

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Callimachus and Callimacheanism in the Poetry of Gregory of Nazianzus

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

©

Copyright  
All Rights Reserved

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 (about 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 enunciate 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 *Halientica*, and ps.-Oppian’s *Cynegetica*), I argue that Callimachus is a uniquely useful influence for probing how later poets create their poetic *personae* and enunciate 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 guidance of William Adler. It was he with whom I first read patristic authors in Greek, and it was he who introduced me to the delights of Byzantine manuscripts. At Catholic University of America, I must first thank my *Doktorvater*, William McCarthy. In my first Greek class at CUA, he suggested I have a look at Gregory's poetry; I have not put Gregory's work down since. He has supported me in numerous ways over the past seven years, not least in his constant exhortation to stay close to the source texts. Sarah Ferrario, in addition to her input as a reader, provided sage counsel throughout my time at CUA on all manner of issues, whether βιωτικά or φιλολογικά. I am grateful also for the numerous helpful comments of my second reader, Rev. Gregory Gilbert. While the Lead Editorial Assistant to the Library of Early Christianity, I learned from John Petruccione something of the care and attention to detail required to produce scholarly works of value. I am thankful for his counsel and encouragement. Frank Mantello's appreciation for manuscripts and love of Latin made a deep mark even on this Hellenist. Fabio Pagani has to my profit consistently pushed me to think through methodological issues.

My work and my life have been enriched by numerous colleagues and friends at CUA. Pride of place goes to my friend and colleague, Kathleen Kirsch, who has provided invaluable critique at every stage of this work. My writing has profited from the scrupulous attention of, *inter alios*, Karen Carducci, Sr. Fiat Miola (SSVM), Patricia Craig, John Marshall, Casey Knott and Luigi de Luca. Numerous friends have pitched in to watch my children at one point or another: Patricia Craig, Keturah Kiehl, John and Susannah Marshall, Bohdan Lonchyna, Maria Stouraiti, Niki and Nissa

Flanders, and Carl Vennerstrom. I am grateful also to all who participated in CUA's Dissertation Bootcamp during the summer of 2018, and to Kevin Rulo and Bethany Besteman for organizing this stimulating atmosphere in which to work and reflect on the process of research.

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 εἶης. 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.

Γρηγορίῳ τοδὲ ἔργον ἐθήκα νῖϖ τ' ἁγίῳ τε  
καὶ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἣ μέλεται τὸ γελᾶν.  
χαίρω ἐγὼ δὲ κάσει, Κασσάνδρῃ, Σαπφοῖ καίνῃ,  
ἥ μὲν πρὸς τὸ σκότος, νῦν δὲ φάος Χάριτος.  
ὦ ῥοδὸν, ὄμματά μου, γλυκὺς ἥμερος, εὖφρον ἄκοιτι,  
τοῦτο δέ τοι ῥέξα· τοῦτο δὲ σοί, Βριάνῃ.

*Alex Poulos*  
*Deo gloria*  
*Lent 2019*

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgments .....	iii
Abbreviations .....	ix
Introduction .....	1
Gregory's Life .....	8
Literary Approaches to Gregory's Poetry .....	12
Chapter 1: The Imperial Callimachus .....	22
Part 1: Scholastics, Sophists, and Singers .....	22
Callimachus in the School .....	23
Callimachus and the Poets .....	26
Callimachus and the Sophists .....	30
Callimachus in Greco-Roman Literary Culture .....	32
Part 2: Callimachus and the Poetics of Imperial Greek Didactic .....	34
The <i>Periegesis</i> of Dionysius .....	35
The <i>Halientica</i> of Oppian of Cilicia .....	41
The <i>Cynegetica</i> of Ps.-Oppian .....	47
Conclusion .....	53
Chapter 2: ΚΕΛΕΥΘΟΙ ΑΤΡΙΠΤΟΙ. Originality .....	54
Untrodden Paths: Gregory and Callimachus .....	55
The Epigrams .....	59
Introduction .....	59
<i>Topoi</i> and Allusions .....	61
The Sequence for Gregory the Elder .....	63
Gregory and the Epigrammatic Tradition .....	68
<i>De rebus suis</i> (2.1.1) .....	73
Conclusion .....	84
Chapter 3: ΛΕΠΤΟΤΗΣ. Gregory's Style .....	86
Part 1: Gregory the Callimachean .....	86
Proper Measure .....	86
Craft .....	96
Part 2: The Gregorian Style .....	110
Stylistic Signatures (ΓΝΩΡΙΣΜΑ ΤΩΝ ΛΟΓΩΝ) .....	110
Discursive Sweeteners (ΛΟΓΟΙ ΓΛΥΚΕΙΣ) .....	111



Discursive Sweeteners in Verse (ΔΙΔΑΣΚΟΝΤΕΣ ΛΟΓΟΙ) .....	112
Thundering Poets (ΒΡΟΝΤΑΝ ΝΑΙ ΕΜΟΝ ΕΣΤΙ) .....	119
Conclusion .....	122
Chapter 4: ΕΠΙΣΤΑΜΕΝΟΙΣ ΑΓΟΡΕΥΣΩ. Erudition. ....	124
1.2.25 <i>Adv. iram</i> .....	124
Prose Sources for <i>Adv. iram</i> .....	126
Scripture.....	126
Philosophical Literature.....	127
Basil of Caesarea, <i>Homily 10</i> .....	130
<i>Chreiae</i> and Basil's <i>De legendis gentilium libris</i> .....	134
Poetic Sources .....	137
Medea's μαλθάκοι λόγοι and Alcestis' shade .....	138
Fire and Anger: Ajax and Achilles .....	140
Angry Beasts: Iliadic Lions and Odyssean Boars .....	141
1.2.1a <i>Hymn Virg.</i> .....	142
Prose Sources .....	146
Scripture.....	146
Virginity Literature in Greek of the Fourth Century AD .....	148
Poetic Sources .....	155
The Hymnic Hail: Callimachus' <i>Hymn to Zeus</i> .....	155
Incipient Light: Hesiod's <i>Theogony</i> and Apollonius' <i>Argonautica</i> .....	156
Human and Animal <i>Eros</i> : Oppian's <i>Halientica</i> and Ps.-Oppian's <i>Cynegetica</i> .....	159
Erudition: Means and Ends .....	162
Means .....	162
The Ends of Erudition .....	166
Appendix to Chapter 4: The Compositional History and Date of <i>Hymn Virg.</i> and the <i>Agon</i> .....	170
<i>Hymn Virg.</i> 15–19, 31–34, and 48–50 .....	171
<i>Hymn Virg.</i> * 11–55.....	172
<i>Poem. arc.</i> 6.1–26 .....	173
<i>Hymn Virg.</i> 56–99 and <i>Poem. arc.</i> 7.53–83 .....	174
<i>Hymn Virg.</i> 56–109 .....	174
<i>Poem. arc.</i> 7.53–83.....	175
<i>Hymn Virg.</i> 137–155 and <i>Poem. arc.</i> 8.32–52.....	177
<i>Hymn Virg.</i> 128–155.....	177

<i>Poem. arc.</i> 8.31–59.....	178
Chapter 5: ΓΝΩΘΙ ΣΑΥΤΟΝ. Self-Awareness.....	182
Poetic <i>Corpora</i> .....	187
Callimachus .....	187
Ovid.....	190
Gregory’s poetic <i>corpuscula</i> .....	193
Introduction .....	193
The Pre-Silence Poems.....	196
The Silence Poems .....	208
References to Other Poems.....	220
Conclusion .....	221
Appendix of Text Critical Discussions .....	224
1.1.3 ( <i>Poem. arc.</i> 3: <i>De spiritu</i> ) 29.....	224
2.1.1 <i>De rebus suis</i> 294.....	224
2.1.1 <i>De rebus suis</i> 313–14 .....	225
2.1.1 <i>De rebus suis</i> 353.....	226
2.1.32 ( <i>De vitae huius vanitate atque incertitudine</i> ) 7.....	226
2.1.39 ( <i>In uersus suos</i> ) 58–62.....	227
Bibliography .....	229

## Abbreviations

Lampe = Lampe, G. W. H. 1961. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford.

LfGRE = Snell, B. et al. 1955–2010. *Lexikon des frühgriechischen 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.

I have abbreviated the names of books of the Bible according to the SBL Handbook of Style. Abbreviations of Greek patristic authors follow those of Lampe. For classical authors I have followed the abbreviations of the *OCD*, when available, with the following exceptions:

Call. = Callimachus of Cyrene

*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)

Luc. = Lucian of Samosata

*Rh. pr.* = *Rhetorum praeceptor*

Abbreviations for journals follow those of *L'année philologique*.

## 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 more deftly.

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 best 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> Modern Greek and Italian are 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> See Caillau 1842.

especially the Bible. Many scholars of early Christianity do not have the classical background needed to appreciate Gregory's tightly wrought, allusive and elusive verse. Many 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.<sup>3</sup> The historical studies of John McGuckin and Susannah Elm in particular have made Gregory and his world much more accessible to anglophone readers.<sup>4</sup> 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*.<sup>5</sup> In his unpublished dissertation, Preston Edwards<sup>6</sup> 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 (*car.* 1.1.1 1–24 and 2.2.3, 4), and his analysis is more concerned with theological and philosophical questions than literary art. Suzanne Abrams Rebillard's<sup>7</sup> 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. 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

---

<sup>3</sup> See the literature review below for bibliography.

<sup>4</sup> See McGuckin 2001 and Elm 2012.

<sup>5</sup> See Demoen 1996.

<sup>6</sup> See Edwards 2003.

<sup>7</sup> See Abrams Rebillard 2003.

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.<sup>8</sup>

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).<sup>9</sup> 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 focused consideration 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 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.<sup>10</sup> The Cyrenaean was no less

---

<sup>8</sup> See Simelidis 2009 30–46 and Kuhn 2014 41–116.

<sup>9</sup> 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 for subsequent poets the “Alexandrian” approach to poetry, I have often used “Callimachean” and “Alexandrian” synonymously.

<sup>10</sup> For Callimachus' influence in Augustan Latin poetry, the classic study is Wimmel 1960. More recently, see Asper 2016 and Barchiesi 2011.

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.<sup>11</sup> 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,<sup>12</sup> 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,<sup>13</sup> 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 (see chapter 3). And yet even these departures from Callimachean precedent are often motivated by Gregory's (quite

---

<sup>11</sup> For example, see De Stefani and Magnelli 2011 for an excellent survey of Callimachus' afterlife in Greek poetry.

<sup>12</sup> See Part One of Chapter 3 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.

<sup>13</sup> See examples in Chapter Two, section “*Topoi* and Allusions” and Chapter Four, section “The Hymnic Hail.”

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 he was cited almost exclusively by poets, while 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 *Halientica*, 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 2–5 around four traits that scholars have consistently associated with Callimachean poetry: originality, fineness (λεπτότης), erudition, and self-awareness.<sup>14</sup> In

---

<sup>14</sup> 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.



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,<sup>15</sup> 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, as 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 alluded carefully not only to prior poetry, but also to earlier prose, 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

---

<sup>15</sup> See Keydell 1953 142–43.

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 recommended emendations to the transmitted text or suggested a minority reading. For the convenience of future 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.<sup>16</sup> I have generally not accorded other 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

---

<sup>16</sup> 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 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. Throughout, translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

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 the work will thereby be accessible to a 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.<sup>17</sup>

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,<sup>18</sup> initially belonged to a sect called the "hypsistarians" (worshippers 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.<sup>19</sup> After Gregory's father converted, he became bishop of Nazianzus (celibacy was not yet normative for bishops).

---

<sup>17</sup> 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.

<sup>18</sup> 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.

<sup>19</sup> McGuckin 2001 3.

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.<sup>20</sup>

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 lesser lights, like Gregory's kinsmen Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium. The literary activity of these men makes Cappadocia in the fourth century one of the best documented periods and places of the ancient world.<sup>21</sup> 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 after about a year Gregory continued to Athens, where he spent most of his twenties studying rhetoric and literature in the company of his friend and fellow Cappadocian Basil.<sup>22</sup>

Around the age of thirty, Gregory returned home from Athens. There is some indication he worked initially as a professional rhetorician,<sup>23</sup> 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

---

<sup>20</sup> Nonna's vow is described at *carm.* 2.1.45 197–201 and more extensively at *carm.* 2.1.11 68–81.

<sup>21</sup> For historical treatments of fourth century Cappadocia, see Van Dam 2003b, Van Dam 2003a, and Van Dam 2002.

<sup>22</sup> For student life in Athens in the fourth century, see Bernardi 1990.

<sup>23</sup> See McLynn 2006 220–26.

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.<sup>24</sup> 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.<sup>25</sup> 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 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

---

<sup>24</sup> In addition to McGuckin 2001 85–168, see also Rousseau 1998 233–269 for this period of Gregory's life.

<sup>25</sup> See Gallay 1964 61n1.

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.<sup>26</sup> A flurry of apologetic and polemical poems flew forth.<sup>27</sup> The following year, Gregory was invited to a council in the capital to address the growing Apollinarian crisis.<sup>28</sup> In reply, Gregory dispatched a bitter critique of bishops (*car.* 2.1.13) and a series of theological letters (*ep.* 101 and 102) that quickly were received as the Orthodox reply to Apollinarianism. Gregory's correspondence bears witness to his continued contact with people in the capital during his retirement.<sup>29</sup> 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

---

<sup>26</sup> See Storin 2011.

<sup>27</sup> Most notably 2.1.11 *De vita sua*, 2.1.12 *De se ipso et episcopis*, and 2.1.13 *In episcopos*.

<sup>28</sup> Apollinaris and his followers asserted that divine aspect of Jesus' nature, the λόγος θεοῦ, effectively erased Jesus' human mind.

<sup>29</sup> For instance, his correspondence with Nectarius.

asserting episcopal jurisdiction over his father's former see in Nazianzus. Gregory probably was genuinely tired of the demands of 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.<sup>30</sup> Within a year, however, Gregory had orchestrated the 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.<sup>31</sup> This is the basis of the corpus transmitted by the Byzantine manuscripts. 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.<sup>32</sup>

### **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 with regard to Gregory's reception in the 16–19th centuries.<sup>33</sup> 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

---

<sup>30</sup> On this sequence of events, see McLynn 2015.

<sup>31</sup> See Storin 2016.

<sup>32</sup> 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).

<sup>33</sup> Edwards 2003 1–49.

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.<sup>34</sup> 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.<sup>35</sup> 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 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.<sup>36</sup> On the other hand, the Romantic emphasis on original expression of direct experience led many scholars, especially those working in Germany,<sup>37</sup> to regard allusions and other techniques of "bookish" poetry as aesthetic defects, evidence of a degenerate obsequiousness to the past.<sup>38</sup> 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

---

<sup>34</sup> Edwards 2003 23–43.

<sup>35</sup> See Muratori 1709.

<sup>36</sup> In this camp belong, for example, Villemain 1874, Benoît 1876, and Pellegrino 1932.

<sup>37</sup> The divide between French and German valuations of Gregory was noted already by Ackermann 1903 11 at the beginning of the twentieth century.

<sup>38</sup> Eliot 1920 sagely analyzes the limitations of this Romantic conception of poetry which was still tacitly supreme in the period between the great wars.



principle the basic distinction between poetry and prose, but even played with it to the extreme.”<sup>39</sup>

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.<sup>40</sup>

Scholars of this persuasion read Gregory primarily as an instrument to reconstruct earlier, “better” poets.<sup>41</sup> *Quellenforschung* became a means not for considering Gregory’s creative appropriations of the literary past, but a tool for condemning Gregory’s lack of originality.<sup>42</sup> 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.<sup>43</sup> 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 other kinds of verse, especially didactic poetry.<sup>44</sup> 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

---

<sup>39</sup> “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).

<sup>40</sup> See Hardie 1995.

<sup>41</sup> Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1912 294 found Gregory especially interesting because he was useful for reconstructing earlier, lost poetry.

<sup>42</sup> 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).

<sup>43</sup> See especially Schissel von Fleschenberg 1935, a scathing and unjust review of Pellegrino 1932.

<sup>44</sup> Pellegrino 1932 19.

the Hellenic past.<sup>45</sup> 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 Einbeit*) was a noble but ultimately failed task. Gregory was unable to escape the literary conventions of his period, but was "as sensitive to the cultural heritage of Greece as was possible for a Christian of his time."<sup>46</sup> 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.

Romantic paradigms were challenged during the middle decades of the twentieth century, especially by Giorgio Pasquali's rehabilitation of allusion as a legitimate poetic exercise,<sup>47</sup> whence originated a rich and varied theoretical discourse on "intertextuality."<sup>48</sup> 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

---

<sup>45</sup> "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 innerlichstes 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 unfreinwillig ist, erzwungen durch die Verchristlichung des Geistes— das ist, über das Literarhistorische hinaus, die allgemeine geistesgeschichtliche Bedeutung der Gedichte Gregors" (Keydell 1953 142–43).

<sup>46</sup> Wyss 1949 203.

<sup>47</sup> See Pasquali 1942. For the reception of Pasquali, see Citroni 2011.

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

verse.<sup>49</sup> Franca Ela Consolino has criticized Salvatore's analysis for being overly impressionistic;<sup>50</sup> 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.<sup>51</sup> Though the views of Wyss and Keydell occasionally still find proponents,<sup>52</sup> most scholars since the 1960s have had greater sensitivity to and sympathy with the aesthetic opportunities presented by allusion. The Romantic dichotomy between poetry and rhetoric has also been challenged, though more slowly.<sup>53</sup> Ruth Webb and Jeffrey Walker have brought to light the complicated give-and-take between rhetoricians and poets.<sup>54</sup> 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 of any artful speech.<sup>55</sup>

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.<sup>56</sup> Sicherl and Werhahn produced important analyses

---

<sup>49</sup> See Salvatore 1960.

<sup>50</sup> Consolino 1987 409.

<sup>51</sup> Salvatore 1960 41.

<sup>52</sup> E.g. Hose 2004.

<sup>53</sup> 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 ascendancy of rhetoric in the fourth century.

<sup>54</sup> See Webb 1997 and Walker 2000.

<sup>55</sup> See most recently Agosti 2019.

<sup>56</sup> See Knecht 1972, Jungck 1974, Beuckmann 1988, Meier 1989, Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991, Sundermann 1991, Zehles and Zamora 1996, and Domiter 1999.

of the textual transmission.<sup>57</sup> Roberto Palla and Manfred Kertsch collaborated on several editions.<sup>58</sup> The only complete translations of Gregory's poetry into a European vernacular also occurred during this time (Italian and Modern Greek).<sup>59</sup> On the literary front, Nicastrì and Consolino have highlighted Gregory's innovating role in the history of Greek elegy and epigram respectively.<sup>60</sup> Claudio Moreschini and D.A. Sykes produced reevaluations of Gregory's verse sensitive both to literary concerns and Gregory's philosophical and religious contributions.<sup>61</sup> This is most evident in their edition, commentary, and English translation of the *Poemata arcana* (*carm.* 1.1.1–5, 7–9).<sup>62</sup> The studies of Brooks Otis, Herbert Musurillo, and Peter Gilbert elucidated sympathetically the theological aspects of Gregory's verse.<sup>63</sup>

We have seen in the opening decades of the twenty-first century further progress on the philological front. One volume of Gregory's autobiographical verse has appeared in the Budé series.<sup>64</sup> Christos Simelidis has produced an excellent edition<sup>65</sup> 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.<sup>66</sup> 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-

---

<sup>57</sup> See Sicherl, Höllger, and Werhahn 1985, Sicherl and Gertz 1986, and more recently Sicherl 2011.

<sup>58</sup> See Palla and Kertsch 1985 and Crimi, Kertsch, and Guirau 1995.

<sup>59</sup> See Sakalis 1977 Moreschini et al. 1994 and Crimi and Costa 1999.

<sup>60</sup> See Nicastrì 1981 and Consolino 1987.

<sup>61</sup> See Sykes 1979, Sykes 1985, Sykes 1989a, Sykes 1989b, Moreschini 1988, and Moreschini 1997.

