversité du mélange des genres et des tons chez quelques écrivains latins de la fin du Vᵉ s., Ausone, Ambroise, Ammien." In Cameron, A., Junod-Ammerbauer, H., Paschoud, F., and Fuhrmann, M.eds., *Christianisme et formes littéraires de l'antiquité tardive en Occident*, 425–82. Fondation Hardt 23.

———. 1980. "Le mélange des genres dans la poésie de Prudence." *Études Sur La Poésie Latine Tardive d'Ausone à Prudence*: 755–77.

Frangeskou, V. 1984. "The Hymns of Gregory of Nazianzus and Their Place in the History of Greek and Early Christian Hymnography." PhD thesis, The University of Leeds.

Fränkel, H., ed. 1961. *Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gallay, P. 1943. *La vie de Saint Grégoire de Nazianze*. Paris: E. Vitte.

———. 1964. *Grégoire de Nazianze: Lettres*. Budé. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Gangloff, A. 2010. "Rhapsodes et poètes épiques à l'époque impériale." *REG* 123 (1): 51–70.

Geffcken, J. 1909. *Kynika und Verwandtes*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.

Gignac, F.T. 1976. *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. Milano: Istituto editoriale cisalpino.

Gilbert, B.D. 2014. "The Image of God, Greek Medicine and Trinitarian Polemic in Gregory of Nyssa's 'De Hominis Opificio'." Ph.D., Washington, D.C: The Catholic University of America.

Gilbert, P. 1994. "The Problem of Self-Knowledge in the Poetry of Saint Gregory the Theologian." *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 39: 255–74.

———. 2001. *On God and Man: The Theological Poetry of St. Gregory of Nazianzus*. Popular Patristics Series. Crestwood, N.Y: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.

Golega, J. 1960. *Der homerische Psalter*. Ettal: Buch-Kunstverlag Ettal.

Gow, A.S.F., and Page, D.L. 1965. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gowers, E.J. 2012. "Satire." In *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Vol. 4. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Greaves, D.D. 1994. "Dionysius Periegetes and the Hellenistic Poetic and Geographic Tradition." PhD thesis, Stanford: Stanford University.

Gutzwiller, K.J. 1998. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Harder, A. 2012. *Aetia: Introduction, Text, and Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C., ed. 1998. *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*. Groningen, The Netherlands.

Hardie, P. 1995. "Review Article: Virgil's Epic Techniques: Heinze Ninety Years on." *CPh* 90 (3): 267–76.

Hawkins, T. 2014. *Iambic Poetics in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Heldmann, G. 2000. "Die griechische und lateinische Tragödie und Komödie in der Kaiserzeit." *WJA* 24: 185–205.

Hilgard, A. 1901. *Grammatici graeci*. Vol. 3: Scholia in Dionysii thracis. Leipzig: Teubner.

Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext : Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Roman Literature and Its Contexts. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hollis, A.S. 1990. *Hecale*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. 1994. "[Oppian], Cyn. 2, 100-158 and the Mythical Past of Apamea-on-the-Orontes." *ZPE* 102: 153–66.

———. 2002. "Callimachus : Light from Later Antiquity." In Lehnus, L., Montanari, F., Calame, C., and Galli Milić, L.eds., *Callimaque*, 35–54. Entretiens Sur L'Antiquité Classique 48. Geneva: Fondation Hardt.

Holzberg, N. 2002. *Ovid : The Poet and His Work*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Hopkinson, N. 1982. "Juxtaposed Prosodic Variants in Greek and Latin Poetry." *Glotta* 60: 162–77.

Hose, M. 2004. *Poesie aus der Schule: Überlegungen zur spätgriechischen Dichtung*. Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Hörander, W. 1988. "Lexikalische Beobachtungen zum Christos Paschon." In *Studien zur byzantinischen Lexikographie*. Byzantine Vindobonensia 18. Vienna.

Hunter, R.L. 2008a. "The Periegesis of Dionysius and the Traditions of Hellenistic Poetry." In *On Coming After: Studies in Post-Classical Greek Literature and Its Reception*, 1 : Hellenistic Poetry and its Reception:718–34. Trends in Classics. Supplementary Volumes 3. De Gruyter.