<sup>62</sup> See Sykes and Moreschini 1997.

<sup>63</sup> See Otis 1961, Musurillo 1970, Gilbert 1994, and Gilbert 2001.

<sup>64</sup> See Bady, Tuilier, and Bernardi 2004.

<sup>65</sup> See Simelidis 2009.

<sup>66</sup> For example, Moroni 2006, Ricceri 2013, and De Blasi 2018.

Treichel, Christos 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.<sup>67</sup> By contrast, Suzanne Abrams Rebillard's sensitive treatment of *carm.* 2.1.2 shows the benefit of reading Gregory's work against contemporary political and religious disputes.<sup>68</sup> 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,<sup>69</sup> just as Gianfranco Agosti has consistently emphasized the capacity for Christian poetry like Gregory's to produce genuine dialogue between competing religious sects.<sup>70</sup> 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.<sup>71</sup> Wyss judged that Callimachus was the most important linguistic model for Gregory after Homer and Euripides.<sup>72</sup> 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

---

<sup>67</sup> Edwards 2003, Prudhomme 2006, Simelidis 2009, and Kuhn 2014.

<sup>68</sup> See Abrams Rebillard 2013.

<sup>69</sup> Schwab 2009 130.

<sup>70</sup> See especially Agosti 2009.

<sup>71</sup> Naeke 1842 237, *cit.* Edwards 2003 9.

<sup>72</sup> Wyss 1949 192.

were being forced to listen to a beloved piece of music on an old and scratchy record player.”<sup>73</sup>

Gregory’s allusions to Callimachus have only slowly begun to receive closer scrutiny. A. Kambylis’ brief article noted Gregory’s use in *Poem. arv.* 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.<sup>74</sup> 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.<sup>75</sup> Simelidis has shown in his survey of “Gregory and Hellenistic Poetry”<sup>76</sup> 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;<sup>77</sup> Preston Edwards even dared to treat Gregory *qua* an Alexandrian poet. Though the latter’s analysis of individual texts sometimes misses important features,<sup>78</sup> his fundamental conviction that Gregory exhibits the same allusive practices as those of the Alexandrian poets is correct. Byron MacDougall

---

<sup>73</sup> “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 192–93).

<sup>74</sup> 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” (*auf den akustischen Bereich* 121).

<sup>75</sup> See Hollis 2002.

<sup>76</sup> Simelidis 2009 30–46.

<sup>77</sup> Prudhomme 2006 143, 180.

<sup>78</sup> Edwards 2003 54 ably presents the Platonic resonances of the opening lines of *Poem. arv.* 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.

has shown moreover that Gregory even deployed Callimachean catchphrases in his prose, something decidedly atypical for rhetoricians of the Imperial and late antique periods.<sup>79</sup>

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 attend closely to how Callimachus shapes Gregory's poetic persona and the manner in which Gregory narrates his aesthetic in Callimachean terms. Prudhomme and McGuckin have both made important contributions to our understanding of Gregory's poetics,<sup>80</sup> 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.<sup>81</sup> 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 ready paths for a Christian poet to follow. He could have written biblical epic, as did Apollinaris and Nonnus; hagiographic verse, as would Eudocia; or even cento.<sup>82</sup> Instead he composed a highly variegated *corpus* of different tones, registers, genres, and

---

<sup>79</sup> See MacDougall 2016.

<sup>80</sup> See McGuckin 2006 and Prudhomme 2006.

<sup>81</sup> For example, Consolino 1987 Vertoudakis 2011.

<sup>82</sup> 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

metrical schemes. It is my contention that Callimachean categories are precisely what we need to render these aesthetic decisions intelligible and appealing.

---

haphazard attention to classical prosody, even granting that he does not always follow classical quantities. For treatments skeptical of Gregorian authorship of the *Christus patiens*, see Hörander 1988 and Most 2008.



## 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: his presence in the papyrological record, prose literature, and the poetry of the period. I argue that the sophists of the so-called Second Sophistic<sup>83</sup> largely ignored Callimachus in favor of earlier verse, while poets alluded to the Cyrenaean poet frequently and in programmatically significant passages. Hence, Callimachus came to embody specifically poetic, rather than prosaic *technē*. In the second half, we turn to the three most extensive poetic compositions still extant from this period: Dionysius' *Periegesis*, Oppian's *Halientica*, 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.

---

<sup>83</sup> I use the term "sophist" in a neutral sense to refer to a professional practitioner of rhetoric.

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.<sup>84</sup> 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 *Halientica*, 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 ἡδὲ καὶ αὐτὰς  
πτῶσεις γραμματικῆς πτῶσιν ἔχων πενίης.

"I'm selling my Callimachus, Pindar, and those books of declensions, since I've suffered a case of grammatical poverty." (*AnthPal* 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 glosses suggest that Callimachus was already being read in the school, or at least by a broad, educated audience. Evidence from the

---

<sup>84</sup> 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.

Imperial period and late antiquity shows that Callimachus was a common school author. In the epigram *AnthPal* 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* 15.669c (2nd. c. AD) refers to one of Callimachus' epigrams as "those which are read by children (παῖδες)."<sup>85</sup> 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.<sup>86</sup> 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.<sup>87</sup> The paucity of school texts is surprising, but comprehensible. Papyri from school contexts are identified 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.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> τοῦτο γὰρ ἐν παισὶ τὰ Καλλιμάχου ἀναγινώσκων ἐπιγράμματα.

<sup>86</sup> Harder 2012 68–70.

<sup>87</sup> Cribiore 2005 202.

<sup>88</sup> Cribiore 2009 329.

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.<sup>89</sup> Libanius also mentions "Homer, Hesiod, and the other poets" in a context in *ep.* 1036 that refers to studies undertaken in his own school.<sup>90</sup> Callimachus, however, seems to have played little role in the rhetorical classroom. Dio Chrysostom recommends that aspiring rhetors confine themselves to Homer, Euripides, and Menander.<sup>91</sup> 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.<sup>92</sup> 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 all the more surprising, as students did many of their rhetorical exercises in verse, not prose.<sup>93</sup> Clearly some children learned to compose poetry before starting rhetorical studies, for poetic competitions at festivals, which continued until the beginning of the 3rd c. AD, often had categories for παῖδες/*pueri* and ephebes, who would not yet have begun rhetorical training.<sup>94</sup> One particularly striking example of such poetry is the 43 line extemporaneous hexametric poem

---

<sup>89</sup> See discussion at Cribiore 2005 227.

<sup>90</sup> Miguélez-Cavero 2008 230.

<sup>91</sup> Bowie 1989 211–12 notes that this dictate corresponds well with the citation practices of the sophists themselves.

<sup>92</sup> Philostr. *VS* p. 514–15.

<sup>93</sup> Cribiore 2005 229–30.

<sup>94</sup> See Marrou 1956 134–36, 188 and Döpp 1996 103.

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.<sup>95</sup> It remains unclear to me where these young men and women were learning to compose verse before entering the rhetorical school. It 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 friends 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 institutionally subsumed into the rhetorical school, as Martin Hose claims occurred in late antiquity.<sup>96</sup>

### 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 *technē* rather than *mania* (divine inspiration). 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 (*mania*) was at least as old as Plato, who famously denied that poets practice a craft (*technē*). Plato was not unanimously followed, of course. Indeed Callimachus represented the “skill” pole of the spectrum. Ovid famously characterized the Cyrenaean as a skillful poet utterly lacking in inspiration:

---

<sup>95</sup> See Döpp 1996.

<sup>96</sup> “*Spätgriechische Poesie, so darf man behaupten, ist ein rhetorisches Verfahren.*” (Hose 2004 36).

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

The son of Battus<sup>97</sup> 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 craftsmanship.<sup>98</sup> 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  
ἄδετε, ποιητῶν φύλον ἀκανθολόγων,  
οἳ τ' ἐπέων κόσμον λελυγισμένον ἀσκήσαντες,  
κρήνης ἐξ ἱερῆς πίνετε λιτὸν ὕδωρ.  
σήμερον Ἀρχιλόχοιο καὶ ἄρσενος ἡμαρ Ὀμήρου  
σπένδομεν ὁ κρητὴρ οὐ δέχεθ' ὕδροπότας. (*AnthPal* 11.20)

Out, all you who sing of burnoose, cressets, and camasene fish,<sup>99</sup>  
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

---

<sup>97</sup> That is, Callimachus.

<sup>98</sup> See Knox 1985.

<sup>99</sup> I have selected rather obscure English terms to render the correspondingly obscure Greek terms λόκκη (“cloak”), λοφνίς (“torch”), and καμασῆνες (a type of fish).

encouraged the pedantry of the grammarians. See, for instance, *AnthPal* 11.321 (Phillip of Thessalonica, 1st c. AD) which reworks *AnthPal* 11.322 (Antiphanes of Macedon, 1st c. AD):

Γραμματικοὶ Μώμου στυγίου τέκνα, σῆτες ἀκανθῶν,    τελχῖνες  
βίβλων, Ζηνοδότου σκύλακες,  
Καλλιμάχου στρατιῶται, ὃν ὡς ὄπλον ἐκτανύσαντες,  
οὐδ' αὐτοῦ κείνου γλῶσσαν ἀποστρέφετε,  
συνδέσμων λυγρῶν θηρήτορες, οἷς τὸ „μῖν“ ἢ „σφῖν“    [5]  
εὖαδε καὶ ζητεῖν, εἰ κύνας εἶχε Κύκλωψ,  
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! (*AnthPal* 11.321)

Γραμματικῶν περίεργα γένη, ῥιζωρύχα μούσης    ἀλλοτρίης,  
ἀτυχεῖς σῆτες ἀκανθοβάται,  
τῶν μεγάλων κηλίδες, ἐπ' Ἡρίννη 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. Note the following:

- Blame (Μῶμος) in line 1 is a common character in Callimachus (*v.* the end of the *hAp*).
- The τελχῖνες in line 2 recalls the opening line of the prologue to the *Aetia*.

- κατατρύζοντες in line 7 recalls the opening line of the prologue to the *Aetia*, where Callimachus uses the similar verb ἐπιτρύζω in the same *sedes*.
- ἀλιτροί in line 7 recalls Call. *hAp* 2, where sinners (ἀλιτροί) are told to get out of the god's presence. Both occur at line end.

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]  
 εἵκελος, „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<sup>100</sup> from the rivers.”  
 But those poets filch Homer just like this,  
 and so that they write yet again, “wrath, goddess, sing!” (*AnthPal* 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 for these authors, 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

---

<sup>100</sup> Also called in English “nipplewort” or “swallowwort.”



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.<sup>101</sup>

### **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 would be cited by the rhetoricians of the Second Sophistic. This is in fact 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.<sup>102</sup> 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 repackaged as arias, or sung solos.<sup>103</sup> Prose and poetry might both be performed at symposia or other private gatherings, which, we should recall could have public

---

<sup>101</sup> Harder 2012 68–70.

<sup>102</sup> See Gangloff 2010.

<sup>103</sup> 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 Imperial period.

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. 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.<sup>104</sup> 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.”<sup>105</sup> Lucian mocks similar tendencies in *Rh. pr.* 19–20. Curiously, the use of these “rhetorical” figures in later poetry is sometimes taken perversely as proof that later poetry is rhetorical.<sup>106</sup> 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 BC Attic that was the frequent 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

---

<sup>104</sup> So Philostratus describes Gorgias dignifying prose with poetic vocabulary (*VS* p. 492).

<sup>105</sup> πολλοῦ δὲ τῆς μεγαλοφωνίας ἐξέπεσεν ἀταμιεύτως τῇ τραγωδίᾳ χρησάμενος (*VS* p. 509).

<sup>106</sup> See Vertoudakis 2011, “ῥφος και ποιητική ρητορική”: 197–209, especially 198.

that his rhetorical instruction could provide everything needed for poetic composition except metrics.<sup>107</sup>

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,<sup>108</sup> 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 extant sophists of the 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.<sup>109</sup> 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 Chrysostom'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."<sup>110</sup> 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

---

<sup>107</sup> εἴτε τις ῥητορείας ἐρᾷ, ... ἢ εἴτε τις ποιητικῆς ἐρᾷ, ἡκέτω πορισάμενος ἄλλοθεν τὰ μέτρα μόνον, τὴν δὲ ἄλλην χορηγίαν λαμβανέτω ἐντεῦθεν. (*diss.* 1.7).

<sup>108</sup> See Bowie 1989.

<sup>109</sup> See De Stefani and Magnelli 2011.

<sup>110</sup> Ὅμηρος δὲ καὶ πρῶτος καὶ μέσος καὶ ὕστατος παντὶ παιδὶ καὶ ἀνδρὶ καὶ γέροντι, τοσοῦτον ἀφ' αὐτοῦ διδοὺς ὅσον ἕκαστος δύναται λαβεῖν (*Or.* 18.8).

more “traditional” stream associated with Homer and Ennius. Nearly all of the subsequent Greek poets whose works survived in medieval manuscripts positioned 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 Bodmer 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.<sup>111</sup> Our poet was not particularly skilled. False quantities abound even in vowels clearly long (ω and η).<sup>112</sup> Pauses are found in strange locations,<sup>113</sup> and the narration is often unclear,<sup>114</sup> even though the poem is fairly well preserved.<sup>115</sup> It is unsurprising that such a poet should fail to imitate Callimachus,<sup>116</sup> but this is not due to any Christian prejudice against pagan poetry. Rather, it our poet has clearly attempted to imitate Homer, not Callimachus.<sup>117</sup> Indeed, Homer is

---

<sup>111</sup> See Kessels and Van der Horst 1987. For a measured consideration of the possible historical background of the poems, see Agosti 2017.

<sup>112</sup> For example, l. 112, λίπων (scans as a pyrrhus); l. 271 ἔφηνε scans as a dactyl.

<sup>113</sup> See line 179, where a new thought begins at the beginning of the sixth foot.

<sup>114</sup> 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.

<sup>115</sup> The poet does have a few nice flourishes. When he states that God gave him a desire for “graceful” song (l. 3 ἡμερον ἐν στήθεσσι διδούς χαρίεσσα <ν ἐπ’ οἷ>μην) we are meant to hear “elegant” and “infused with Christian grace.”

<sup>116</sup> The only possible echo I have found is in l. 57, where φυλάξεμεν is used in the same location as φυλάσσεμεν in Call. *hZens* 81.

<sup>117</sup> A selection of Homeric elements include: νήδυμος ὕπνος ἔπιπτεν ἐπὶ βλεφάροισιν ἑμοῖσιν (“Sweet sleep fell upon my eyes.”). Cf. *Od.* 13.79: καὶ τῷ νήδυμος ὕπνος ἐπὶ βλεφάροισιν ἔπιπτε (“And sweet

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.<sup>118</sup> 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.

## **Part 2: Callimachus and the Poetics of Imperial Greek Didactic**

In part two of this chapter, I consider how Callimachus shaped the poetic *personae* represented in

Dionysius of Alexandria’s *Periegesis*, Oppian of Cilicia’s *Halieutica*, and ps.-Oppian’s *Cynegetica*.<sup>119</sup> The

---

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).

<sup>118</sup> See Wyss 1983 for a list of allusions. The same omnivorous attitude may be seen in Nonnus.

<sup>119</sup> 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–

recent survey of Callimachus' afterlife in subsequent Greek poetry by Claudio De Stefani and Enrico Magnelli<sup>120</sup> 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.<sup>121</sup> 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*.<sup>122</sup> 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.<sup>123</sup> Jane Lightfoot rightly emphasizes the roles that other Alexandrian poets like Apollonius of Rhodes and Aratus played in shaping the *Periegesis*.<sup>124</sup> 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

---

200), it is clear to me, as it is to most other scholars, that the *Cynegetica* and the *Halientica* were written by two different authors.

<sup>120</sup> See De Stefani and Magnelli 2011.

<sup>121</sup> De Stefani and Magnelli 2011 551–52.

<sup>122</sup> Müller 1861 *passim*.

<sup>123</sup> For example, Greaves 1994 105–139.

<sup>124</sup> See Lightfoot 2014 35–41.

inspiration from the Muses. The connections with Hes. *Op.* 646–62, where Hesiod boasted of his inexperience with ships, have rightly received much attention in recent scholarship.<sup>125</sup> 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.<sup>126</sup> Though he pushed his point too far, Ulrich Bernays was correct that Dionysius’ appropriations of Hesiod were mediated through the Alexandrians, chiefly Callimachus.<sup>127</sup> Dionysius’ significant allusion to Callimachus comes in *Perieg.* 709–710:

οὐ γάρ μοι βίος ἐστὶ μελαινάων ἐπὶ νηῶν,  
οὐδέ μοι ἐμπορίη πατρῴος

For my livelihood is not from black ships, nor is trade my inherited occupation.<sup>128</sup>

Adrian Hollis<sup>129</sup> rightly notes that this is a conflation of *Hecale* fr. 41.2 (οὐ γάρ μοι πενίη πατρῴος, “penury was not my inherited state”) and *Aetia* fr. 178.31–33, where an Ician sailor named Theogenes addresses Callimachus at a symposium:

τρισμακάρ, ἧ παύρων ὄλβιός ἐσσι μέτα,  
ναυτιλίας εἰ νῆιν ἔχεις βίον· ἀλλ’ ἐμὸς αἰὼν  
κύμασιν αἰθυίης μᾶλλον ἐσωκίσατο

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.<sup>130</sup>

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

<sup>125</sup> Lightfoot 2014 *ad loc.*, Amato 2002 7–15, and Kneebone 2017 216–19.

<sup>126</sup> R. L. Hunter 2008a 729.

<sup>127</sup> Bernays 1905 27–32 conservatively concluded that no profound interaction with Hesiod can be proven on the part of Dionysius, since Dionysius’ most noteworthy parallels with Hesiod had Alexandrian precedent.

<sup>128</sup> I have consulted Lightfoot 2014 in preparing my translations of Dionysius’ *Periegesis*.

<sup>129</sup> Hollis 1990 171.

<sup>130</sup> Translation from Harder 2012, modified.

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, and hence likely carried programmatic weight.<sup>131</sup> 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.<sup>132</sup> Thus, Callimachus uses the *makarismos* of Theogenes to align himself once more with Hesiod, as he had done at the beginning of the *Aetia*.<sup>133</sup> Through this careful double allusion Dionysius depicts himself as a Callimachean poet in the tradition of Hesiodic epic.

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 Φωκίς ἄρουρα, πρὸς ἀντολίην τε καὶ ἡῶ  
 ἐλκομένη βορέηνδε κατὰ στόμα Θερμοπυλάων,  
Παρνησοῦ νιφόεντος ὑπὸ πτυχί· τῆς διὰ μέσσης  
 Κηφισοῦ μέγα χεῦμα κατερχόμενον κελαρύζει. [440]  
τῷ πάρα Πυθῶνος θυόεν πέδον, ἥχι δράκοντος  
Δελφύνης τριπόδεσσι θεοῦ παρακέκλιται ὀλκός,  
 ὀλκός, ἀπειρεσίησιν ἐπιφρίσσων φολίδεσσι,  
 νηῶ ἐν μεγάλῳ, τόθι πολλάκις αὐτὸς Ἀπόλλων  
 ἱστάμενος χρυσέης ἀναλύεται ἄμμο φαρέτρης, [445]  
 ἢ ἀπὸ Μιλήτιοιο 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 Cephissus 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.

<sup>131</sup> For the location of the fragment in the *Aetia*, see Harder 2012 vol. 2 956–57.

<sup>132</sup> Harder 2012 vol. 2 969.

<sup>133</sup> 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.



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:

χρύσεια τῶπόλλωνι τό τ’ ἐνδυτὸν ἢ τ’ ἐπιπορπίς  
ἢ τε λύρη τό τ’ ἄεμμα τὸ Λύκτιον ἢ τε φαρέτρη,  
χρύσεια καὶ τὰ πέδιλα.<sup>134</sup>

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”).<sup>135</sup> 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.

---

<sup>134</sup> I cite Callimachus’ *Hymns* according to Stephens 2015.

<sup>135</sup> See *Hom. Hymn Ap.* 372–74.

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. *bDel* 93 (Παρνησὸν νιφόεντα περιστέφει ἑννέα 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).<sup>136</sup> 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 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 Εὐξείνιοιο  
 ἄντα Βορυσθένης μεγαλῶνυμος εἰν ἀλὶ νῆσος  
 ἡρώων· Λευκὴν μιν ἐπωνυμίην καλέουσιν,  
 οὐνεκά 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 τιμὴν.

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 ψυχὰς (“souls” or “shades”) of the heroes from the Trojan War in *Perieg.* 545–46 evoke the Homeric epics, most

---

<sup>136</sup> I cite Posidippus according to Bastianini and Austin 2002.

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, as later authors of hexameter tended to use fewer spondees.<sup>137</sup> 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.<sup>138</sup>

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.<sup>139</sup> 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 (*Il.* 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,”<sup>140</sup> which it certainly does mean in Nicander, but Dionysius seems to mean bird instead. The Byzantine

---

<sup>137</sup> See West 1982 177–78.

<sup>138</sup> Lines with three spondees, like 546, are rare in the *Periegesis*. They comprise 7% of the poem. See Lightfoot 2014 66.

<sup>139</sup> 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.

<sup>140</sup> See Stephens 2015 *ad loc.*

commentator Eustathius was right to see an etymology in play, deriving the word from κινεῖν and πτερόν (birds as “wing-movers”).<sup>141</sup> We thus have an erudite elaboration of a rare noun in a passage where Dionysius, in good Alexandrian fashion, corrects Homeric notions of the afterlife.

### The *Halientica* of Oppian of Cilicia

In the last fifty years, scholarship on the *Halientica* has highlighted Oppian’s surprising indifference toward Alexandrian poetry.<sup>142</sup> A. W. James characterizes Oppian’s revival of neglected Homeric vocabulary as a “conscious stand” against the Alexandrians as “fastidious stylists.”<sup>143</sup> Enrico Rebuffat, moreover, has shown that the *Halientica* possesses several formal characteristics that separate it from Alexandrian didactic.<sup>144</sup> The teacher-student binary, what Katarina Volk characterizes as a sort of didactic drama between teacher and student, is almost entirely absent from the *Halientica*.<sup>145</sup> 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.<sup>146</sup> Indeed, the most conspicuous feature of Oppian’s style, the simile, was plentiful in Homer but sparse in Alexandrian didactic.<sup>147</sup> Finally, Oppian only rarely alludes to Alexandrian poets.<sup>148</sup> I argue that Oppian’s preference for Homeric

---

<sup>141</sup> Κινώπετα δέ ἐστιν, ὧν 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.*

<sup>142</sup> 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.

<sup>143</sup> James 1970 200.

<sup>144</sup> Rebuffat 2001 37.

<sup>145</sup> Volk 2002 37–38.

<sup>146</sup> So Effe’s apt remark, “*Oppian verfährt größtenteils beschreibend als Betrachter – nicht aber Lehrer – des Stoffes*” (Effe 1977 151).

<sup>147</sup> Bartley 2003 8.

<sup>148</sup> 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.

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.* 2.199–224, 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,<sup>149</sup> 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.<sup>150</sup> 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.<sup>151</sup> 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

---

<sup>149</sup> *Hal.* 3.17 recalls the structure of Call. *hZeus* 4 (of Zeus): Πηλαγόνων ἐλατῆρα, δικασπόλον Οὐρανίδησι. The nominal phrase αὐτὸς ἀναξ *Hal.* 3.13 resembles Call. *hAp* 90 (of Apollo), though Ap. Rhod. *Arg* 1.968 is closer.

<sup>150</sup> σοὶ δ' ἐμὲ περπωλὴν τε καὶ ὕμνητῆρ' ἀνέηκαν / δαίμονες ἐν Κιλικέσσιν ὕφ' Ἑρμαίοις ἀδύτοισι ("Under the shrine of Hermes in Cilicia the gods have consecrated me to be your singer and delight").

<sup>151</sup> 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).

shrine to Hermes in Corycio in Rough Cilicia, suggesting that Oppian was motivated by a patriotic pride in this native shrine and an intense religious devotion to Hermes.<sup>152</sup> Yet the choice also has poetological implications; I argue that Hermes functions as an aesthetic foil to the Callimacheanism typified by Apollo.<sup>153</sup>

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

Ἑρμεία, σὺ δέ μοι πατρώϊε, φέρτατε παίδων  
 Αἰγίοχου, κέρδιστον ἐν ἀθανάτοισι νόημα, (10)  
 φαῖνέ τε καὶ σήμαινε καὶ ἄρχεο, νύσσαν ἀοιδῆς  
 ἰθύνων· βουλὰς δὲ περισσονόων ἀλιήων  
 αὐτός, ἄναξ, πρῶτιστος 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.<sup>154</sup>

Oppian has selected for Hermes the epithet ἄναξ (“lord”). Though not exclusive to Apollo, this is a pointedly Apollonian epithet.<sup>155</sup> Even in the *Hom. Hymn Herm.*, it is Apollo repeatedly receives the epithet ἄναξ (“lord”), not Hermes.<sup>156</sup> 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 lacking his

<sup>152</sup> See Rebuffat 1997.

<sup>153</sup> Callimachus uses Apollo to express his aesthetic most famously in the prologue to the *Aetia* (fr. 1.21–29 and at the end of *hAp* (105–113).

<sup>154</sup> I have consulted Mair 1928 and Fajen 1999 in preparing my translations of Oppian’s *Halieutica*.

<sup>155</sup> So LSJ *s.v.* A.1 “Of the gods, especially Apollo.” For its use with different gods, see LfGRE *s.v.*

<sup>156</sup> 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.

[Apollo's] strength, but as superior (φέρτερος) to Apollo as broad-ruling Zeus is to Cronus.”<sup>157</sup> We may therefore read Oppian's invocation of Hermes as 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” (ήμεροκοίτης) 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 (ήμεροκοίτης, “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.<sup>158</sup> These Hesiodic echoes are matched by features typical in hexametric didactic but rare in the *Halientica*: 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,<sup>159</sup> is unparalleled elsewhere in

---

<sup>157</sup> αὐτοὶ νῦν μευ πάντες ἀκούσατε καὶ δότε παῖδα  
νόσφι Διός, μηδέν τι βίην ἐπιδευέα κείνου·  
ἀλλ' ὃ γε φέρτερος ἔστω ὅσον Κρόνου εὐρύοπα Ζεύς.  
I cite the *Hom. Hymn Ap.* according to Richardson 2010.

<sup>158</sup> 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 *Halientica* make it clear that Hesiod is the primary model.

<sup>159</sup> 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.

the *Halientica*.<sup>160</sup> 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 ἔδωδῆς  
ἢ κόρον ἢ τι μέτρον ἐπίσταται, ἀλλ' ἀτέλεστον [207]  
λυσσομανῇ 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.<sup>161</sup> Unlike most of the ornamental borrowings that De Stefani and Magnelli note,<sup>162</sup> 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 noun ἀδηφαγίη is not uncommon in Imperial prose literature, particularly Plutarch, but the significant

<sup>160</sup> The closest parallel is the 2nd person singular optative φράζοιο at the beginning of book 3.

<sup>161</sup> 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.*

<sup>162</sup> De Stefani and Magnelli 2011 552.



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 *Halientica* actually underscores Oppian's independence from Callimachean poetics.

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

θαῦμα δ' ὀλισθηρῆς ἐχενηίδος ἐφράσσαντο  
 ναυτίλοι· οὐ μὲν δὴ 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,<sup>163</sup> 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 activity. He had expressed the desire to "lie in persuasive manner" to his audience<sup>164</sup> and had elevated himself in

---

<sup>163</sup> Consider, for instance, his allusion to Plato's "Soul-Charioteer" in *Hal.* 2.217–24, or the Stoicizing hymn of *Hal.* 1.409–420.

<sup>164</sup> ψευδοίμην ἄοντος ἃ κεν πεπίθοιεν ἀκουήν (Call. *hZeus* 65).

*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.<sup>165</sup> 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.<sup>166</sup> 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 *Halientica*, 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.<sup>167</sup> 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;<sup>168</sup> 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.

---

<sup>165</sup> There is one passage in the *Halientica* 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.

<sup>166</sup> Bartley 2003 160.

<sup>167</sup> For treatments of ps.-Oppian’s debt to the Alexandrians, see Hollis 1994, Whitby 2007, and De Stefani and Magnelli 2011 552.

<sup>168</sup> 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.<sup>169</sup> What has not received sufficient attention is how peculiar such a claim to originality is in a work of epic poetry. *Contra* A. Bartley,<sup>170</sup> these sorts of claims are rare in epic, probably because they were perceived to be improper in such a "solemn" genre.<sup>171</sup> 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 the virtue of originality was still 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 extant 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.<sup>172</sup>

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. 1.3–5. When

---

<sup>169</sup> 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; στεῖλβειν fr. 1.26). In other places, the poet has substituted synonyms for the Callimachean vocabulary: l. 20 ἀταρπὸν ("road") for Callimachus' οἶμος and κέλευθος (both meaning "road," *Aet.* fr. 1.27); l. 20 τρηχεῖαν ("rugged") for Callimachus' στεिनότερην ("narrower," *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.

<sup>170</sup> Bartley 2003 173–75.

<sup>171</sup> R. L. Hunter 2008a 731–33.

<sup>172</sup> The term "*Kreuzung der Gattungen*" originates with Kroll 1924. For more recent analyses of genre in Hellenistic poetry, see the volume edited by Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker 1998.

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.<sup>173</sup> Indeed, by the Imperial period Callimachus had a reputation for teetotaling.<sup>174</sup> 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*.<sup>175</sup> 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 ἡχῆς *Cyn.* 1.18), but he “conversed with the goddess” (καὶ θεὸν ἡμείφθην *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*.<sup>176</sup> Yet ps.-Oppian cleverly announces this departure with an allusion to Callimachus:

---

<sup>173</sup> For Callimachus’ moderation in wine-drinking, see *epigr.* 30 (Page #30=*Anth. Pal.* 7.415) and *Aetia* fr. 178.15–16.

<sup>174</sup> 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.

<sup>175</sup> 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.

<sup>176</sup> See Acosta-Hughes 2009 238.

Θ. Ἀμφὶ πόθοις ὀλοοῖσιν ἀκὴν ἔχε, λειπέ τε κεστούς.<sup>177</sup>  
ἐχθαίρω τὰ λέγουσιν ἀθύρματα Ποντογενεΐης.

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)<sup>178</sup>

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"),<sup>179</sup> 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 Thunaeon Dionysus" (δηθάκις ἀμπεχόρευσά 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 δῦας καὶ Κτησιφόνωντα). 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 between his different poetic works. After narrating Apollo's epiphany to him as a young man, he notes at *Aet.* fr. 1.37 that the Muses have not forsaken him in his old age.<sup>180</sup> 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 *Amores* became the teacher of love in the *Ars amatoria*, who subsequently gained the ability to cure passion in the *Remedia*

---

<sup>177</sup> 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.

<sup>178</sup> I have modified the translation of Mair 1928.

<sup>179</sup> See Schmitt 1969 *ad loc.*

<sup>180</sup> For further discussion and bibliography, see Gutzwiller 1998 212.

*amoris*.<sup>181</sup> At the beginning of the *Metamorphoses*, the Sulmonan poet observed that the gods had changed the nature of his poetic undertakings.<sup>182</sup> 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: *τερπωλή δ' ἔπεται θήρη πλέον ἢ ἐπερ ἰδρώς*. ("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:

τερπωλή δ', ὅτε χαλκὸς ὑπαὶ γενέσσι τορήσας  
ὑψι μάλα θρώσκοντα βυθῶν ὑπερ ἄσπαιροντα [60]  
εἰνάλιον φορέησι δι' ἥερος 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.<sup>183</sup>

<sup>181</sup> For a discussion of the course of Ovid's poetic *persona* in the amatory poems, see Conte 1989.

<sup>182</sup> *Met.* 1.1–2. For discussion, see Keith 2002 237–238.

<sup>183</sup> 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 *ms.*, 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 *γενέσσι* 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 *Halientica*, but it is this would be its only such use in the *Cynegetica*. It seems much more likely that *γενέσσι* refers to the jaws of the fish; I have emended to the nominative *χαλκός* and made this the subject of the temporal clause. Cf. Apol. Rhod. *Arg.* 2.112–13: ὅσον δ' ἐπὶ δέρματι μοῦνον / νηδυίων ἄψαυτος ὑπὸ ζώνην *τόρε χαλκός*. This avoids the hiatus created by the genitive *χαλκοῦ*.

Schmitt is right to connect this passage with *Hal.* 1.71–72,<sup>184</sup> 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 αἰδεῖν 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;<sup>185</sup> 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.<sup>186</sup> Ps.-Oppian's embrace of polemic is quite unlike what we saw in Dionysius and Oppian. They used careful allusions to position themselves within the poetic tradition. Ps.-Oppian instead aligns himself vocally with Alexandrian poetics.

---

<sup>184</sup> Schmitt 1969 *ad loc.*

<sup>185</sup> Ps.-Oppian's ἰσοτάλαντα ("equal in weight") in *Cyn.* 1.67 may be indebted ἐπ' ἰσότη ("on the basis of equality") at *hZeus* 63. Ps.-Oppian's indignant τίς with the optative recalls *hZeus* 62.

<sup>186</sup> 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.

## Conclusion

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 *Halientica* 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<sup>187</sup>

In this chapter I address the issue of originality. Gregory has the dubious 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 thus been judged both too innovative and too traditional.<sup>188</sup> 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) and his long, innovative hexametric

---

<sup>187</sup> Taken from Eliot 1920.

<sup>188</sup> 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 griechischen Literaturgeschichte, 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.”

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,<sup>189</sup> the prologue to his *Aetia* became a touchstone for subsequent poets.<sup>190</sup>

καὶ γὰρ ὅτ' ἐπὶ πρῶτιστον ἔμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα  
 γούνασιν, Ἀπόλλων εἶπεν ὁ μοι Λύκιος·  
 '..... ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον  
 θρέψαι, τῇ]ν Μοῦσαν δ' ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην·  
 πρὸς δέ σε] καὶ τόδ' ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἅμαξαι [25]  
 τὰ στεῖβειν, ἐτέρων ἴχνια μὴ καθ' ὁμά  
 δίφρον ἐλ]ῃν μηδ' οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους  
 ἀτρίπτο]υς, εἰ καὶ στεῖινοτέρην 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 ἦμην γέμων,<sup>191</sup> [15]  
 τέμνων ὁδοὺς ἀτρίπτους,  
 ἐθῶν πατρῶων καὶ νόμων διαφθορεὺς,  
 εἶπερ νόμος τὰ φαῦλα,  
 πλούτου, τύφου τε, θρύψεως, φιλαρχίας,  
 τῶν νῦν ἐπικρατούντων.[20]

<sup>189</sup> Harder 2012 *ad fr.* 1.25–28 points 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.

<sup>190</sup> I cite the *Aetia* according to Harder 2012.

<sup>191</sup> 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.* 286–92. The moral tenor of the passage also resonates with Jesus’ words in the sermon on the mount to “enter through the narrow gate.”<sup>192</sup> 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,  
ᾧ κέρδος οὐδὲν ἢ κενὴ γλωσσαλγία·  
ἀλλ’ οὖν γράφοντας καὶ λίαν τυραννικῶς, [5]  
ὥς μεστὰ πάντα τυγχάνειν ληρημάτων,  
ψάμμου θαλασσῶν ἢ σκνιπῶν Αἰγυπτίων,  
πάντων μὲν ἂν ἥδιστα καὶ γνώμην μίαν  
ταύτην ἔδωκα πάντα ρίψαντας λόγον  
αὐτῶν ἔχεσθαι τῶν θεοπνεύστων μόνον [10]  
ὥς τοὺς ζάλην φεύγοντας ὄρμων εὐδίων.

---

<sup>192</sup> <sup>13</sup> Εἰσελθατε διὰ τῆς στενῆς πύλης· ὅτι πλατεῖα ἡ πύλη καὶ εὐρύχωρος ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν καὶ πολλοὶ εἰσιν οἱ εἰσερχόμενοι δι’ αὐτῆς· <sup>14</sup> τί στενὴ ἡ πύλη καὶ τεθλιμμένη ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ζωὴν καὶ ὀλίγοι εἰσιν οἱ εὐρίσκοντες 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.” Matt 7:13–14).

ἥ<sup>193</sup> γὰρ τοσαύτας αἱ Γραφαὶ δεδώκασι λαβὰς,  
 †τὸ Πνεῦμα τουτί σοι σοφώτερον †,  
 ὥς καὶ τόδ' εἶναι παντὸς ὀρμητήριον  
 λόγου ματαίου τοῖς κακῶς ὀρμωμένοις.[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 ἐαυτῶν ἐκτροπῆς [20]  
 τούτους ἐχόντων τοὺς λόγους συμπροστάτας·  
 ἄλλην μετῆλθον τῶν λόγων ταύτην ὁδὸν  
 εἰ μὲν καλὴν 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 ἄμετρος (either “immoderate” or “prose”). Though Gregory does later develop the term in an ethical direction, Milovanović and Caillau were right to see the term's principal meaning as “prose.”<sup>194</sup> After criticizing prose authors in general Gregory divides them into two groups (the καί...καί in 2–3 should be taken as

<sup>193</sup> *Scriptsi*. 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.

<sup>194</sup> Milovanović-Barham 1997 501, 504; Caillau 1842 *ad loc.*

“both...and”). The first group are glib sophists who like to speak impromptu (ρέοντας 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.”<sup>195</sup>

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

Cataudella has noted several appropriations of the *Aetia*.<sup>196</sup> 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).<sup>197</sup> Furthermore, Tim Hawkins observes a number of pointed references to Callimachus’ *Aetia*: both poets address their contemporary authors (οἱ νῦν Call. fr. 191.6; ἐν τῷ νῦν βίῳ Gr. *carm.* 2.1.39 1).<sup>198</sup> Both poets liken their rivals to biting insects (μυῖαι “flies” and σφήκες

<sup>195</sup> 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 it as a 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.*”

<sup>196</sup> See Cataudella 1928.

<sup>197</sup> 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 *bendiadys* 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”).

<sup>198</sup> I cite the *Iambi* according to Pfeiffer 1949.

“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).<sup>199</sup>

## 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 helped to ensure 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, carries over 250 funerary epigrams, which constitute only a selection of more than 300 transmitted under his name. Of those found in *AnthPal* 8, around 160 are literary *epitaphioi*. The rest are concerned with death: meditations on death, apotropaic inscriptions against grave robbers,<sup>200</sup> 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.<sup>201</sup> Though a more sympathetic view has taken hold in the past two decades,<sup>202</sup> 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 St. Basil,<sup>203</sup> twelve for Gregory’s father,

---

<sup>199</sup> Hawkins 2014 148–49.

<sup>200</sup> For analysis of the epigrams against tomb-robbers, see Floridi 2013.

<sup>201</sup> For an overview of Greek epigram in late antiquity, see the recently published Agosti 2019. I am grateful to Gianfranco Agosti for providing me a pre-publication draft of this article.

<sup>202</sup> 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.”

<sup>203</sup> 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.

and over 40 for his mother; remarkable too is his cycle for the dignitary Martianus (*AnthPal* 8.104–117). Modern interpreters have frequently seen these as artless, rhetorical excesses instead of carefully designed arrangements.<sup>204</sup> 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.<sup>205</sup>

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). We shall see that this expansion of the epigrammatic form into full sequences is one of the key contributions of the fourth century epigrammists.<sup>206</sup> 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” when writing for his family and friends. I part ways with Consolino in arguing that Gregory consciously

---

<sup>204</sup> 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*.

<sup>205</sup> 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.

<sup>206</sup> 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.”