———. 2008b. "Written in the Stars: Poetry and Philosophy in the Phainomena of Aratus." In *On Coming After: Studies in Post-Classical Greek Literature and Its Reception*, 1 : Hellenistic Poetry and its Reception:153–88. Trends in Classics. Supplementary Volumes 3. Berlin ; New York: De Gruyter.

Hutchinson, G.O. 1988. *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Jacques, J.-M. 2002. *Nicandres. Les Thériaques*. Collection des Universités de France. Série Grecque 421. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

James, A.W. 1970. *Studies in the Language of Oppian of Cilicia: An Analysis of the New Formations in the Halieutica*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Jungck, C. 1974. *Gregor von Nazianz. De vita sua*. C. Winter.

Kambylis, A. 1982. "Gregor von Nazianz und Kallimachos." *Hermes* 110 (1): 120–22.

Kaufmann, H. 2017. "Intertextuality in Late Latin Poetry." In Elsner, J. and Hernández Lobato, J.eds., *The Poetics of Late Latin Literature*, 149–75. Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199355631.003.0005.

Keith, A. 2002. "Sources and Genres in Ovid's Metamorphoses 1-5." In Boyd, B.W.ed., *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, 235–69. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.

Kenney, E.J. 1994. *Amores ; Medicamina Faciei Femineae ; Ars Amatoria ; Remedia Amoris*. Oxford : New York: Oxford University Press.

Kerkhecker, A. 1999. *Callimachus' Book of Iambi*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Kessels, A.H.M., and Van der Horst, P.W. 1987. "The Vision of Dorotheus (Pap. Bodmer XXIX)." *VChr* 41: 313–59. doi:10.1163/157007287X00201.

Keydell, R. 1951. "Ein dogmatisches Lehrgedicht Gregors von Nazianz." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 44: 315–21.

Keydell, R. 1953. "Die literarhistorische Stellung der Gedichte Gregors von Nazianz." In *Atti dello VIIIᵒ Congr. intern. di Studi Biz., I*, 134–43.

Knecht, A. 1972. *Gregor von Nazianz. Gegen die Putzsucht der Frauen*. Wissenschaftliche Kommentare zu griechischen und lateinischen Schriftstellern. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Kneebone, E. 2008. "Τόσσ' ἐδάην: The Poetics of Knowledge in Oppian's Halieutica." *Ramus* 37 (1): 32–59.

———. 2017. "The Limits of Enquiry in Imperial Greek Didactic Poetry." In Konig, J. and Woolf, G.eds., *Authority and Expertise in Ancient Scientific Culture*, 203–20. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781107446724.

Knox, P.E. 1985. "Wine, Water, and Callimachean Polemics." *HSPh* 89: 107–19. doi:10.2307/311271.

Köchly, H.A.T. 1881. "Coniectanea in Apollonium et Oppianum." In *Gesammelte kleine philologische Schriften*. Vol. 1: Opuscula latina. B.G. Teubner.

Kranz, W. 1961. "Sphragis. Ichform und Namensiegel als Eingangs- und Schlussmotiv antiker Dichtung." *RhM* 104: 3–46 and 97–124.

Kroll, W. 1924. "Die Kreuzung der Gattungen." In *Studien zum Verständnis der Römischen Literatur*, 202–24. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Kuhn, T. 2014. *Schweigen in Versen: Text, Übersetzung und Studien zu den Schweigegedichten Gregors von Nazianz (II,1,34A/B)*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 328. Berlin ; Boston: De Gruyter.

Lapp, F. 1965. *De Callimachi Cyrenaei tropis et figuris*. Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität.

Lardinois, A.P.M.H. 1997. "Modern Paroemiology and the Use of Gnomai in Homer's Iliad." *CPh* 92 (3): 213–34.

Lieggi, J.P. 2009. *La cetra di Cristo: le motivazioni teologiche della poesia di Gregorio di Nazianzo*. Rome: Herder.

Lietzmann, H. 1904. *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule*. Tübingen: Paul Siebeck.

Lightfoot, J.L. 2014. *Dionysius Periegetes: Description of the Known World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lloyd-Jones, H. 1963. "The Seal of Posidippus." *JHS* 83: 75–99. doi:10.2307/628455.

Lloyd-Jones, H., and Wilson, N.G. 1990. *Sophoclis Fabulae*. 2nd edition. Oxford ; New York: Clarendon Press.