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 “theft” (ἁράζω). Poets typically lament that the deceased has been snatched by Hades, especially when a young person has died.<sup>207</sup> In erotic epigram, by contrast, Eros (or the beloved) snatches away the heart of the poet.<sup>208</sup> 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.<sup>209</sup> 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 striking innovation occurs in *AnthPal* 8.103:

Κτῆσιν ἔην σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα πάντ’ ἀναθεῖσα  
 Γοργόνιον Χριστῷ μοῦνον ἀφῆκε πόσιν·  
 οὐ μὰν οὐδὲ πόσιν δηρὸν χρόνον, ἀλλ’ ἄρα καὶ τὸν  
 ἥρπασεν ἑξαπίνης κύδιμον Ἀλύπιον.  
 ὄλβιε ὀλβίστης ἀλόχου πόσι· τοῖς ῥα λοετροῖς [5]  
 λύματ’ ἀπωσάμενοι ζῆτε παλιγγενέες.

<sup>207</sup> See e.g. *AnthPal* 7.170, 221, 308.

<sup>208</sup> See, e.g., Call. G.-P. #4=*AnthPal* 12.73, and Meleager, G.-P. #81=*A.P.* 12.52.

<sup>209</sup> For Basil snatched by the Trinity, see *AnthPal* 8.3. For Gregory’s mother being “snatched,” see *A.P.* 53, 54, and 69.



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 γενετὴν.  
 εἰδείης δ' ἄμφω κεν: ὁ μὲν κοτε πατρίδος ὅπλων  
 ἤρξεν, ὁ δ' ἤεισεν κρέσσονα βασκανίης:  
 οὐ νέμεσις: Μοῦσαι γὰρ ὅσους ἴδον ὄμματι παῖδας [5]  
 μὴ λοξῶι, πολιοῦς οὐκ ἀπέθεντο φίλους (Call. G.-P. 29= *AnthPal*  
 7.525).<sup>210</sup>

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 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,  
 κάλλει μαρμαίρων τοσσατίω λαγόνων. (*AnthPal* 8.188)

O thou that bringst thy foot beside my tomb,  
 do know that I have suffered greedy ill,

---

<sup>210</sup> 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 placed at the end of Callimachus' collection of epigrams, and function as a coda to his entire oeuvre.

for nought I had of gold, but only seemed  
when I did gleam with, O, so lovely pillars.<sup>211</sup>

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.<sup>212</sup> 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.<sup>213</sup> 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.<sup>214</sup> Gregory here nods to his master as he adapts Callimachus' lines for a new, satirical setting.

### 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.<sup>215</sup> 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

---

<sup>211</sup> 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."

<sup>212</sup> Vertoudakis 2011 164.

<sup>213</sup> Vardakas, for instance, misses Gregory's humor in his short summary of his style. See Vardakas 2011 16–17.

<sup>214</sup> See Gutzwiller 1998 190–96 for the variety of approaches that Callimachus adopts in his dedicatory epigrams.

<sup>215</sup> Milo 2005 has analyzed several of these poems, though she does not treat 8.22. She usefully highlights a number of Gregory's allusions; 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 she about many of the parallels she mentions. Gregory does reprise numerous terms and *formulae* from older authors, especially Homer, but often he does this for the grandeur of the language, not with any allusive intention.

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*.<sup>216</sup> 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.<sup>217</sup> In the others (8.14 and 8.23), the narrator is unnamed, though we are to imagine that Gregory the son is narrator.

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 (cf. 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

---

<sup>216</sup> 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 Sichterl 2011. The principal witnesses are: Heidelberg gr. 23 (10th c.) *H*, Ambrosianus gr. 433 (11th c.) *Am*, and 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.

<sup>217</sup> 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.

priest (ἱρὸς ἐμῶν τεκέων ἀγανώτατος<sup>218</sup> l. 5). The epigram concludes with the Elder shrugging off his death: εἰ δὲ τελευτὴν ἔτλην Γρηγόριος, οὐ μέγα· θνητὸς ἦν (“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.<sup>219</sup> Gregory concludes the epigram by asserting that his father, though once far away, is now near his beloved Trinity (alluding to Eph 2:16–18). 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 λαμπρόμενον Τριάδι,  
 ἄγγελον ἀτρεκίης ἐριχχέα, ποιμένα λαῶν,  
 ἡίθεον 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,

---

<sup>218</sup> 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 πραῦς (meek) or προσηνής (mild) but ἡδύς and ὑδύλογος (see *LfGRE s.v.*).

<sup>219</sup> Aaron is called a high-priest (ἀρχιερεὺς in the Septuagint) in Josh 22:13. For the LXX text of Joshua I have consulted Rahlfs and Hanhart 2006. 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. Matt 20:1–16, where the workers who start at different time are given the same reward.

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 ἐρηχέα) and a shepherd of his flock (ποιμένα 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.<sup>220</sup> 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.<sup>221</sup> The poem does contain, however, a number un-Callimachean elements. When Gregory describes himself as ἐριήχης (“loud-sounding”) we may easily think of Callimachus leaving “thundering” to Zeus. Moreover “shepherd of the peoples” (ποιμένα λαῶν) is a common Homeric tag.<sup>222</sup>

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.

---

<sup>220</sup> 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.

<sup>221</sup> For the Christian as a “living sacrifice” (θυσίαν ζῶσαν) see Rom 12:1. For the Greek New Testament, I cite the NA<sup>28</sup>= Institute for New Testament Textual Research 2012.

<sup>222</sup> According to the TLG, the formula occurs 28 times in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. For just a few examples, see *Il.* 1.263, 2.243, and 4.296. Callimachus does not use the epithet.

ὥς δ' ὀλίγην μὲν ἐγὼ ποιμνὴν 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.<sup>223</sup>

The preference for the slight but excellent surely evokes Callimachus' preference for shorter, finely crafted poems (λεπτότης).<sup>224</sup> The anaphora of a Callimachean keyword (τυτθὴ...τυτθὴ) and the bucolic dieresis in line 3 only reinforce the Callimacheanism.<sup>225</sup>

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

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 *syninx* in question does not evoke the panpipes,<sup>226</sup> but Gregory would not use such a striking phrase (ποιμενίην σύρρινγα) without being attuned to the resonances from bucolic

<sup>223</sup> 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."

<sup>224</sup> For the theme of λεπτότης in the epigrams, see Callimachus, G.-P. 56-57 (G.-P. = Page 1976), which praise the λεπταὶ 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.

<sup>225</sup> 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.

<sup>226</sup> Waltz 1944 41 n. 1.

poetry.<sup>227</sup> 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 *technē*). In good Callimachean fashion, Gregory rejects this approach to life and verse in favor of one rooted in *paideia* and *technē*. The enjambement of ἐπισταμένως (“skillfully”) with the somber molossus (- - -) σημαίνειν (“exposit” or “expound”) only underscores this further. Given the context, Gregory may also be punning on Pan’s name in line 3 (ἄπασιν).<sup>228</sup>

### 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 Muratori, scholars have argued that Gregory’s remarkable number of epigrams on single themes was due to filial or familiar piety.<sup>229</sup> They point to *AnthPal* 8.30:

Γρηγόριον βοόωσα παρ’ ἀνθοκόμοισιν ἀλωαῖς  
ἦντεο, μήτηρ ἐμή, ξείνης ἄπο νισσομένοισι,  
χεῖρας δ’ ἀμπετάσασα φίλας τεκέεσσι φίλοισι,  
Γρηγόριον βοόωσα· τὸ δ’ ἔξεν αἷμα τεκούσης  
ἀμφοτέροις ἐπὶ παισὶ, μάλιστα δὲ θρέμματι θηλῆς· [5]  
τοῦνεκα καὶ σὲ τόσοις ἐπιγράμμασι, μήτηρ, ἔτι σα.

“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

<sup>227</sup> See Agosti 2013 for an analysis of bucolic themes in late antique epigrams. This passage is discussed on p. 241.

<sup>228</sup> The ancients naturally associated Pan’s name with πᾶς, πᾶσα, πᾶν. See, for example, *Hom. Hymn* 19.47: Πᾶνα δέ μιν καλέεσκον, ὅτι φρένα πᾶσιν ἔτερψεν (“They call him ‘Pan’ because he gladdens the heart of all”).

<sup>229</sup> 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.

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 asceticism (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.

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.<sup>230</sup> 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

---

<sup>230</sup> For potential epigrammatic compositions by Herodes Atticus, the second century sophist, see Bowie 1989 231–36.



analogues 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.<sup>231</sup> 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.<sup>232</sup> Hose sees Gregory's numerous epigrams on single themes as an adaptation of *ethopoeia*, a rhetorical exercise.<sup>233</sup> Vertoudakis follows Pellegrino in considering a rhetoricity fundamental to Gregory's style.<sup>234</sup>

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.<sup>235</sup> 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.<sup>236</sup> We do more justice to the late antique conception if we regard rhetoric as a toolbox for

---

<sup>231</sup> E.g. Keydell 1953 138–39.

<sup>232</sup> Pellegrino 1932 97–102.

<sup>233</sup> Hose 2004 24–25.

<sup>234</sup> Vertoudakis 2011 219–34.

<sup>235</sup> 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.

<sup>236</sup> Menander Rhetor, for instance, considers Homer the inventor of the monody (a kind of speech of lament). See Russell and Wilson 1981 202–203.

creating eloquent speech, whether in verse or in prose.<sup>237</sup> 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.<sup>238</sup> 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 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.<sup>239</sup> 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*.<sup>240</sup> I suspect Gregory's abundance would look less remarkable if other epigrammatic

---

<sup>237</sup> 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.

<sup>238</sup> On the relationship between prose and poetry under the Empire, see Bowie 1989 210–14.

<sup>239</sup> 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 Meleager's *Garland*.

<sup>240</sup> See Gutzwiller's forthcoming article, "Palladas Sequences in the Greek Anthology and the Yale Papyrus."

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, I do not think we can consider features like polyptoton, anaphora, and alliteration as traits that show "the decisive influence of rhetoric."<sup>241</sup> 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.<sup>242</sup> 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 readily: anaphora, clever play with generic expectation, and sprawling enjambement.<sup>243</sup> 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.<sup>244</sup>

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

---

<sup>241</sup> See Vertoudakis 2011, "ὕφος και ποιητική ρητορική": 197–209, especially 198 "Το πόσο η ρητορική έχει ασκήσει αποφασιστική επίδραση στην ποιητική γραφή του Γρηγορίου μαρτυρείται και από την πληθύν των σχημάτων λόγου."

<sup>242</sup> Walker 2000 65–66 recounts several ancient discussions of the relationship between poetry and rhetoric.

<sup>243</sup> For more detailed analysis of Gregory's style and its relationship to Callimachus', see chapter three, below.

<sup>244</sup> 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* (134).

same holds true in the epigrammatic *corpora* of Callimachus and Meleager, which though impartially preserved, are even more varied in subject matter than Gregory's.

My treatment of Gregory's epigrams is 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.<sup>245</sup> 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 asceticism or familial piety, nor reduced to rhetoric. He consciously develops 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.<sup>246</sup> 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 much of Gregory's hexametric and elegiac verse.<sup>247</sup> Moreover, the poem is also transmitted at the head of Gregory's orations, making it the only poem to be transmitted both among Gregory's verse and and

---

<sup>245</sup> The epigrams against tomb-robbers have a particularly complicated textual tradition, for which see Palla 2013.

<sup>246</sup> For *De rebus suis* I cite Bady, Tuilier, and Bernardi 2004 unless otherwise noted. The poem has been translated into English by Meehan 1987.

<sup>247</sup> Werhahn has divided the manuscripts of Gregory's poetry into the now standard twenty *Gedichtgruppe* or poem-groups (Sicherl, Höllger, and Werhahn 1985). For refinements of Werhahn's original observations, see Sicherl 2011 1–5. 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.

among his prose.<sup>248</sup> In part, this poem is the introduction to Gregory's poetic persona. *De rebus suis* is also an exceedingly varied poem, however, 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: woe (ὀϊζυς 104–116)
  - Lament
    - Establishing the character of G's parents and their troubles (117–163)
    - 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):

---

<sup>248</sup> Sichterl 2011 4.

- 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 argued 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.<sup>249</sup> Jean Bernardi calls it a prayer,<sup>250</sup> and most recently Cilica Milovanović has argued that the work fits into the genre of didactic epic.<sup>251</sup> 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

---

<sup>249</sup> “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).

<sup>250</sup> “Le poème intitulé Περὶ τῶν καθ’ ἑαυτὸν est une longue prière de 634 hexamètres que le poète adresse à Dieu dans son désanxi 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.

<sup>251</sup> See Milovanovic 2008.

conclusion (e.g. 627–29) is again characteristic of the hymnic style, and we have a reference to future hymns in the concluding line.<sup>252</sup> 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 or fewer. Moreover, 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, 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 likely have signaled this, as he does in the *Hymn to Virginity*.<sup>253</sup> 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*.<sup>254</sup>

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

---

<sup>252</sup> See 633f. ἐνθάδε καὶ μετέπειτα ὅλη 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.

<sup>253</sup> See my analysis of this work (*carm.* 1.2.1a) in Chapter Four.

<sup>254</sup> See Daley 2006 29 and Faulkner 2010 for discussion of the hymnic elements in the *Poemata arcana*.

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.

Milovanović's considers *De rebus suis* a didactic work in the vein of Hesiod's *Works and Days*.<sup>255</sup> She is correct that *De rebus suis* is about right in terms of length and meter for a didactic poem, but these are not by themselves sufficient indicators. Hexameter hymns could sometimes stretch to over 500 lines (*v.* the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo*), as could many *epyllia*. She points also to Gregory's intricate similes as another feature characteristic of didactic poetry.<sup>256</sup> Yet, As we saw in Chapter One, this feature is more redolent of Homeric epic than Hesiodic didactic. 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.<sup>257</sup> I think Milovanović is correct that Gregory intends the poem to be instructive; after all, Gregory expresses the desire in 2.1.1 351–59 that his misfortune will be instructive to others. Yet we must

---

<sup>255</sup> See Milovanovic 2008.

<sup>256</sup> Milovanovic 2008 50.

<sup>257</sup> I am particularly puzzled by the assertion that the poem exhibits the “metaphrastic” tendency of didactic epic. Didactic poets from Aratus onward typically used a scientific prose treatise as the basis for their poetic efforts. If this were the case here, we would need to suppose a prose *Urtext* of Gregory's own life.



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 Hesiod's *Works and Days*, was ever intended to be useful for victims of snake bites.<sup>258</sup> 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.<sup>259</sup> 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;<sup>260</sup> 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 theme comes in lines 104–05: ἐξερέω δ' ἀναφανδὸν ἐμὴν πάντεσσιν οἷζύν· / ὥς κέν τις σκολιοῖο νοήματα θηρὸς ἀλύξει. (“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: ἐγὼ 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's didactic intentions have found expression in a threnic mode.

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 (οἷζυς). 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

<sup>258</sup> Most recently, see Overduin 2014 for a reading of Nicander that privileges the formal aspects of the work.

<sup>259</sup> See e.g. Basil *De legendis gentilium libris* 5.6: πᾶσα μὲν ἡ ποιήσις τῷ Ὁμήρῳ ἀρετῆς ἐστὶν ἔπαινος (“All of Homer's poetry is praise of virtue”).

<sup>260</sup> Cf. Gregory's *Poemata arcana*, which do present a summary of Christian doctrine.

present misfortune.<sup>261</sup> 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.<sup>262</sup>

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,<sup>263</sup> yet there were other important models in 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

---

<sup>261</sup> 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.

<sup>262</sup> Gregory naturally also has precedent for self-lament in Greek tragedy, though here the laments are spoken by characters, rather than the *persona* of the poet himself.

<sup>263</sup> See Casanova 1999 147.

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.<sup>264</sup>

Finally, let us address the didactic elements of the poem. Though wrong about the mode of the poem, Milovanović 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 Gregory has chosen the hexameter as his metrical scheme.<sup>265</sup> One must also note the pervasive influence of the Bible on the basic outlook of the poem. Gregory laments his misfortune with the

---

<sup>264</sup> 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.

<sup>265</sup> 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.

sort of unremitting tenebrity so prevalent in the wisdom literature of the Old Testament. The Psalms of Lament and the prayers of Job shape the spirit of poem, even if the formal models lie elsewhere.<sup>266</sup> 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*.<sup>267</sup> 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.<sup>268</sup> For Gregory, as for ps.-Oppian, this generic experimentation is a self-consciously Callimachean act.<sup>269</sup> 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.<sup>270</sup> 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.<sup>271</sup> 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.

*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

---

<sup>266</sup> Gregory often alludes to the Book of Job and even depicts himself as a sort of new Job (e.g. *carm.* 2.1.32 31 Ἄλλος ἰὼβ νέος εἰμί, "I am a new Job". Of the Old Testament passages mentioned in Simelidis' commentary on four short poems of Gregory's (1.2.17, 2.1.10, 19, and 32=Simelidis 2009), half come from Job. For further instances where Gregory uses Job as an *exemplum*, see the appendices in Demoen 1996.

<sup>267</sup> See Kroll 1924.

<sup>268</sup> For a discussion of generic mixing in Prudentius, see Fontaine 1980.

<sup>269</sup> See my remarks on the opening to ps.-Oppian's *Cyn.* in chapter one.

<sup>270</sup> "Seine übrigen Dichtungen aber litten schwer unter dem Mangel der Bindung an eine feste Form" Keydell 1953 142.

<sup>271</sup> 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.

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,<sup>272</sup> 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).<sup>273</sup>

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 ἐσσι μέγιστον.  
 οὐ μ' ἄλοχος κομέουσα δυσαλθέα κήδεα λύσει  
 ἢ τε καὶ ἀσχαλόωντα παρηγορήσιν ἰαίνει·  
 οὐδὲ φίλοις παιδεσσιν ἀγάλλομαι, οἷς ὑπὸ γῆρας  
 ὀρθοῦται, νεαροῖσιν ὑπ' ἰχνεσιν αὖθις ὀδεῦον·  
 οὐδὲ κασιγνήτοις ἐπιτέρπομαι, οὐδ' ἐτάροισι.

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

<sup>272</sup> I note only line 227 οὐτε κασιγνήτων. The phrase appears in *Il.* 6.452, at the same metrical *sedes*.

<sup>273</sup> 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.

of my old age as guides upon the path;  
nor is their joy in brothers or in friends.

The verbal overlaps are slight,<sup>274</sup> but again, we hear Andromache's plea to Hector to abide in the city, for she has no other protector.<sup>275</sup>

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' Ἀσσυρίῃ 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.<sup>276</sup> We may juxtapose with a portion of Jesus' Sermon on the Mount (Matt 7:13–14), as well as other scriptural passages.<sup>277</sup> At 461, Christ is described as the one who leads Gregory through the narrow and toilsome road to the tiny (λεπτὴν) gate not taken by many. The framework is evangelical: we have the narrow road leading to the narrow gate as we do in Matt 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

<sup>274</sup> Cf. the beginning of l. 605 (οὐδὲ κασιγνήτοις) with the beginning of *Il.* 6:430 (ἡδὲ κασίγνητος).

<sup>275</sup> *Il.* 6.413–430.

<sup>276</sup> Cf. also Zeus's two jars in *Il.* 24.527, one of blessing, and one of curses.

<sup>277</sup> For a full list of comparands, see Bady and Tuilier (2004), *ad loc.*

(e.g. Ajax is compared to a rushing river at *Il.* 11.492–95), and much of the vocabulary is Theocritean.<sup>278</sup> 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.<sup>279</sup> Moreover, 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 Juvenius and Apollinaris, or written a long didactic poem in the style of Aratus or Oppian.<sup>280</sup> He might even have written centos or

---

<sup>278</sup> V. Bady and Tuilier (2004), *ad loc.*

<sup>279</sup> For an analysis of generic *mélange* in Ausonius, Ambrose, and Ammianus Marcellinus, see Fontaine 1977.

<sup>280</sup> 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.

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.<sup>281</sup> 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.