MacDougall, B. 2016. "Callimachus and the Bishops: Gregory of Nazianzus's Second Oration." *Journal of Late Antiquity* 9 (1): 171–94. doi:10.1353/jla.2016.0005.

Mair, A.W. 1928. *Oppian, Colluthus, Tryphiodorus*. Loeb Classical Library 219. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Marcotte, D. 2002. *Introduction générale: Pseudo-Scymnos: Circuit de la terre*. Les géographes grecs 1. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Marrou, H.I. 1956. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Mastronarde, D. 2002. *Euripides: Medea*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McDonald, J. 2019. "Paideia in the Poems of Greogry of Nazianzus (Forthcoming)." PhD thesis, University of Glasgow.

McGuckin, J.A. 1995. *Saint Gregory Nazianzen: Selected Poems*. Oxford: SLG Press.

———. 2001. *Saint Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography*. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press.

———. 2006. "Gregory: The Rhetorician as Poet." In Børtnes, J. and Hägg, T.eds., *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*. København: Museum Tusculanum.

McLennan, G.R. 1974. "Enjambement in the Hymns of Callimachus." *Hermes* 102 (2): 200–206.

McLynn, N. 1997. "The Voice of Conscience: Gregory Nazianzen in Retirement." *Vescovi E Pastori in Epoca Teodosiana: XXV Incontro Di Studiosi Dell'antichità Cristiana* 2: 299–308.

———. 2006. "Among the Hellenists: Greogry and the Sophists." In Børtnes, J. and Hägg, T.eds., *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum.

———. 2015. "Gregory's Governors: Paideia and Patronage in Cappadocia." In van Hoof, L. and van Nuffelen, P.eds., *Literature and Society in the Fourth Century AD*, 48–67. Mnemosyne. Supplements, 373. Leiden: Brill.

Meehan, D. 1987. *Three Poems: Concerning His Own Affairs, Concerning Himself and the Bishops, and Concerning His Own Life*. Fathers of the Church 75. CUA Press.

Meier, B. 1989. *Gregor von Nazianz, Über die Bischöfe (Carmen 2, 1, 12)*. Paderborn: F. Schöningh.

Miguélez-Cavero, L. 2008. *Poems in Context: Greek Poetry in the Egyptian Thebaid 200-600 AD*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Milo, D. 2005. "Sugli epigrammi di Gregorio di Nazianzo per il padre." *AAP* (54): 439–51.

Milovanovic, C. 2008. "Gregory of Nazianzus's de Rebus Suis and the Tradition of Epic Didactic Poetry." *Zbornik Radova Vizantoloskog Instituta* (45): 43–69. doi:10.2298/ZRVI0845043M.

Milovanovič-Barham, C. 1997. "Gregory of Nazianzus : Ars Poetica." *JECS* 5: 497–510.

Mineur, W.H. 1984. *Callimachus. Hymn to Delos*. Mnemosyne 83. Leiden: Brill.

Misch, G. 1907. *Geschichte der Autobiographie*. Vol. 1: das Altertum. Leipzig; Berlin.

Moreschini, C. 1988. "Poesia e cultura in Gregorio Nazianzeno." In Felici, S.ed., *Crescita dell'uomo nella catechesi dei padri*, 51–63. Rome.

———. 1997. "Poesia e teologia nei Carmina arcana di Gregorio Nazianzeno." In *Synodia : studia humanitatis Antonio Garzya septuagenario ab amicis atque discipulis dicata*, 727–40. Naples.

Moreschini, C., Costa, I., Crimi, C., and Laudizi, G. 1994. *Gregorio nazianzeno. Poesie.* Collana di testi patristici 115. Roma: Città nuova.

Moroni, M.G. 2006. *Nicobulo jr. al padre (carm. II, 2, 4), Nicobulo sen. al figlio (carm. II, 2, 5): una discussione in famiglia*. Poeti cristiani 6. Pisa: ETS.

Most, G.W. 2008. "On the Authorship of the Christus Patiens." In Jördens, A.ed., *Quaerite Faciem Eius Semper : Studien Zu Den Geistesgeschichtlichen Beziehungen Zwischen Antike Und Christentum*, 229–40. Studien Zur Kirchengeschichte 8. Hamburg: Kovac.

Muratori, L.A. 1709. *Anecdota graeca*. Padua.

Musurillo, H. 1958. *St. Methodius: The Symposium: A Treatise on Chastity*. Ancient Christian Writers 27. New York, N.Y.: Paulist Press.