---

<sup>281</sup> 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.<sup>282</sup> More recently, however, scholars have shown that Gregory was sensitive to the various rules governing verse construction, even if there are prosodic irregularities.<sup>283</sup> 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 extant poet to use Callimachus' coinage ὀλιγόστιχος

---

<sup>282</sup> Wilamowitz wrote that Gregory "considered poetry to be the less worthy sister of rhetoric" (*"Es ist wahr, der Rhetor behandelt die Poesie als mindervertige 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"*).

<sup>283</sup> For metrics, see especially Agosti and Gonnelli 1995. See also Simelidis 2009 47–57.

(“few-lined,” *Act. fr.* 9).<sup>284</sup> 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, Nemesisius.<sup>285</sup>

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 portrays himself for the governor as a sophisticated Callimachean poet:

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ, τὰ με Χριστὸς, ἐμὸν φᾶος, ἐξεδίδαξεν, [300]  
 ἐξερέω, μύθοιο θεμείλια πάντ’ ἀναφαίνων  
 ἡμετέρου, θεότητα, Θεοῦ κτίσιν, οἶακα παντὸς,  
 ὃ κόσμον μέγαλοιο Θεοῦ Λόγος αἰὲν ἐλίσσει·  
 καὶ τὰδ’ ἐπιδρομάδην, ὀλιγόστιχον, εὐρέα μῦθον,  
 ὥς νόμος ἐστὶν ἔμοιγε· τὰ δ’ ἔκτοθι ρίψα 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 (ὥς νόμος ἐστὶν ἔμοιγε). In addition to the plainly Callimachean use of ὀλιγόστιχος (“few-lined”), there are a few other possible echoes. The formula αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ (“but I”) in 300 is a favorite tag of the Cyrenaean, who uses it to close the *Aetia*

<sup>284</sup> Philip uses the derived noun ὀλιγοστιχίη in the *sphragis* to his garland (*AnthPal* 4.2).

<sup>285</sup> The poem dates to the beginning of Nemesisius’ term as governor of Cappadocia II, which ran from the middle of 383 to 384. See McLynn 2015 for analysis of the historical context.

(αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Μουσέων πεζὸν [ἔ]πειμι νομόν “but I shall go to the foot-pasture of the Muses.” fr. 112.9).<sup>286</sup>

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.”<sup>287</sup> 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”).<sup>288</sup> 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<sup>289</sup> 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 Logos

<sup>286</sup> On this concluding formula, see Lloyd-Jones 1963 92–93.

<sup>287</sup> Τὸ λακωνίζειν οὐ τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὅπερ οἶε, 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

<sup>288</sup> Cameron 1995 336.

<sup>289</sup> 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 ἢ...ἢ ἐν 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 ἐπάγει in line 7 as a passive in English “made a human being.” Line 8 is difficult, but it seems Gilbert read μικρὸς (“small”) instead of μικτὸς (“mixed”). We want the latter for the wordplay with μίξη. In line 12, ἀμφὶ θεὸν θνητοὶ cannot mean “both are God, mortals” but “as regards God, you mortals, respect...”

replaced his human mind (νοῦς).<sup>290</sup> The poem is replete with allusions and stylistic features that evoke Callimachus.

Νήπιος, ὅστις ἄνακτα Θεοῦ Λόγον αἰὲν ἐόντα  
 οὐ σέβει· ἰσοθέως Πατρὸς ἐπουρανίου.  
 νήπιος, ὅστις ἄνακτα Λόγον βροτὸν ἐνθα φανέντα  
 οὐ σέβει· ἰσοθέως οὐρανίῳ Λόγου.  
 τέμνει δ' ἢ μέγαλοιο Πατρὸς Λόγον, ἢ Λόγοιο [5]  
 μορφήν ἀνδρομέην, καὶ πάχος ἡμέτερον.  
 ἦν Θεός, ἀλλ' ἐπάγη Πατρὸς Λόγος ἡμέτερος φῶς,  
 ὥς κε Θεὸν μίξη, μικτὸς ἐὼν χθονίοις.  
 εἷς Θεὸς ἀμφοτέρωθε· τόσον βροτὸς, ὅσον ἐμ' ἔρδιν  
 ἀντὶ βροτοῖο Θεόν. Ἰλαθι, τρωτὸς ἄνω. [10]  
 τόσον ἔχοις. Τί δ' ἔμοιγε νόον, καὶ μίξιν ἄφραστον;  
 ἀμφὶ Θεὸν, θνητοὶ, στέργετε μέτρα λόγου.  
 εἰ μὲν δὴ πεπίθοιμι, τὸ λῶϊον. 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  
 come here and I will scratch these letters few  
 onto your books, with pen that bears no stain.

---

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.

<sup>290</sup> For Gregory's role in the Apollinarian controversy, see McLynn 2015 57–63.

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 to intensify what follows.<sup>291</sup> He thereby argued that νήπιος meant “extremely gentle” (cf. ἥπιος, “gentle”) rather than “witless.”<sup>292</sup> 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 (εἵνεκεν οὐχ ἔν ᾄεσα... ἐν πολλαῖς ἤνυσσα 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 anaphora of the two opening couplets (νήπιος ὅστις ἄνακτα in 1 and 3, οὐ σεβερτ’ ἰσοθεῶς in 2 and 4) with *hZeus* 86–87, which both begin and end with ἐσπέριος... νοήση.

<sup>291</sup> καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ ἔστι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ νηπίου κατὰ στέρησιν ἡμῖν νοούμενον, ἐπεὶ τὸ νη στερητικὸν γραμματικῶν νομοθετοῦσιν παῖδες (Clem. Al. *Paed.* 1.20).

<sup>292</sup> Chantraine 1968 *s.v.* rejects an etymology from νη- and ἔπος.

Moreover, Gregory employs a number of juxtaposed prosodic variants, a favorite technique of Callimachus.<sup>293</sup> 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 *πατρός* is scanned as a trochee in line 2 (– ◡) but a pyrrhus in line 4 (◡ ◡). He combines the two methods in line 7, where *πατρός* 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 11, he places *τόσον*, *ὅσον*, 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 (φῶς).” He here exploits the homophones φῶς (man) and φῶς (light). By Gregory’s period the original difference in tonal accentuation would scarcely have been heard.<sup>294</sup> Gregory certainly intends us to hear John 1 in the background, where Jesus as the Word (λόγος) is described as “the light of men” (τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων John 1:4), “the true light that illumines every human being” (τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον Jn 1:9), and where the

---

<sup>293</sup> 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.

<sup>294</sup> 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 φῶς by the ancients.

Logos is said to “become flesh and dwell among us” (καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν John 1:14).

After a few lines dealing with Jesus’ incarnation, he bids his interlocutor to be satisfied with his extremely brief account of the Jesus’ natures (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 characterizes 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*.<sup>295</sup> 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 preoccupation with “measure” (μέτρον) is here presented as a distinctly Callimachean concern. We shall see the same when we come later to *ep*.

51.

---

<sup>295</sup> This is the only passage of which I am aware where an author uses γραφίς in this metaphorical sense.

## ΤΥΤΘΟΣ

In imitation of Callimachus, Gregory deploys the binary of thick and thin to describe his poetry.<sup>296</sup>

We have already seen in Gregory's epigrams his Callimachean comparison of his small see to the small pearl and small Bethlehem.<sup>297</sup> Gregory deploys similar vocabulary at the end of *carm.* 2.2.1 (*Ad Hellenium*), which ends with a Callimachean flourish:

Τυτθὴ μὲν πόλις ἐσμέν, ἀτὰρ πολὺ σεῖο, φέριστε, [305]  
 δώσομεν ἀνθρώποις, ἢ Διοκαισαρέων,  
 οὔνομα, καὶ πινάκεσσι χαράξομεν· «Οὔτος ἄριστος,  
 οὔτος 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."<sup>298</sup>

In addition to the use of τυτθὴ ("small"), we see Callimachean elements in the extreme hyperbaton between πολὺ and οὔνομα (over two lines), the bucolic diaereses, and the anaphora with οὔτος in 307-308. The final line reworks a famous Callimachean epigram we saw in chapter 2: (Call. G.-P. *epigr.* 29.4 κρείσσονα 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 ἡματίοις πόνοις, νυχίησί τ' ἀοιδαῖς·  
 δὸς δὲ χαμευνίη, λεπταλέοις τε γόοις, [310]  
 καὶ τρυχίνοις ῥακέεσσι, καὶ ὄμμασι τηκομένοις·  
 δὸς δὲ νόῳ καθαρῷ, δὸς δ' ἱεροῖσι λόγοις,  
 ὄφρ' ἀρετὴν τίων, ἀρετῆς ὁδὸν ἀμπετάσειας  
 πλείοσι, καὶ πλεόνων μισθὸν ἔχοις Θεόθεν.

<sup>296</sup> The most detailed treatment of Callimachus' stylistic metaphors is Asper 1997.

<sup>297</sup> *AnthPal* 8.21. See discussion in chapter 2.

<sup>298</sup> 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.'"



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 reminiscent of Artemis' requests of Zeus in *hArt* 6–25.<sup>299</sup> 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 λεπταλήν *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.<sup>300</sup>

## METPON

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

<sup>299</sup> The imperative δός begins lines 6, 8, 13, 15, and 18.

<sup>300</sup> 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 Matt 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.

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 καμῶν  
οὕτω πεδῆσαι τὴν ἐμὴν ἀμετρίαν, [35]  
ὥς ἂν γράφων γε, ἀλλὰ μὴ πολλὰ γράφω  
καμῶν 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.<sup>301</sup>

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” (ὥς 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 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

---

<sup>301</sup> Note that when translating passages from *carm.* 2.1.39, I have used prose instead of verse. See the introduction for further detail.

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.<sup>302</sup>

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 Callimachus in mind. Callimachus is the archetype of the appropriately concise poet.

## Craft

### Metrics

The mechanics of Gregory's hexameter have received solid analysis from Agosti and Gonnelli,<sup>303</sup>

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

---

<sup>302</sup> Τί γάρ; Ἡ τῇ περσικῇ σχοίνῳ μετρεῖσθαι δεῖ τὴν σοφίαν, ἢ παιδικοῖς πῆχεσι, καὶ οὕτως ἀτελῇ γράφειν ὥς 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, ὥς ἂν εἴποιμι καιρίως, εἰκασμάτων εἰκάσματα; δέον, ἀμφοτέρων φεύγοντα τὴν ἀμετρίαν, τοῦ μετρίου κατατυγχάνειν. (*ep.* 51.3, ed. Gailay 1964).

The passage is difficult to render, for Gregory is rather terse. Storin 2012 captures the flow of the sentence better than Gailay 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.

<sup>303</sup> Agosti and Gonnelli 1995.

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 over spondees.<sup>304</sup>

Dactyls per line	Homer	Homeric Hymns	Callimachus	Gr. Combined	Gr. <i>Poem.</i> <i>arc.</i> 3	Gr. <i>DRS</i> 294–392	Nonnus <i>Dion.</i>
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 %

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*.<sup>305</sup>

Pattern	Frequency
DDDD	35.94%
SDDD	19.27%

<sup>304</sup> 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.

<sup>305</sup> Harder 2012 57.

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).<sup>306</sup> They are rare in Callimachus also (7% according to Stephens),<sup>307</sup> although more prevalent than in Gregory.

Gregory's preferences for the feminine caesura in the third metron reveal Alexandrian influence.<sup>308</sup> Callimachus most favored the feminine caesura (74%).<sup>309</sup> Gregory similarly prefers the feminine (78.8%) to the masculine caesura in the third metron (22.2%). Nonnus, another poet extensively indebted to 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.<sup>310</sup> In these respects, Nonnus and Gregory contrast sharply with the author of the *Metaphrasis psalmorum*, attributed to Apollinaris of Laodicea, who uses

---

<sup>306</sup> Agosti and Gonnelli 1995 373.

<sup>307</sup> Stephens 2015 31.

<sup>308</sup> That is, a caesura between the two shorts of the third foot, rather than after the princeps of the third foot.

<sup>309</sup> Lightfoot 2014 68–69. Of Hellenistic poets, only Euphorion (77%) used the feminine caesura more than Callimachus.

<sup>310</sup> For example, West 1982 36 notes *Il.* 1.218. There are two such lines in Dionysius' *Periegesis* (630, 753). See Lightfoot 2014 68.

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.<sup>311</sup>

Author	Freq. of Feminine Caesura <sup>312</sup>
Homer, <i>Il.</i> and <i>Od.</i>	57%
Callimachus, <i>Hymns</i>	74%
Dionysius, <i>Perieg.</i>	64.5%
Nonnus, <i>Dionysiaca</i>	81.1%
<i>Met. Psalm.</i>	62.1%
Gregory (All)	78.8%
Gr. <i>Poem. arc.</i> 3	83.9%
Gr. <i>DRS</i> 294–392	80.1%

I have analyzed several of the bridges respected by Callimachus. Gregory respects the most important, Hermann's bridge.<sup>313</sup> He is less strict with other Callimachean prohibitions. As Bacci observes,<sup>314</sup> 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 ἄγνοῦ. There are 13 lines where Gregory places an uncorrected 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

---

<sup>311</sup> 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.

<sup>312</sup> 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.

<sup>313</sup> 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 (θεῶ γε μὲν), 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 σὸν was also felt to be enclitic). For the latter, however, note that μὲν was effectively enclitic in late antiquity, and hence γε μὲν would not have been felt to be in violation of Hermann's bridge. See West 1982 180. We may also note Homeric precedent for γε μὲν in the fourth biceps (cf. Simelidis 2009 139).

<sup>314</sup> Bacci 1996 56.

and may be taken almost as a proclitic with what follows.<sup>315</sup> As for Meyer's first law (words of the shape  $x - \upsilon$  rarely end in the second metron), I have found only two violations.<sup>316</sup> It is done for effect in *Poem. arc.* 3. 47 (οὐ σε, καθαροί φίλη, οὐ ψεύσομαι<sup>317</sup>). 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  $x - \upsilon \upsilon$  never end the second metron): *Poem. arc.* 3.77 εὔτε 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. *Poem. arc.* 3.36, 41) and occasionally at 5 or 5.5, though never across the line's main caesura.<sup>318</sup> 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.<sup>319</sup> In the passages from Gregory, correption occurs at 2, 6, 8. As for hiatus, Callimachus avoided it between metra, except with the conjunction ἥ or words originally containing a digamma. Within metra, hiatus occurred only after the princeps when the metron was dactylic

---

<sup>315</sup> The appositive nature of καί is illustrated by the fact that Homer never places a caesura following it; see West 1982 36.

<sup>316</sup> The violation in *Poem. arc.* 3.62 is only apparent, for ἐν is proclitic.

<sup>317</sup> Cf. Call. *hDem* 91 ὥς δὲ Μίμαντι χιῶν, ὥς ἀελίῳ ἐνι πλαγγῶν. Hollis 1990 20 notes that the repeated ὥς to some extent diverts attention from the irregularity).

<sup>318</sup> For instance, consider *DRS* 297: τοῦνεκεν αἰάζω. τὸ δ' ἐσαύριον οὐ σάφα οἶδα. Gregory elides at position 5.5, but there is a masculine caesura and pause after αἰάζω.

<sup>319</sup> Stephens 2015 31–32.

(e.g. *Hec.* fr. 9.1 κολουραίη 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,<sup>320</sup> 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 ῥ (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.

### Prosody

Gregory takes considerably more license in his prosody than he does in his metrics. He is more flexible than even Homer in admitting short syllables before consonantal clusters. For instance, at *Poem. arc.* 3.15 he scans γυμνήν as an iamb (◡ –). The LfGRE lists no precedent for this unusual scansion.<sup>321</sup> 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).<sup>322</sup> Furthermore, on occasion Gregory does not

<sup>320</sup> Sykes 1979 14–15.

<sup>321</sup> See LfGRE s.n. γυμνός.

<sup>322</sup> West 1982 16.



observe traditional vowel lengths for the dichrona (α ι υ), though his “false quantities” are more common in iambic than in hexametric verse.<sup>323</sup> In my passages, I have observed four prosodic irregularities: *Poem. arv.* 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 prosody, perhaps intentionally, but only on rare occasions. As Simelidis has noted,<sup>324</sup> 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.<sup>325</sup> Gregory is fond of stylistic devices like alliteration and anaphora, but he 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

---

<sup>323</sup> 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 ὑμῖν 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 equates to 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, Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 26–31, and Whitby 2008 93. “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.

<sup>324</sup> Simelidis 2009 54–55.

<sup>325</sup> Simelidis 2009 52.

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.<sup>326</sup> As Opelt observed, the purpose of the trope is often to emphasize the syntactical connection of the alliterated elements (*strukturelle Funktionalität*), but it 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 κραδίησιν ἀφανροτάτησιν ἄπιστον (“[it was not fitting] to lay an unbearable burden on such feeble hearts”). Gregory here emphasizes the impropriety of revealing the Spirit’s 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 φαινόμενον μερόπεσιν (“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”).<sup>327</sup> Though

---

<sup>326</sup> See Opelt 1958 and Whitby 2008 91. It is worth noting that Nonnus and ps.-Oppian both depicted themselves as Callimachean poets.

<sup>327</sup> We may further note *Poem. arc.* 3.16 πινυτὸν ποθέων; 42 ἄκτιστον ἄχρονον ἐσθλὸν ἐλεύθερον; 57 ἀναρχον 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

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.<sup>328</sup> *Poem. arc.* 3.47 is one striking instance: οὐ σε, κάθαρσι φίλη, οὐ ψεύσομαι ("I shall not, my purification, I shall not betray you"). At *Poem. arc.* 3.72–73, where repeats of οὐτε...ἐπεὶ at the beginning of the line and after the feminine caesura: οὐτε μονὰς νήριθμος, ἐπεὶ τρισὶν ἴστατ' ἐν ἐσθλοῖς / οὐτε Τριάς 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.<sup>329</sup> But elsewhere Gregory uses the device much more sparingly. I have found six instances in the 93 lines of *Poem. arc.* 3,<sup>330</sup> 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*.

---

ὄργανα πάντα παρακλίνας; 377 ἐσιδὼν ἐλέηρεν, ὃν οὐκ ἐλέηραν 382 κενυῆς καταβάντα; 389 πέμποις πόλιν.

<sup>328</sup> 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), πολλάς...πολλάς...πολλά (22–24), καλὰ μὲν...καλὰ δ'ἔτραφες (55), ἐν δὲ...ἐν δ' (84), ἐσπέριος...ἐσπέριος (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.

<sup>329</sup> Εἷς Θεὸς ἐστὶν ἕκαστον, ἐπὶ μόνον ἐξαγορεύης. / εἷς Θεὸς αὖθις ἀναρχος, 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").

<sup>330</sup> *Poem. arc.* 3.4 ὅς...ὅς, 47 οὐ...οὐ, 60 ἐκ μονάδος...καὶ ἐκ Τριάδος, 72–73 οὐτε...ἐπεὶ, 75–76 εἷς θεός...εἷς θεός, 87–88 ἐν μὲν...ἐν δὲ...ἐν κλέος, ἐν δὲ.

Gregory frequently employs polyptoton to good effect, a technique Callimachus particularly favored in the *Hymn to Apollo*.<sup>331</sup> *Poem. arc.* 3.3–4 constitute one striking example: Πνεῦμα μέγα τρομέωμεν, ὃ 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 (Υἱός...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 pronoun in three different forms (ὃ, ᾧ, ὃς) 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 ὃ is short, while the other the dative ᾧ is long, and the nominative ὃς 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

---

<sup>331</sup> E.g. *hAp* 62–63 (κεράεσσιν...κεράων, κεραοὺς), 68–71 (Ἀπόλλων...ὥπολλον...Καρνεῖον...Καρνεῖε), 109–10 (ἔφ ὕδατι / ὕδωρ, also a juxtaposed prosodic variant).

two different forms and the noun θεότης in both the dative singular and the nominative singular (Ἡ μονὰς ἐν θεότητι, τὰ δ' ὦν θεότης τρισάριθμα. “The unity is in divinity; that which is divinity is three”). In *Poem. arc.* 3.80–81, Gregory combines polyptoton with *parisa*<sup>332</sup>: Μηδὲ θεῶν ἀγορῇ  
τερπώμεθα τῇ πολυάρχῳ. / ἴσον γὰρ πολύαρχον ἔμοι 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 in *Poem.*  
*arc.* 3 than in *De rebus suis*.<sup>333</sup> 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 of enjambement favored by Callimachus.<sup>334</sup>

	Work	Not Enjambed	Unperiodic	Necessary
	Gr. <i>Poem. arc.</i> 3	35.5%	31.2 %	33.3%
	Gr. DRS 294–392	36.4%	40.4%	23.23%

<sup>332</sup> *Parisa* occurs when words with the same root are used but with a different prefix (in this case, πολύαρχος is juxtaposed with ἄναρχος).

<sup>333</sup> I have found only one instance: Gregory repeats ὁδίτης (traveler) in different cases in 369 and 372 but two entire lines intervene.

<sup>334</sup> For analyzing enjambement I have used the categories adopted by Parry 1929 and McLennan 1974, from whom I derive the statistics for Homer, Callimachus, and Apollonius. Unperiodic enjambement 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 enjambement occurs when the sense is not complete at the end of the line. In *Poem. arc.* 3.19–20 (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀρχομένοισι τελειότεροιο λόγιοι / καιρός) the sense is not complete until the subject (and implicitly the verb ἔστί) are supplied in line 20.

No enjambement occurs when a new clause begins with a new line.

Gr. <i>Total</i>	35.9%	35.9%	28.1%
Homer <i>Il.</i>	48.5	24.8%	26.6 %
Homer <i>Od.</i>	44.8 %	26.6%	28.5 %
Hesiod <i>Theog.</i>	33.0%	39.1%	27.9%
Hesiod <i>WD</i>	43.0%	27.2 %	29.7%
Callimachus <i>Hymns</i>	40.2%	25%	34%
Apollonius <i>Arg.</i>	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 each Callimachean work to the next. Even among the *Hymns*, Callimachus varies his practice considerably:

Work	Not Enjambed	Unperiodic	Necessary
Call. <i>hZeus</i>	37.8%	29.5%	32.7%
Call. <i>hAp</i>	46.4%	25.9%	27.7%
Call. <i>hArt</i>	30.4%	20.7%	48.97%
Call. <i>hDel</i>	34.5%	23.4%	42.1%
Call. <i>hDem</i>	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.<sup>335</sup> McLennan points to examples at Call. *Hymn* 1.11–12 (ἐνθεν ὁ χῶρος / ἱερός, “where the

---

<sup>335</sup> I have found the following instances in *Poem. arc.* 3 and *DRS* 294–392: *Poem. arc.* 3.12–13 τρίβους εἰς ἐν συνιούσας / ὄψεται; 19–20 Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀρχομένοισι τελειότεριοι λόγιοι / καιρός; 55–56 θεοφόροισιν

precinct is holy”) and at *Hymn* 1.19–20 (ἔτι δ’ ἄβροχος ἦεν ἅπασα / Ἀζηνίς “but all of Arcadia was still unwatered”).<sup>336</sup>

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 / οἷτες (“nor where the sheep un-milked”) and observes that this type of necessary enjambement 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 / εὐμένεων πάντεσσιν; 308–09 κορυσσόμενον ἀνέμοισι /  
γαίης ἐκ Φαρίης ἐπ’ Ἀχαιίδα, πόντον ἔτετμον; 381–82 μεγαίρων /  
ληϊστῆς

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, ἐκάς, ἐκὰς ὅστις ἀλιτρός). Gregory has combined a Callimachean allusion with adaption of a stylistic technique favored by his Cyrenaean master. Gregory’s use of 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.<sup>337</sup>

---

/ ἄνδρασιν; 81–82 πάμπαν ἄναρχον / μαρνάμενον; 82–83 ἢ δ’ ἐπὶ λῦσιν / σπεύδει. *DRS* 294–95: ἀπ’ ἔμοιο / ψυχῆς; 318–19 καὶ στροπῆσι / λάμπετο; 331–332 φάος δ’ ἐμὸν οἷα φονῆος / ὤλετο; 333–334 ἀνέπεμψα θυγλῆν / πνεύματος; 340–41: ἐνέκυρσε τάλαινα / ψύχη; 354–54 ἐπὶ κραναῆς πεδίοισιν / δουριαλῆς; 356–57 παρακλίνας ἀτίνακτα / δακρυόεις; 360–61 οὔποτε ἔληξα / ἱμείρων; 380–81 ἐγὼ ἀντεβόλησα / πήμασι.

<sup>336</sup> McLennan 1974 201.

<sup>337</sup> Mineur 1984 34.

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 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 Χριστοῦ 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’ ὅπότε (“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.<sup>338</sup>

Gregory 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 ἀλλά πόροις ἀμφοτέρ’ εὐαγέως, “but I pray that you would grant both [my speech and my hearing] to be holy”) or the postponement of καί in *hVing* 80 (δίξετο καὶ σοφίης ἐπίστορα, “And he sought one practiced in wisdom”).<sup>339</sup> The textbook example for such anastrophe was Call. *Aet.* fr.

---

<sup>338</sup> Harder 2012 42.

<sup>339</sup> This example perhaps alludes to *hZeus* 16 αὐτίκα δίζητο ῥόον ὕδατος (“at once she looked for a flow of water”).



1.15–16: *Μασσαγέται καὶ μακρὸν οἷστεύοιεν ἐπ’ ἄνδρα / Μῆδον* (“and may the Massagetes shoot from afar at the man from Media”).<sup>340</sup> See also *Aet.* fr. 43.53 *φίλατο καὶ κεστοῦ δεσπότης ἦν Ἔρυκα* (“[I can tell about...] Eryx, which the mistress of the girdle loved.” tr. Harder, modified). Callimachus also postpones the conjunction *ἀλλά* at *bZens* 18 *Λάδων ἀλλ’ οὐπω 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 (*γνώμαι* and *δόγματα*):

Ἄλλου μὲν γὰρ ἄλλο τι γνώρισμα, ἢ μικρὸν ἢ μεῖζον· τῶν δ’  
 ἡμετέρων λόγων τὸ παιδευτικὸν ἔν τε γνώμας καὶ δόγμασιν, ὅπη  
 παρείκοι. καὶ καθάπερ εὐγενεῖ τόκῳ, τοῖς λόγοις ὁ πατὴρ αἰεὶ  
 συνεμφαίνεται οὐχ ἥττον ἢ τοῖς σωματικοῖς ὡς τὰ πολλὰ  
 χαρακτηρῶσιν 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

---

<sup>340</sup> For ancient definitions of the various types of anastrophe, see the scholia to Dionysius Thrax, ed. Hilgard 1901, p. 460.

and *dogmata*. An author, like a father in a noble son, is often even 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.<sup>341</sup> They offer examples like *Il.* 2.24: οὐ χρὴ παννύχιον εὔδειν βουλευφόρον 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 gnomonic speech that are not gnomes proper, like proverbs (παροιμίας) 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:

---

<sup>341</sup> Γνώμη ἐστὶ λόγος ἐν ἀποφάνσεσι κεφαλαιώδης ἐπὶ τι προτρέπων ἢ ἀποτρέπων. (Aphth. *Progymasmata* p. 7. ed. Rabe 1926). Cf. Ps.-Hermogenes, *Progymasmata* 4. Aristotle’s definition occurs in *Rhet.* 1394a.

Τρίτον ἐστὶ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν, ἡ χάρις. ταύτην δὲ φυλάξομεν, εἰ μήτε παντάπασι ξηρὰ καὶ ἀχάριστα γράφοιμεν καὶ ἀκαλλώπιστα, ἀκόσμητα καὶ ἀκόρητα, ὃ δὴ λέγεται, οἷον δὴ γνῶμῶν 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 μὲν, ὀλίγας δέ, καὶ ταύτας οὐκ ἀναισχύντους. ἀντίθετα δὲ καὶ πάρισα καὶ ἰσόκωλα τοῖς σοφισταῖς ἀπορρίψομεν· εἰ δέ που καὶ παραλάβοιμεν, ὥς 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.”<sup>342</sup> 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.<sup>343</sup> I propose instead that Gregory

<sup>342</sup> Note, e.g., the *parisa* in the juxtaposition of φαίνω and παραφαίνω.

<sup>343</sup> De Blasi 2018, *ad loc.*, Crimi and Costa 1999, Demoen 1996 61 n. 108, Milovanović-Barham 1997 500.

here emphasizes the didactic features of his poetic style, like gnomes and maxims. I print De Blasi's text, with departures noted.

Πρὸς ταῦτα νῦν γινώσκεθ' ἡμῖν, οἱ σοφοί,  
 τῶν ἔνδον.<sup>344</sup> εἰ δ' ἥττεσθε, τῶν αὐτῶν λόγων  
 πλεῖστον τὸ χρήμα.<sup>345</sup> καὶ τὰ παιζόντων λόγοι<ς><sup>346</sup> [60]  
 χωρεῖτε. μακρὸν δ' οὐδὲν οὐδ' ὑπὲρ κόρον  
 ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἄχρηστον ὡς ἐγῶμαι 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 ὢν,  
 ἱαμβοποιὸς 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.<sup>347</sup>

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.”<sup>348</sup> We should, however, take these lines as prospective. With the opening phrase of 58 (πρὸς ταῦτα, “moreover”) Gregory

<sup>344</sup> 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.

<sup>345</sup> I am the first, to my knowledge, to introduce punctuation here.

<sup>346</sup> *Scriptsi*. The manuscripts and editions read καὶ τὰ παιζόντων λόγοι.

<sup>347</sup> 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.

<sup>348</sup> 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.”

marks a transition from his reasons for writing verse to a new topic: the style and content of his poetry.<sup>349</sup> The verb γινώσκετε in 58 should be taken as imperative in this polemical context, not indicative (Crimi, Abrams Rebillard, White).<sup>350</sup> Indeed, the imperative is reinforced by the particle νῦν, which often accompanies commands or requests.<sup>351</sup> We should thus understand τῶν ἔνδον not as Gregory's reasons for writing verse, but as the contents of his poetry books.<sup>352</sup>

In line 60, the transmitted text is almost certainly corrupt, as De Blasi notes.<sup>353</sup> 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:

<i>carm.</i> 2.1.39	<i>ep.</i> 51
μακρὸν δ' οὐδὲν	οὔτε μακρότερα γραπτέον...
οὐδ' ὑπὲρ κόρον	τὸ δ' ἄπληστον
οὐδ' ἄχρηστον <sup>354</sup> ...παντελῶς	ἔστι δὲ μέτρον τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἢ χρεῖα

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.

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

---

<sup>349</sup> Abrams Rebillard's "Regarding these verses" is possible, but πρὸς ταῦτα, like διὰ τοῦτο, is virtually a conjunctive particle. See LSJ πρὸς III.2.

<sup>350</sup> De Blasi 2018 *ad loc.* prints νῦν γινώσκετε but in his note prefers the more poorly attested συγγινώσκειτ' ("pardon"). But even an ironic plea for pardon does not cohere well with the mention of yielding in the next verse.

<sup>351</sup> LSJ *s.v.* II.3.

<sup>352</sup> For ἔνδον used with the contents of a book, *cf.* Diog. Laert. *Vit. Phil.* 5.4.

<sup>353</sup> De Blasi 2018 *ad loc.*

<sup>354</sup> Gregory may well be punning in this line on the presence of χρεῖαι (witty anecdotes attributed to historical persons) in his verse.

different kinds of poems that Gregory wrote.<sup>355</sup> 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.<sup>356</sup> 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,”<sup>357</sup> or by reading the line in apposition with οἱ λόγοι in line 63.<sup>358</sup> 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,<sup>359</sup> 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.<sup>360</sup>

Let us now reconsider each element of the catalogue in the light of the prior argument. Praises of virtue and excoriations of vice (ἡ τῶν καλῶν ἔπαινος ἢ κακῶν ψόγος) refer not to extended compositions, but to concise aphorisms. Notably, Gregory’s contemporary Aphthonius

---

<sup>355</sup> E.g. Demoen 1996 61–63.

<sup>356</sup> 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 τὰ in 64 as correlative with οἱ λόγοι which would be rather awkward, particularly as Gregory could easily have written οἱ μὲν...οἱ δέ.

<sup>357</sup> Moreschini et al. 1994 16.

<sup>358</sup> So De Blasi 2018 *ad loc.*

<sup>359</sup> De Blasi 2018 *in l.* 64

<sup>360</sup> Gregory’s fondness for definitions is well-attested in 1.2.34, a poem consisting entirely of definitions.

distinguished ἔπαινος from ἐγκώμιον precisely on the basis of length: the former was short, the latter longer with more stylistic elaboration.<sup>361</sup> 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). Gnomic, 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 δέχνησο ῥήματ' ἐμεῖο “Let Heaven hear; O Earth receive my words.” Cf. Dt. 32:1 and Isa 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 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 gnostic

---

<sup>361</sup> Διενήνοχε [scil. τὸ ἐγκώμιον] δὲ ὕμνου καὶ ἐπαίνου τῷ τὸν μὲν ὕμνον εἶναι θεῶν, τὸ δὲ ἐγκώμιον θνητῶν, καὶ τῷ τὸν μὲν ἔπαινον ἐν βραχεὶ γίνεσθαι, τὸ δὲ ἐγκώμιον κατὰ τέχνην ἐκφέρεσθαι (“Encomium differs from hymn and *epainos* in that a hymn honors the gods, while an encomium honors mortals, and in that an *epainos* is concise, but an encomium is extended through rhetorical art.” vol. 10, pg. 21, line 10).

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. arv.* 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*.<sup>362</sup> This amounts to about one every 128 lines. I have counted seven in the Hymns of Callimachus (about one every 155 lines):

- *hZeus* 6 κρηῖτες ἀεὶ ψεύσται (“Cretans are always liars”).
- *hZeus* 63–64 ἐπ’ ἰσαίῃ γὰρ ἔοικε / πῆλασθαι (“For it is fitting to cast lots on equal terms”).
- *hAp* 9–10 ὡπόλλων οὐ παντὶ φαίνεται, ἀλλ’ ὃ τις ἐσθλός / ὅς μιν ἴδῃ, μέγας οὔτος, 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 αἰδόντεσσι 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”).

In the passages selected from Gregory, by contrast, I have counted nine in 192 lines, or about one every 21 lines. From *Poem. arv.* 3 I note:

- 16-18 Οὐ γὰρ ἐώκει...ἄχθος ἄγειν κραδίησιν ἀφαιροτάτησιν ἄπιστον (“For it was not fitting to lay an incredible burden on hearts so feeble”).

---

<sup>362</sup> 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.



- 19–20 Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀρχομένοισι τελειότεροιο λόγοιο / καιρός (“nor was it time for those beginning to have a more perfect explanation”).
- 32 Καὶ γὰρ πῦρ Θεὸν οἶδα κακοῖς, ὥς 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 ἀναρχον / 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 ἀγνοῦ κακὸν (“It is wicked for one impure to touch what is clean”).
- 348–50 ἦ γὰρ ἄριστον / δάκρυόν ἐστι βροτοῖσιν ἄκος, ψυχαῖς τε μελαίνοις, / 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 Ἐλκων οἶκτον Ἄνακτος οἷζυῖ, ὃς χθαμαλοῖσιν / εὐμένεων 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.<sup>363</sup> 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 to *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 ὅλη 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 Isa 58:1,<sup>364</sup> 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 martial 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

<sup>363</sup> 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 gnomonic statements (5–8, 11–16, 20–26, 28–30, 35, 40, 42, 100–05, 134–37, 176–79, 187–94, 200–01). In the future I should also like to explore how Theognis functions as a gnomonic model for Gregory, as the Cappadocian frequently alludes to the *Theognidea*; see Wyss 1983 842–43.

<sup>364</sup> Sykes and Moreschini 1997 *ad loc.* suggests Ex. 19.16–19 as a parallel but the language of Isa 58:1 is the most immediate linguistic comparand: Ἀναβόησον ἐν ἰσχύι καὶ μὴ φείσῃ, ὥς σάλπιγγα ὑψώσῃ τὴν φωνήν σου καὶ ἀνάγγελον τῷ λαῷ μου τὰ ἁμαρτήματα αὐτῶν καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ Ιακωβ τὰς ἀνομίας αὐτῶν (“Cry out in your strength and do not be sparing; lift up your voice as a trumpet and announce to my people their sins and to the house of Jacob their transgressions”). For Isaiah, I cite Ziegler 1983.

and solemn ring,” which is reinforced by the Homeric formula of dative + participial form of *μῖγνυμι* at the end of the next line.<sup>365</sup> 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*.

Ἦθελον ἢ πέλεια τανύπτερος, ἢ χελιδῶν  
 ἔμμεναι, ὥς κε φύγοιμι βροτῶν βίον, ἢ τιν’ ἔρημον  
 ναιετάειν θήρεσσιν ὁμέστιος (οἱ γὰρ ἔασι  
 πιστότεροι μερόπων), καὶ ἡμάτιον βίον ἔλκειν,  
 νηπενθῇ, νήποινον, ἀκηδέα· ἐν τόδ’ ἄθηρον [5]  
 μῦνον ἔχειν, θεότητος ἴδριν νόον, οὐρανοφοίτην,  
 ὥς κε γαληνιόωντι βίῳ φάος αἰὲν ἐγείρω.<sup>366</sup>  
 ἢ τινος ἡερίης σκοπιῆς καθύπερθεν ἀερθεῖς,  
 βρονταῖον πάντεσσιν ἐπιχθονίοισιν αὔσαι·

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

<sup>365</sup> Sykes and Moreschini 1997 *ad loc.*

<sup>366</sup> The manuscripts all transmit ἄγ-, but “that I may gather/collect light in peace” seems a rather strange locution. I suspect that Gregory instead wrote ἐγείρω (“raise”). See the appendix of textual discussions for further detail.

and take some lofty vantage point so I  
may loudly thunder to all those below.

The passage begins in both a Callimachean and biblical vein. Simelidis suggests<sup>367</sup> that Gregory's choice of the dove and the swallow is inspired by Isa 38:14: "I shall speak like the swallow, and meditate like the dove."<sup>368</sup> 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 dew, so that he may escape the burden of old age.<sup>369</sup> 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 ἡέρος εἶδαρ ἔδων *Aet.* fr 1.32–34).<sup>370</sup> 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 questions (10–13),

---

<sup>367</sup> Simelidis 2009 222–23.

<sup>368</sup> ὡς χελιδών, οὕτως φωνήσω, καὶ ὡς περιστέρα, οὕτως μελετήσω.

<sup>369</sup> Simelidis 2009 219.

<sup>370</sup> Cf. also Call. *bDel* 59, where Callimachus uses σκοπιή in the same position as Gregory to describe Hera staring down from an etherial look-out at Leto (σκοπιήν ἔχεν αἰθέρος εἶσω).

imperatives (14), and maxims (44–45). Gregory thus sees his cultivation of the didactic as a departure from Callimachus relatively gnome-free style.<sup>371</sup>

### 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 within 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, make his own way in some respects, and this is most clear in his cultivation of gnomes and other paroimiatic 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 departure from Callimachus. Yet the variety and skill with which Gregory constructs these

---

<sup>371</sup> Pontani 2011 102 observes that Callimachus "remained virtually unknown to the paroemiographers and florilegia."

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."<sup>372</sup>

---

<sup>372</sup> 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)<sup>373</sup> 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 μὲν τοι τούτων ἄξιον φθέγγοισθ' ἔπος,

---

<sup>373</sup> The most recent text remains that of Caillau, reprinted in *PG* 37.813–851, though Oberhaus and Sicheil 1991 provide a list of improvements to the text of Caillau. 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 κάμοί· εἰ δὲ σιγῆς, οὐκ ἔμοί. [545]  
καὶ ὦτα δῆσω 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.<sup>374</sup> 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 of the hexameter generally permitted

---

<sup>374</sup> See especially lines 33–35 of ps.-Scymnus' *Periegesis*:

μέτρῳ δὲ ταύτην ἐκτιθέναι προείλετο,  
τῷ κωμικῷ δέ, τῆς σαφηνίας χάριν,  
εὐμνημόνευτον ἔσομένην οὕτως ὀρῶν.