———. 1970. "The Poetry of Gregory of Nazianzus." *Thought 1970* (45): 45–55.

Müller, K. 1861. *Geographi graeci minores*. Vol. 2. Paris: Ambrosio Firmin Didot.

Naeke, A.F. 1842. *Opuscula philologica*. Ed. Weberi.

Nicastri, L. 1981. "Ricerche sull'elegia ellenistico-romana. La tradizione alessandrina nel carme 1,2,14 di Gregorio Nazianzeno." In *Studi Cantarella*, 413–60.

Oberhaus, M., and Sicherl, M. 1991. *Gregor von Nazianz. Gegen den Zorn : (carmen 1, 2, 25) : Einleitung und Kommentar*. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Oliensis, E. 2014. "The Paratext of Amores 1: Gaming the System." In Jansen, L.ed., *The Roman Paratext*, 206–23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139168786.011.

Opelt, I. 1958. "Alliteration Im Griechischen?" *Glotta* 37: 205–32.

Otis, B. 1958. "Cappadocian Thought as a Coherent System." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 12: 95–124. doi:10.2307/1291118.

Otis, B. 1961. "The Throne and the Mountain. an Essay on St. Gregory Nazianzus." *CJ* 56: 146–65.

Otto, J. 1881. *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi Secundi*. 3rd ed. Vol. 5. Jena: Mauke.

Overduin, F. 2014. *Nicander of Colophon's Theriaca: A Literary Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.

Page, D.L. 1976. *Epigrammata Graeca*. Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Palla, R. 2013. "Gli epigrammi di Gregorio Nazianzeno contro i violatori di tombe. 1 : Tra raccolte metriche e raccolte tematiche." In Zimmerl-Panagl, V.ed., *Dulce melos. 2*, 33–46.

Palla, R., and Kertsch, M. 1985. *Gregor von Nazianz, Carmina de virtute*. Graz: Institut für Ökumenische Theologie und Patrologie an der Universität Graz.

Panagiotis, V. 2011. "Ἐπιτάφια Ἐπιγράμματα τοῦ Γρηγορίου Ναζιανζήνου τοῦ Θεολόγου." PhD thesis, Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

Papathomopoulos, M. 2003. *Oppianus Apameensis Cynegetica*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Munich: Saur.

Parry, M. 1929. "The Distinctive Character of Enjambement in Homeric Verse." *TAPA*: 200–220.

Pasquali, G. 1942. "Arte allusiva." *L'Italia Che Scrive* 25: 185–87.

Pellegrino, M. 1932. *La poesia di s. Gregorio Nazianzeno*. Società editrice "Vita e pensiero".

Pfeiffer, R. 1949. *Callimachus: Fragmenta*. Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pietersma, A., and Wright, B.G., ed. 2007. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. 1 edition. New York ; Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Piottante, F. 1999. *Gregorio Nazianzeno. Inni per il silenzio.* Pisa.

Pontani, F. 2011. "Callimachus Cited." In Lehnus, L., Stephens, S.A., and Acosta-Hughes, B.eds., *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, 93–117. Leiden: Brill.

Prudhomme, J. 2006. "L'oeuvre poétique de Grégoire de Nazianze : héritage et renouveau littéraires." PhD thesis, Lyon.

Rabe, H. 1926. *Aphthonii progymnasmata*. Rhetores graeci 10. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ranke-Heinemann, U. 1956. "Zum Ideal der vita angelica im frühen Mönchtum." *Geist Und Leben* 29: 347–57.

Rebuffat, E. 1997. "Il proemio al terzo libro degli Halieutica e la biografia di Oppiano." *SCO* 46 (2): 559–84.

———. 2001. *ΠΟΙΗΤΗΣ ΕΠΕΩΝ. Tecniche di composizione poetica negli Halieutica di Oppiano*. Florence: Olschki.

Reinsch-Werner, H. 1976. *Callimachus Hesiodicus: Die Rezeption der Hesiodischen Dichtung durch Kallimachos von Kyrene*. Berlin: Mielke.

Ricceri, R. 2013. "Gregorio Nazianzeno, carm. II,1,50: introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento." PhD thesis, University of Gent.

Richardson, N. 2010. *Three Homeric Hymns: To Apollo, Hermes, and Aphrodite*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rousseau, P. 1998. *Basil of Caesarea*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Russell, D.A., and Wilson, N.G. 1981. *Menander Rhetor*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Salanitro, G. 2003. "Gregorio di Nazianzo e il Christus Patiens." In Benedetti, F. and Grandolini, S.eds., *Studi di filologia e tradizione greca in memoria di Aristide Colonna*, 727–28. Studi e ricerche di filologia classica. Naples: Ed. Scientifiche Italiane.

Salvatore, A. 1960. *Tradizione e originalità negli epigrammi di Gregorio Nazianzeno*. Collana di Studi Greci 33. Naples: Libraria Scientifica Editrice.

Schissel von Fleschenberg, O. 1935. "Review of Michele Pellegrino, La Poesia Di S. Gregorio Nazianzeno." *Philologische Wochenschrift* 55: 70–72.

Schmitt, W. 1969. *Kommentar zum ersten Buch von Pseudo-Oppians Kynegetika*. Münster: Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität zu Münster.

Schwab, A. 2009. *Über Vorsehung = Peri pronoias*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Sens, A. 2010. *Asclepiades of Samos: Epigrams and Fragments*. Oxford University Press.

Sicherl, M. 2002. "Verschmolzene Gedichte Gregors von Nazianz." *JbAC* 33: 313–23.

———. 2011. *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Gedichte Gregors von Nazianz*. Vol. 3: Die epischen und elegischen Gruppen. Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums. 2. Reihe: Forschungen zu Gregor von Nazianz 15. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Sicherl, M., and Gertz, N. 1986. *Die handschriftliche überlieferung der Gedichte Gregors von Nazianz*. Vol. 2: Die Gechichtgruppe I. Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums. 2. Reihe: Forschungen zu Gregor von Nazianz 4. F. Schöningh.

Sicherl, M., Höllger, W., and Werhahn, H.M. 1985. *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Gedichte Gregors von Nazianz: 1. Die Gedichtgruppen XX und XI*. Vol. 1: Die Gedichtgruppen XX und XI. Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums. 2. Reihe: Forschungen zu Gregor von Nazianz 3. Paderborn: Schöningh Paderborn.

Sieber, J.J. 2017. "Das Symposium des Methodius von Olympus: Überlieferung, Edition, Übersetzung und Erläuterungen." PhD thesis, Munich / Zürich: Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München; UZH Zürich.

Silva Sánchez, T. 1995. "Kaiserkult y creación poética: algunas reflexiones sobre las Vitae Oppiani y la composición de los Cynegetica." *ExcPhilol* 4-5: 107–22.

Simelidis, C. 2009. *Selected Poems of Gregory of Nazianzus: 1.2.17; 2.1.10, 19, 32 : A Critical Edition with Introduction and Commentary*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 2017. "Emotions in the Poetry of Gregory of Nazianzus." In Vinzent, M.ed., *Studia Patristica Vol. LXXXIII*. Vol. 9: Emotions. Leuven: Peeters.

Staats, R. 1985. "Basilius als lebende Mönchsregel in Gregors von Nyssa 'De Virginitate'." *Vigiliae Christianae* 39 (3): 228–55. doi:10.2307/1583855.

Stephens, S. 2003. *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 2015. *Callimachus: The Hymns*. Oxford University Press.

Storin, B.K. 2011. "In a Silent Way: Asceticism and Literature in the Rehabilitation of Gregory of Nazianzus." *JECS* 19 (2): 225–57.

———. 2012. "The Letters of Gregory of Naianzus: Discourse and Community in Late Antique Epistolary Culture." PhD thesis, Indiana University.

———. 2016. "The Letter Collection of Gregory of Nazianzus." In Sogno, C., Storin, B.K., and Watts, E.J.eds., *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide*, 81–101. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

———. 2017. "Autohagiobiography: Gregory of Nazianzus Among His Biographers." *Studies in Late Antiquity* 1 (3) (September): 254–81. doi:10.1525/sla.2017.1.3.254.

Sundermann, K. 1991. *Gregor von Nazianz: Der Rangstreit zwischen Ehe und Jungfräulichkeit*. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Sykes, D.A. 1979. "The Poemata Arcana of Gregory of Nazianzus. Some Literary Questions." *ByzZ* 72 (1): 6–15. doi:10.1515/byzs.1979.72.1.6.