“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 easiest to remember.”

I take the Greek text of ps.-Scymnus from Marcotte 2002.



only allusion, not explicit citation.<sup>375</sup> 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 of 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 clearest 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).<sup>376</sup> Gregory’s memory occasionally slipped:

---

<sup>375</sup> By contrast, Callimachus felt perfectly free to cite his sources by name in the elegiac *Aetia*. See, for example, fr. 75.54.

<sup>376</sup> 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. That is, Gregory explains that Peter bore Paul’s accusation because Peter knew the charge was made in good faith.

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 paraenesis, 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."<sup>377</sup> This is clearly a paraphrase of Ps 4:5 "Be angry, but do not sin" (ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε).<sup>378</sup>

### 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 οἱ λέγουσιν αἵματος ζέσιν [35]  
 τοῦ γειτονοῦντος καρδίᾳ τὴν ἔκστασιν·  
 ὅσοι νέμουν 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 ὀρμῶσαν· 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' ὥς ἔχει μὲν, οὐχὶ νῦν σκοπητέον.  
 ἐκεῖνο μὲν τοι καὶ λίαν τῶν γνωρίμων,  
 ὥς νοῦς ἀπάντων ἡγεμῶν· ὃν σύμμαχον  
 δέδωκεν ἡμῖν κατὰ παθῶν ὁ Δεσπότης.

Briefly then, let us now investigate  
 this ill, its nature, source, and antidote  
 by examining the views of ancient men

<sup>377</sup> ζήλωσον, ἀλλὰ τὴν νόσον γ' αὐραῖς δίδου. That is, be zealous, but surrender sinful anger.

<sup>378</sup> For citations of the Psalms, I follow Rahlfs 1979.

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.<sup>379</sup> 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 will 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

---

<sup>379</sup> 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.<sup>380</sup> 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.<sup>381</sup> 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 (a separation of the mind from control), revealing his familiarity with Aristotle's dictum in *Phys.* 247a3 that virtues are perfections (τελειώσεις) and vices separations (ἐκστάσεις). At *Adv. iram* 39 he has probably coined the word ἀντίπληξις ("striking back").<sup>382</sup> 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<sup>383</sup> and defines θυμός as a sudden type of anger (ὀργή ὀρμῶσα); μνησικακία by contrast is the type that takes up

---

<sup>380</sup> Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 *ad loc.* responds to Geffcken 1909 29.

<sup>381</sup> Gregory does not here emphasize the disagreement, as he does in the parallels adduced by Oberhaus.

<sup>382</sup> 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).

<sup>383</sup> See *SVF* 3 fr. 394.

residence within the soul for an extended period of time.<sup>384</sup> 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.<sup>385</sup> 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),<sup>386</sup> both mention the mirror as a useful tool to remind the angry person of his ugly countenance,<sup>387</sup> 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.<sup>388</sup> 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*).<sup>389</sup>

### **Basil of Caesarea, *Homily 10***

We now turn to Gregory's use of Basil's tenth homily. As Oberhaus has noted,<sup>390</sup> the parallels between *Adv. iram* and *Hom. 10* are particularly strong in the respective *ephrases* of an angry person (Gr. Naz. *Adv. iram* 85-110 and Basil *Hom. 10.2*). Both Cappadocians describe in vivid detail the

---

<sup>384</sup> The schema of anger is somewhat different in Gregory's *car. 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*.

<sup>385</sup> See Cameron 2006 333–35.

<sup>386</sup> The painter metaphor opens Plutarch's treatise. Cf. *Adv. iram* 99.

<sup>387</sup> Gr. naz. *adv. iram* 87-90; Plutarch *De coh. ira* 456B.

<sup>388</sup> In addition to Plutarch's *De coh. ira*, consider for instance his *De tranquillitate animi* and *De invidia et odio*.

<sup>389</sup> Gregory mentions in *Adv. iram* 4–5 that he turned to this work on anger after “restraining oath-swearing.”

<sup>390</sup> Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 *ad loc.*

physical features of someone suffering from anger. These *ephrases* occur near the beginning and function as a sort of prooemium for what follows.

Ὁφθαλμοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἐκείνοις οἱ οἰκεῖοί τε καὶ συνήθεις ἡγνόνηται·  
 παράφορον δὲ τὸ ὄμμα, καὶ πῦρ ἤδη βλέπει. Καὶ παραθήγει τὸν  
 ὀδόντα κατὰ τῶν συνῶν τοὺς ὁμόσε χωροῦντας. Πρόσωπον  
 πελιδνὸν καὶ ὑφαιμον· ὄγκος τοῦ σώματος ἐξοιδαίνων·  
φλέβες διαρρήγνυμναι, ὑπὸ τῆς ἐνδοθεν ζάλης κλονουμένου  
 (357) τοῦ πνεύματος. Φωνὴ τραχεῖα, καὶ ὑπερτεινομένη, καὶ ὁ λόγος  
ἄναρθρος καὶ εἰκῇ προεκπίπτων, οὐ κατὰ μέρος, οὐδὲ εὐτάκτως,  
 οὐδὲ εὐσήμως προΐων.<sup>391</sup>

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 ὥπται τῶν ἀλόντων τῷ πάθει, [85]  
 οἶδας σαφῶς ὃ φημι, καὶ γράψει λόγος.  
 ἔσοπτρον ἐχρῆν ἐστάναι χολουμένοις,  
 ὡς ἂν βλέποντες, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτῶν ὕβριν  
 μικρὸν χαλῶεν, τοῦ πάθους ἐξ ὀψεως,  
 κατηγόρω σιγῶντι κάμπτοντες φρένα. [90]  
 ἢ καὶ τόδ' ἔστηκ' αὐτὸς ὕβριστῆς ὁ σὸς,  
 ἐν ᾧ κατόψει σαντὸν, εἰ σχολὴν ἄγοις.  
 πάθος γὰρ οἷς ἐν, κοινὰ καὶ συμπτώματα.  
ὑφαιμον ὄμμα, καὶ θέσεις διάστροφοι,  
τρίχες συνῶδεις, καὶ γένυς διάβροχος, [95]  
 ὥχρὰ παρειὰ, νεκρότητος ἔμφασις·  
 ἄλλων ἐρυθρὰ, καὶ μολιβδώδης τινῶν·  
 ὅπως ἂν, οἶμαι, καὶ τινα χρώσας τύχοι  
 ὁ βακχιώδης καὶ κάκιστος ζωγράφος·  
αὐχὴν διοιδῶν, ἀγκυλούμεναι φλέβες, [100]  
πνοὴ λόγον κόπτουσα καὶ πυκνουμένη,  
 λυσοῶδες ἄσθμα, καὶ φρύαγμ' ἀσχημονοῦν,  
 μυκτὴρ πλατύς τε καὶ πνέων ὄλην ὕβριν.  
 κρότοι τε χειρῶν, καὶ ποδῶν ἐξάλματα,

<sup>391</sup> 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.

κύψεις, στροφαί, γέλωτες, ἰδρῶτες, κόποι· [105]  
 τίνος κοποῦντος; οὐδενὸς, πλὴν δαίμονος.  
 νεύσεις ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω, λόγου δίχα,  
 γνάθοι φυσώμεναί τε καὶ ψοφούμεναι,  
 ὥς δὴ τις αὐλοῖς<sup>392</sup>· παιομένη τε δακτύλοις  
 ἢ χεὶρ ἀπειλή<sup>393</sup> 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  
 as flutists' do. The hands, balled into fists,<sup>394</sup>  
 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)

<sup>392</sup> P Caillau ἄλως (*contra metrum*) : *codd.* ἄλλος : ἄσκός Oberhaus.

I have adopted the conjecture of Crimi 2018 136.

<sup>393</sup> *codd.* ἀπειλεῖ : ἀπειλή *susp.* Oberhaus.

<sup>394</sup> 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.

- 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 συῶδεις (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 ἀναρθρὸς καὶ εἰκῇ προεκπίπτων).

Gregory takes the basic structure of Basil’s *ecphrasis* and built upon it. Basil moved from the eyes to the cheeks and face to the difficulties of breathing and speaking when angry. Gregory dwells at greater length on the individual features of the face and the agitations of the rest of the body, but retains the basic structure. Gregory adopts some of Basil’s terminology, but often employs adjectives, participles, or metaphors for a different purpose. So, Gregory has compared the angry person’s hair to swine; Basil 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 incorporates several of Basil’s scriptural examples, but occasionally reverses their significance in a striking manner. In section 6 (*PG* 31.368–69), Basil 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 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 praises 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.<sup>395</sup> 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 condescended to human weakness by using wrath as a way to describe God's chastisement of the wicked.<sup>396</sup> 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.

### ***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 "ennervating" effect on the work as a whole.<sup>397</sup> But proper use of these witty sayings attributed to historical individuals was one important technique

---

<sup>395</sup> 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.

<sup>396</sup> For the theological principle in Origen, see, for example, *Contra celsum* 4.72.

<sup>397</sup> "il *carme* ... *poggia su una impalcatura teorica innervata da exempla, immagini e dialoghi con un interlocutore fittizio...*" (Crimi 2018 131).

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 this technique in a self-conscious and skillful manner; I then compare Gregory's approach to Basil's use of two identical *chreiae* in *leg. lib. gent.* 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.<sup>398</sup> 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."<sup>399</sup> 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, the testimony of the ancients, and a short epilogue or concluding statement.<sup>400</sup> 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 καὶ τινων, καὶ συντόμως ("I shall, though briefly, cite several examples.") The use of the verb μιννήσκω ("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

---

<sup>398</sup> Rabe 1926 XXII.

<sup>399</sup> Χρεία ἐστὶν ἀπομνημόνευμα σύντομον εὐστόχως ἐπὶ τι πρόσωπον ἀναφέρουσα (sec. 3 ed. Rabe 1926).

<sup>400</sup> Ἡ μὲν οὖν διαίρεσις αὕτη τῆς χρείας· ἐργάσαιτο δὲ αὐτὴν τοῖσδε τοῖς κεφαλαίοις· ἐγκωμιαστικῶ, παραφραστικῶ, τῶ τῆς αἰτίας, ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου, παραβολῇ, παραδείγματι, μαρτυρίᾳ παλαιῶν, ἐπιλόγῳ βραχεῖ (Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 3).

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 patiently 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 of *chreia* 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 (ὦ 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 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.<sup>401</sup> A lit lamp quenches anger.

Ἐλοιδόρει τις τὸν μέγαν Περικλέα,  
πολλοῖς ἐλαύνων καὶ κακοῖς ὀνειδέει [280]  
(τῶν οὐδὲ τιμίων τις), ἄχρῃς ἐσπέρας.  
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.

---

<sup>401</sup> Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 *ad loc.*

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.<sup>402</sup> 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*.<sup>403</sup>

### 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', ὥς ἔοικε, μή τι μαλθακὸν λέγειν, [15]  
 κακοῦ τοσούτου τῷ λόγῳ προκειμένου·  
 ἀλλ' ὥς πυρὸς βρέμοντος ἀγρίαν φλόγα,  
 πηδῶντος, αἰθύσσοντος ἐντινάγμασι  
 πολλοῖς, ἄνω ῥέοντος ἐμψύχῳ φορᾷ,  
 λάβρως αἰεὶ τὰ πρόσθεν οἰκείουμένου, [20]  
 ὕδωρ, κόνιν πέμποντας εὐνάσαι βίᾳ·  
 ἢ θῆρα λόχμης ἐκφανέντα συσκίου,  
 φρίσσοντα, πῦρ βλέποντα, ἐξαφρούμενον,  
 μάχης ἐρῶντα, καὶ φόνων καὶ πτωμάτων,  
 λόγχαις, κυνηγοῖς, σφενδόναϊς καταιχμάσαι [25]

<sup>402</sup> 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.

<sup>403</sup> Gregory’s reverence for Constantius is all the more unexpected since Constantius was not a supporter of Gregory’s pro-Nicene party.

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.<sup>404</sup> 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 βουλευῆς κακόν.  
 τοσῶιδε δ' ἤσσον ἢ πάρος πέποιθά σοι·  
 γυνή γὰρ ὀξύθυμος, ὥς δ' αὐτῶς ἀνήρ<sup>405</sup>

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*,  
 τῶς καὶ δοκεῖ μοι ταῦτα καὶ καλῶς ἔχει†<sup>406</sup>

<sup>404</sup> Lucian, *Symposium* 13 is the only other attestation of the phrase before Gregory.

<sup>405</sup> I cite the plays of Euripides according to Diggle 1984.

<sup>406</sup> Diggle brackets the line. Mastronarde 2002 prints: ὥς καὶ δοκεῖ μοι ταῦτ' αὖ καλῶς γαμεῖ, which relies on two conjectures, for which see *ibid. ad loc.*

γάμους τυράννων οὐς 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 ἐπωδαί (songs or enchantments).<sup>407</sup>

*Adv. iram* 16 is 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.<sup>408</sup>  
ποῦ καὶ σφε θάπτει; ποῖ νιν εὐρήσω 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.

<sup>407</sup> See *Adv. iram* 183 and 304 with comments by Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 *ad loc.* and Crimi 2018 132–35.

<sup>408</sup> The mss read προκειμένου. προσ- is Scaliger's emendation. See Diggle 1984, *ad loc.*

### 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 neatly moves within an epic simile from Sophocles to Homer.<sup>409</sup> 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, ἦνίκα  
έρκέων ποθ’ ὑμᾶς ἐντὸς ἐγκεκλημένους,  
ἦδη τὸ μηδὲν ὄντας ἐν τροπῇ δορός, [1275]  
ἐρρύσατ’ ἐλθὼν μοῦνος, ἀμφὶ μὲν νεῶν  
ἄκροισιν ἦδη ναυτικοῖς <θ’> ἐδωλίοις  
πυρὸς φλέγοντος, ἐς δὲ ναυτικὰ σκάφη  
πηδῶντος ἄρδην “Ἐκτορος τάφρων ὕπερ; [1280]<sup>410</sup>

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 διπετέος ποταμοῖο  
πλάζ’ ὤμους καθύπερθεν· ὃ δ’ ὑψόσε ποσσὶν ἐπήδα  
θυμῷ ἀνιάζων· ποταμὸς δ’ ὑπὸ γούνατ’ ἐδάμνα [270]  
λάβρος ὕπαιθα ῥέων, κονίην δ’ ὑπέρεπτε ποδοῖν.<sup>411</sup>

<sup>409</sup> See remarks in Kuhn 2014 114.

<sup>410</sup> I cite the *Ajax* according to Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990.

<sup>411</sup> I cite the *Iliad* according to West 1998.

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 in *Il.* 20. The language generally has tragic pedigree, but the contexts evoked are Homeric.<sup>412</sup> 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: ἢ θῆρα λόχμης ἐκφανέντα συσκίου (“or a beast appearing out of a shadowed lair”). Gregory uses the Homeric word for lair (λόχμη) and “shadowy” (σύσκιος) glosses the elaborate four-line description of the boar's haunt 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”).<sup>413</sup>

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”),<sup>414</sup> Gregory has transposed into iambs the hexametric

<sup>412</sup> 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 πτώμα to mean “corpse” is particularly frequent in tragedy. See LSJ, *s.v.*

<sup>413</sup> For Homer's *Odyssey* I cite von der Mühl 1962.

<sup>414</sup> ἐξαφρούμαι is a very rare word, probably medical in origin. Cf. Clem. *Paed.* 1.6.48.



περί τ' ἀφρὸς ὀδόντας / γίνεταί ("Foam appeared about his teeth" *Il.* 20.168-69). 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.

### 1.2.1a *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 Virginity in human society.<sup>415</sup> The work contains numerous features that situate it within the tradition of pagan hymnography. Virginity is personified and treated as the *dea laudanda* 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 (ῥυμος) three times (at *Hymn Virg.*

---

<sup>415</sup> The best edition of the *Hymn Virg.* remains that of Caillau, reprinted in *PG* 37.521–38. Gilbert 2001 has rendered it into English, though not divided it from 1.2.1b.

2, 7, and 8).<sup>416</sup> In *Hymn Virg.* 7–10, he exhorts the pure to draw near (*cf.* Call., *hAp* 9–11). Gregory hails the goddess with the traditional formula in *Hymn Virg.* 11: Παρθενίη, μέγα χαῖρε (“Hail, Virginité!”). 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.<sup>417</sup> 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 χρόνοις ὅπως πυμάτοις ἐλαμψεν (“I shall now speak the myst’ries of our God, / how shone in latter days Virginité”).

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 Virginité finally return, now in her full splendor. As Sunderman noted, we have a recognizable *Geburtsgeschichte*.<sup>418</sup> As in the *Homeric Hymns* or those of Callimachus, praise operates

---

<sup>416</sup> 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.

<sup>417</sup> 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.

<sup>418</sup> Sundermann 1991 1–4.

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 Virginitas 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.<sup>419</sup> 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.<sup>420</sup> While the *Agon* certainly does grow out of and depend upon the *Hymn Virg.*,<sup>421</sup> 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 a

---

<sup>419</sup> See Sundermann 1991 4 and Sicherl 2002 313.

<sup>420</sup> *liber, hexametro versu, Virginitatis et nuptiarum contra se disserentium*. Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 117.

<sup>421</sup> McDonald 2019 persuasively highlights numerous instances where the *Agon* presupposes the *Hymn Virg.*

*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.<sup>422</sup> McGuckin places it during Gregory's stay at the shrine of Thecla in Seleucia from 375–78.<sup>423</sup> Sundermann was uncertain over the date of the poem,<sup>424</sup> while Zehles and Zamora date the poem to the 380s.<sup>425</sup> The latter came to this conclusion by analyzing the lines that appear in both the *Poemata arcana* and the *Hymn Virg.*<sup>426</sup> 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).<sup>427</sup> 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 *De virginitate*,<sup>428</sup> which can be dated safely to the early 370s.

---

<sup>422</sup> See Szymusiak 1963 55 and Szymusiak-Affholder 1971.

<sup>423</sup> McGuckin 2006 203.

<sup>424</sup> Sundermann 1991 19.

<sup>425</sup> Zehles and Zamora 1996 2–4.

<sup>426</sup> 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.

<sup>427</sup> 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.

<sup>428</sup> When necessary I use Nazianzen and Nyssen to distinguish the two Gregories. The simple form "Gregory" I retain for our poet, the Nazianzene.

## 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 ἀνέυροι,  
ὅς σταγόνων ὑετοῖο, καὶ ὅς ἀλῆς ψαμάθοιο  
οἶδας ἀριθμὸν ἅπαντα, καὶ ὅς ἀνέμοιο κελεύθους;  
τίς δέ κεν αὖ γνώσοιτο τεῆς, Μάκαρ, ἵχνια βουλῆς, [175]  
ὑψιμέδων ὡς πάντ' ἐφορᾷς καὶ πάντα κυβερνᾷς,  
αἰῶν 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<sup>429</sup> and Rom 11:33.<sup>430</sup> The opening line recalls Rom 11:33–34. while the next two lines draw primarily from Job. In 175, we

---

<sup>429</sup> <sup>24</sup> αὐτὸς γὰρ τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν πᾶσαν ἐφορᾷ εἰδὼς τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ πάντα, ἃ ἐποίησεν, <sup>25</sup> ἀνέμων σταθμὸν ὕδατός τε μέτρα· <sup>26</sup> ὅτε ἐποίησεν οὕτως, ὑετὸν ἡρίθμησεν καὶ ὁδὸν ἐν τινάγματι φωνᾶς· <sup>27</sup> τότε εἶδεν αὐτὴν καὶ ἐξηγήσατο αὐτήν, ἐτοιμάσας ἐξιχνίασεν. <sup>28</sup> εἶπεν δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ Ἴδου ἡ θεοσεβεία ἐστὶν σοφία, τὸ δὲ ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπὸ κακῶν ἐστὶν 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 Pietersma and Wright 2007.