———. 1985. "Gregory Nazianzen as didactic poet." In *Studia Patristica 16*, 2:433–37.

———. 1989a. "Reflections on Gregory Nazianzen's Poemata Quae Spectant Ad Alios." In *Studia Patristica 18*, 3:551–56.

———. 1989b. "Gregory Nazianzen, Poet of the Moral Life." In *Studia Patristica 22*, 69–73.

Sykes, D.A., and Moreschini, C. 1997. *St. Gregory of Nazianzus. Poemata Arcana.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Szymusiak, J.M. 1963. *Éléments de théologie de l'homme selon saint Grégoire de Nazianze*. Roma.

Szymusiak-Affholder, C. 1971. "Psychologie et histoire dans le rêve initial de Grégoire le théologien." *Philologus* 115: 302–10.

Tarrant, R.J. 2004. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses*. Oxford : New York: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, R.F. 1986. "Virgil's Georgics and the Art of Reference." *HSPh* 90: 171–98.

Toohey, P. 1996. *Epic Lessons: An Introduction to Ancient Didactic Poetry*. New York: Routledge.

Tuillier, A. 1969. *La Passion Du Christ*. Sources Chrétiennes 149. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Ukleja, K. 2005. *Der Delos-Hymnus Des Kallimachos Innerhalb Seines Hymnensextetts*. Orbis Antiquus 39. Münster: Aschendorff.

Van Dam, R. 2002. *Kingdom of Snow: Roman Rule and Greek Culture in Cappadocia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

———. 2003a. *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

———. 2003b. *Becoming Christian: The Conversion of Roman Cappadocia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Van Sickle, J. 1981. "Poetics of Opening and Closure in Meleager, Catullus, and Gallus." *CW* 75 (2): 65–75. doi:10.2307/4349339.

Vergados, A. 2013. *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes: Introduction, Text and Commentary*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Vertoudakis, V. 2011. *ΤΟ ΟΓΔΟΟ ΒΙΒΛΙΟ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΛΑΤΙΝΗΣ ΑΝΘΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ*. Athens: ΚΑΡΔΑΜΙΤΣΑ.

Villemain, A.F. 1874. *Tableau de l'éloquence chrétienne au 4. siecle*. Paris: Didier.

Volk, K. 2002. *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

von der Mühll, P. 1962. *Homeri Odyssea*. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Wagner, S.M.M. 1950. *Basil the Great. Ascetical Works.* Fathers of the Church 9. Catholic University of America Press. doi:10.2307/j.ctt32b2kz.

Walker, J. 2000. *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity*. Oxford University Press.

Waltz, P. 1944. *Anthologie grecque*. Vol. 6: Book 8. Les Belles Lettres.

Webb, R. 1997. "Poetry and Rhetoric." In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period*, 340–70. Leiden: Brill.

West, M.L. 1966. *Hesiod. Theogony*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. 1982. *Greek Metre*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 1998. *Homeri Ilias*. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Stuttgart: Teubner.

West, S. 1988. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Edited by Alfred Heubeck and J. B. Hainsworth. Vols. 1: Introduction and Books 1–4. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Whitby, M. 2007. "The Cynegetica Attributed to Oppian." In *Severan Culture*, 125–34.

White, C. 1996. *Gregory of Nazianzus: Autobiographical Poems*. Cambridge Medieval Classics 6. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

White, H. 2001. "Notes on Oppian's Halieutica." *AC* 70: 171–75.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1912. "Die griechische Literatur des Altertums." In Hinneberg, P.ed., *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache*, 3–318. Leipzig: Teubner.

———. 1924. *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*. Berlin: Weidmann.

Wimmel, W. 1960. *Kallimachos in Rom*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.

Wyss, B. 1946. "Zu Gregor von Nazianz." In *Phyllobolia für P. von der Muehll zum 60. Geburtstag*, 153–83. Basel: Benno Schwabe.

———. 1949. "Gregor von Nazianz. Ein griechisch-christlicher Dichter des 4. Jahrhunderts." *MH* (6): 177–210.

———. 1983. "Gregor II (Gregor von Nazianz)." In *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 12:793–863.

Zehles, F.E., and Zamora, M.J. 1996. *Gregor von Nazianz, Mahnungen an die Jungfrauen: Carmen 1, 2, 2: Kommentar*. Paderborn: Schöningh.