<sup>430</sup> <sup>33</sup> ὦ βάθος πλούτου καὶ σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως θεοῦ· ὡς ἀνεξεραύνητα τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνεξιχνίαστοι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ. <sup>34</sup> 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?”);

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 ἵχνος (ἀνεξίχνιαστοι in Rom 11:33 and ἐξίχνιασεν 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).<sup>431</sup> 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.

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, although this passage is 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 closely connects the appearance of Virginity 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.

---

<sup>431</sup> 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.

## Virginité Literature in Greek of the Fourth Century AD

In Greek, the most significant literary treatments of virginity from the fourth century are:<sup>432</sup>

- Methodius of Olympus, *Symposium*. Around 300,<sup>433</sup> Methodius composed a 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.<sup>434</sup> 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.<sup>435</sup> It is one of Nyssen's earliest extant works.

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 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.

---

<sup>432</sup> For a more detailed list including works in both Greek and Latin, see Sundermann 1991 15–19.

<sup>433</sup> For the date, see Sieber 2017, whose text I employ for the citations below. See Musurillo 1958 for English translation, introduction, and notes.

<sup>434</sup> Burgsmüller 2005 16–46.

<sup>435</sup> 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 cardiocentrism of *Virg.* For further discussion, see Gilbert 2014 165.

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 ἔην ἔβρισ’ ἐπὶ γαῖαν) after his expulsion from paradise. It is clearer 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.<sup>436</sup>

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:

Δεδημιούργητο γὰρ δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔξω φθορᾶς, ἵνα τὸν βασιλέα  
γεραίρῃ πάντων καὶ ποιητὴν ἀντίφθογγα μελωδῶν 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, ὧ καλλιπάρθενοι, τὰ ὄργια μυστηρίων,  
αὗται τῶν ἐν παρθενίᾳ μυσταγωγηθέντων αἱ τελεταί, ταῦτα τὰ  
ἐπίχειρα «τῶν ἀμιάντων ἄθλων» τῆς σωφροσύνης.

---

<sup>436</sup> 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.



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 χθονός, 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 (ἀγνεία) 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.<sup>437</sup> 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*

---

<sup>437</sup> Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀκριβῶς ἡσθῆσθαί μοι δοκῶ, ὅτι τῆς εἰς τὸν παράδεισον ἀποκαταστάσεως καὶ τῆς εἰς τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν μεταβολῆς καὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καταλλαγῆς οὐδὲν οὕτως αἷτιον ἄλλο γέγονε καὶ σωτήριον ἀνθρώποις τὸ στρατηγῆσαν ἡμᾶς εἰς ζωὴν ὡς ἀγνεία (“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”).

7), when she insists that biblical writers directed their praise at God, rather than the angelic order, and so she will 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 moderates Methodius’ lavish praise for Virginity.

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. 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.<sup>438</sup> 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

---

<sup>438</sup> *Hymn Virg.* 139–155. Cf. *De ver. virg.* 54.

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).<sup>439</sup>

Scholarship on Nyssen's *De virginitate* has generally ignored our Gregory's virginity poems.<sup>440</sup> 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.<sup>441</sup> On the whole, I find it more likely that Nyssen is responding to Nazianzen than the 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, ὥς διὰ τούτων προσθήσονται τι τῷ θαύματι τῆς παρθενίας, λελήθασιν ἑαυτοὺς κατὰ γε τὴν ἐμὴν κρίσιν ἐναντιούμενοι τῷ ἰδίῳ σκοπῷ καί, δι’ ὧν ἐξαίρουσιν εἰς μέγεθος, ὑποπτον ποιοῦντες διὰ τῶν ἐγκωμίων τὸν ἔπαινον ... Ὁ δὲ ὑπόθεσιν ἐγκωμίων ταύτην ὑπὸ φιλοτιμίας ποιούμενος ἔοικε τὴν σταγόνα τῶν οἰκείων ἰδρώτων ἀξιόλογον εἰς προσθήκην νομίζειν τῷ ἀπείρῳ πελάγει γενήσεσθαι, εἴ γε ἀνθρωπίνῳ λόγῳ δυνατόν εἶναι τὴν τοσαύτην χάριν ἀποσεμνῆναι πεπίστευκεν· ἢ γὰρ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν ἀγνοεῖ ἢ ὁ ἐπαινεῖ οὐκ ἐπίσταται (GNyss, *De virg.* 1).<sup>442</sup>

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

<sup>439</sup> 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.

<sup>440</sup> Aubineau 1966 does not mention Nazianzen's poems in his extensive introduction to the *De virginitate*, nor are they mentioned by Staats 1985.

<sup>441</sup> Sundermann 1991 17.

<sup>442</sup> 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.

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.<sup>443</sup> 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.<sup>444</sup> The relationship was strained even further in 372 in the Sasima 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.<sup>445</sup> 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.<sup>446</sup> Gregory then continued to put pressure on Basil over the next two years to break with the homoian bishop Eustathius of Sebaste,<sup>447</sup> 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.

---

<sup>443</sup> For modern treatments of the period, see McGuckin 2001 169–227 and Rousseau 1998 233–269.

<sup>444</sup> See Gr. naz. *epp.* 40, 45.

<sup>445</sup> Gallay 1964 61 n. 1.

<sup>446</sup> Gr. naz. *epp.* 49–50.

<sup>447</sup> Gr. naz. *epp.* 58–59.

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.<sup>448</sup> 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 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 (μῦθος) 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

---

<sup>448</sup> For the *vita angelica* topos in Methodius and Ps.-Basil, see *Symp.* Logos 8.2, 9.5; *De vera virginitate* 51–53.

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 ἑάων,  
μητέρα ἀπημοσύνης, Χριστοῦ λάχος, οὐρανίοισι  
 κάλλεσιν ἀζυγέεσσιν ὁμόζυγε· ἀζυγέες γάρ,  
 πρῶτα Θεός, μετέπειτα Θεοῦ χορὸς αἰὲν ἑόντος.

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 ἑάων,  
δῶτορ ἀπημονίης. τεὰ δ' ἔργματα τίς κεν αἰίδοι;

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 *μητέρα* ("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 (*bArt*, *bDel*, *bAth*), 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 ἀγνή 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 νύξ ἐκάλυπτεν.  
οὐδ’ ἄρ’ ἔην ἡοῦς ἔρατὸν φάος· οὐδὲ κέλευθον  
ἥελιος πυρόεσσαν ἐπέσσυτο ἀντολίηθεν. [60]  
οὐ μήνη κερόεσσα φαίνετο, νυκτὸς ἄγαλμα.  
πάντα δ’ ἄμ’ ἀλλήλοισι φορούμενα, μὰψ ἀλάλητο  
πρωτογόνου χάος ζοφεροῖς δεδμημένα δεσμοῖς.  
ἀλλὰ σὺ, Χριστὲ μάκαρ, Πατρὸς μεγάλου φραδίῃσι  
πειθόμενος τὰ ἕκαστα διέκρινας εὖ κατὰ κόσμον. [65]  
ἦτοι μὲν πρώτιστα φάος γένεθ’, ὥς κεν ἅπαντα  
ἔργα πέλοι χαρίεντα φάους πλέα. Αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα  
οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα κυκλώσας, θαῦμα μέγιστον,  
ἠελίῳ μήνη 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 occurs in *Hymn Virg.* 66, where Gregory changes a single letter of the first hemistich of Hesiod's *Theog.* 116. Hesiod's line reads ἦτοι μὲν πρῶτιστα Χάος γένετ', ("First Chaos came into existence").<sup>449</sup> 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 Ascrean 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.* 126–27, Gaea produced Uranus as a covering for herself:

Γαῖα δέ τοι πρῶτον μὲν ἐγένετο ἴσον ἐωυτῇ  
Οὐρανὸν ἀστερόενθ', ἵνα μιν περὶ πάντα καλύπτει,  
ὄφρ' εἴη μακάρεσσι θεοῖς ἔδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ

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

---

<sup>449</sup> I cite the *Theogony* according to West 1966.



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 (ἧ 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:

Ἦειδεν δ' ὥς γαῖα καὶ οὐρανὸς ἠδὲ θάλασσα,  
τὸ πρὶν ἔτ'<sup>450</sup> ἀλλήλοισι μιῇ συναρηρότα μορφῇ,  
νεῖκεος ἐξ ὀλοοῖο διέκριθεν ἀμφὶς ἕκαστα·

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

---

<sup>450</sup> I cite the *Argonautica* according to Fränkel 1961. ἔτ' is Fraenkel's conjecture. The manuscripts read ἐπ'.

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 κεράσας,  
 ἀμφοτέροις ἐφέηκεν ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι φέρεσθαι·  
 οὐ πᾶσ' οὐδ' ἐπὶ πάντας, ὅρον δ' ἐπέθηκε πόθοισιν, [110]  
 ὃν ῥα γάμον καλέουσ', ὕλης ἀμέτροιο χαλινὸν,  
 ὥς μὴ μαιμώωσα, καὶ ἄσχετα μαργαίνουσα,  
 προφρονέως ἀγεληδὸν ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισιν ἰόντων,<sup>451</sup>  
 ῥήξειεν μερόπων ἱερὸν γένος ἐκ φιλότητος  
 ἄζυγος, πολέμους δὲ καὶ ἔχθεα πᾶσιν ὀρίνη [115]  
 οἷστρος ἀσημάντοισι φορέυμενος ἀφραδίησιν.

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'y 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.

---

<sup>451</sup> It is not clear to me how to construe this line; it may be corrupt.

*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 κάκεῖνο δαμήμεναι ἄφρονα φύλα  
 ἄμμασιν ἱμερτοῖς καὶ ὁμόγνια φίλτρα δαῖναι  
 καὶ πόθον οὐ νοέοντα ἐν ἀλλήλοισι κεράσσαι, [400]  
 οἷά περ ἀνθρώποισιν ἐπιφροσύνη τε νόος τε  
 ὀφθαλμούς ἐπέτασσε, 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.

*Hymn Virg.* 112 echoes several passages in the *Halientica*. 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.

εὔτε γὰρ ἀγρομένους τε καὶ ἄσχετα μαιμῶντας  
 θηλείης ἐπὶ λύσσαν ἴδη νόος ἀσπαλιῆος,  
 ἐν κύρτῳ κατέθηκεν ὁμοῦ λίνον ἠδὲ μόλιβδον, [95]  
 ὃς σκάρων ἐμπαρύθων 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 *ἀγελῆδον* (“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 εὐνάς  
καὶ θαλάμους ἀλόχους τε διακριδὸν ἀμφὶς ἔχουσι  
ζευζάμενοι· πολλή γὰρ ἐν ἰχθύσιν ἔστ' Ἀφροδίτη  
Οἷστρος τε Ζῆλος 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 οἷστρος (“sexual desire”).<sup>452</sup> 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.<sup>453</sup> 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.

<sup>452</sup> Cf. also ps.-Oppian's *Cyn.* 3.197–198.

<sup>453</sup> See *Hal.* 4.11–39 and *Cyn.* 2.410–425.

### Erudition: Means and Ends

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 of 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.<sup>454</sup> Among the prose sources of both poets, the philosophers deserve special mention.

Stephens and Acosta-Hughes have shown that Plato loomed large in Callimachus' poetic consciousness.<sup>455</sup> 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.<sup>456</sup> 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 ἐκῶν, Ἀρχὶν', ἐπεκώμασα, μυρία μέμφου,  
εἰ δ' ἄκων ἦκω, τὴν προπέτειαν ἔα.  
ἄκρητος καὶ ἔρωσ μ' ἠνάγκασαν, ὦν ὁ μὲν αὐτῶν

<sup>454</sup> See *Aet.* fr. 75.54–55, where Callimachus cites Xenomedes the mythographer as his source for the story of Acontius and Cydippe.

<sup>455</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 2012 23–83.

<sup>456</sup> Cf. Plato, *Rep.* 424b and Hom. *Od.* 1.351–52. For discussion, see Stephens 2015 *ad loc.*

εἶλκεν, ὃ δ' οὐκ εἶα τὴν προπέτειαν ἔαν.  
 ἐλθὼν δ' οὐκ ἐβόησα τίς ἢ τίνος, ἀλλ' ἐφίλησα [5]  
 τὴν φλιν. εἰ τοῦτ' ἔστ' ἀδίκημ', ἀδικέω.

If I willingly reveled my way to Archis' house, reproach me 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.”<sup>457</sup> As we have seen, Gregory also responds to philosophical and theological matters throughout his work. He shows himself knowledgeable of 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.”<sup>458</sup> These abound in Callimachus. At *hZens* 18, for instance, Callimachus places Ἐρυμάνθος (“Erymanthus”) at line end as Homer does in *Od.* 6.103. In Callimachus, however, the Erymanthus is a river, not a mountain. More striking are a portion of

---

<sup>457</sup> This epigram is cited in Plutarch’s *De cohibenda ira* 5, a treatise that Gregory likely consulted for his *Adv. iram*.

<sup>458</sup> Thomas 1986 185.

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.<sup>459</sup> 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*,<sup>460</sup> 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 Virginité. Even more striking is his reworking of 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*.<sup>461</sup> 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 “window allusion,” or in Thomas’s terminology, the “conflation.”<sup>462</sup> 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

---

<sup>459</sup> The humor of Apollo prophesying from within the womb is almost Ovidian.

<sup>460</sup> With the possible exception of his “correction” of Basil in *Adv. iram* 31–45.

<sup>461</sup> For a recent discussion of *Kontrastimitation* and the allusive practices of Late Antique Latin poets, see Kaufmann 2017.

<sup>462</sup> Thomas 1986 193.

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 Κρήτες 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 *Urtex*t 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 ἄϊοντος ἃ κεν πεπίθοιεν ἀκουήν *hZeus* 65).

These sorts of “window allusions” are easier to spot in later poets, since we have more of the poetry that 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 conflation in Gregory, however, involve prose sources. For instance, the beginning of the *Poem. arv.* 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.<sup>463</sup> But Sykes is also right to note the resonance of Homer, most especially to Odysseus’ small raft (σχέδιη) in *Od.* 5, when the hero sets out from Calypso’s island and faces shipwreck.<sup>464</sup> 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

---

<sup>463</sup> See Edwards 2003 54 and Sykes and Moreschini 1997 *ad loc.*

<sup>464</sup> 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.



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.<sup>465</sup> 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 Virginité; 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 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,<sup>466</sup> 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

---

<sup>465</sup> See Ackermann 1903 30; Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 10; and Crimi 2018 137–38.

<sup>466</sup> 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.

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 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 attacked Greek mores and theology. Erudition thereby becomes paradoxically a means of 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 far from traditional centers of Greek culture. Moreover, his most important patron was a Macedonian king, whom some Greeks of the

mainland, particularly in Athens, 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 were keenly aware of the antiquity of Egyptian culture and had to contend with an Athens that may have been eclipsed politically, but whose cultural prestige remained immense. Callimachus found himself between these two traditions and set himself the task of recasting the narrative of Greek literature so that it climaxed on the Nile. To do so, he exploited Egyptian myth and ideology, thereby forging a new poetic synthesis of the two cultures.<sup>467</sup>

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 concomitant cultural achievements had still to be created.<sup>468</sup> Gregory's education bequeathed to him an easy familiarity with a vast and self-confident Greek tradition. Like Callimachus, he infuses this Greek tradition with non-Greek wisdom (i.e. Christianity) 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 endeavor was to assert the ongoing relevance of Hellenism in a world empire dominated by Rome. The task of Gregory and

---

<sup>467</sup> I have here relied heavily on the excellent work of Stephens 2003 74–114.

<sup>468</sup> 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.

Callimachus, by contrast, was to appropriate Greek literature for the benefit of groups that, until recently, had found themselves on the cultural periphery. 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 an outside 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.<sup>469</sup> 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.<sup>470</sup> 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.*),<sup>471</sup> 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.<sup>472</sup> Sundermann was uncertain over the date of the poem,<sup>473</sup> while Zehles and Zamora dated the poem to the 380s.<sup>474</sup> 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 circumstantial evidence.<sup>475</sup>

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

---

<sup>469</sup> Sundermann 1991 4 and Sicherl 2002 313.

<sup>470</sup> *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 vir. ill.* 117).

<sup>471</sup> See McDonald 2019.

<sup>472</sup> Szymusiak 1963 55 and Szymusiak-Affholder 1971.

<sup>473</sup> Sundermann 1991 19.

<sup>474</sup> Zehles and Zamora 1996 2–4.

<sup>475</sup> McGuckin 2006 203.

*Hymn Virg.* was written after the *Poemata arcana*. As the *Poemata arcana* can be dated with fair certainty to Gregory's retirement,<sup>476</sup> 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, Zehles and Zamora have argued, wrongly in my view, for the priority of the lines in the *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.<sup>477</sup> Moreschini has observed similar editing in *De rebus suis* (2.1.1),<sup>478</sup> 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 Virginité*, 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.*

### ***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.

---

<sup>476</sup> Sykes and Moreschini 1997 63–67.

<sup>477</sup> See McGuckin 2001 1.

<sup>478</sup> Bady, Tuilier, and Bernardi 2004 LI

## Hymn Virg.\* 11–55

Παρθενίη, μέγα χαῖρε, θεόσδοτε, δῶτερ ἑάων,  
 μῆτερ ἀπημοσύνης, Χριστοῦ λάχος, οὐρανίοισι  
 κάλλεσιν ἄζυγέεσιν ὁμόζυγε· ἄζυγέες γάρ,  
 πρῶτα Θεός, μετέπειτα Θεοῦ χορὸς αἰὲν ἑόντος.  
ἦτοι ὁ μὲν πηγὴ φαέων, φάος οὔτ' ὀνομαστὸν, [15]  
οὔθ' ἔλετὸν, φεῦγόν τε νόου τάχος ἐγγὺς ἰόντος,  
αἰὲν ὑπεκπροθέον πάντων φρένας, ὥς κε πόθοισιν  
ἐλκώμεσθα πρὸς ὕψος αἰεὶ νέον· οἱ δέ τε φῶτα  
δεύτερα ἐκ Τριάδος βασιλήϊον εὖχος ἐχούσης.  
 πρώτη παρθένος ἐστὶν ἀγνή Τριάς. Ἐκ μὲν ἀνάρχου [20]  
 πατρὸς Υἱὸς ἄναξ, οὔτ' ἔκτοθεν ὀρμηθέντος  
 (αὐτὸς γὰρ πάντεσσι ὁδὸς καὶ ρίζα καὶ ἀρχή),  
 οὔτε πᾶν θνητοῖσιν ὁμοῖα γειναμένοιο,  
 ἀλλ' ὥς ἐκ σέλαος σέλας ἔρχεται. Ἐκ δ' ἄρα Παιδὸς,  
 οὐκέτι παῖς ἀγαπητὸς ὁμοῖον εὖχος ἐφέλκων· [25]  
 ὥς κεν ὁ μὲν μίμνη γενέτης ὅλος, αὐτὰρ ὄγ' Υἱὸς  
 οἶον καὶ μούνιοιο 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, αἰδέες, οἳ ῥα θόωκον  
ἀμφὶ μέγαν βεβαῶτες, ἐπεὶ νόες εἰσὶν ἐλαφροὶ,  
πῦρ καὶ πνεύματα θεῖα δι' ἡέρος ὥκα θεόντες,  
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. Ἴη φύσις, ἓν τε νόημα,  
 εἷς πόθος ἀμφὶ ἄνακτα Θεὸν μέγαν. Οὐδέ τι παισὶ  
 τέρποντ', 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· τροφή μία πᾶσιν ἀρίστη  
 δαίνυσθαι μέγαλοιο Θεοῦ λόγον, ἡδὲ φαινῆς [45]  
 ἔλκειν ἐκ Τριάδος σέλας ἄπλετον. Οἰόβιοι δὲ  
 ζώουσιν καθαροῖο Θεοῦ καθαροὶ θεράποντες,  
ἀπλοῖ τε, νοεροὶ τε, διανγέες, οὔτ' ἀπὸ σαρκῶν  
ἀρχόμενοι (σάρκες γὰρ ἐπεὶ πάγεν, αὐθις ὀλοῦνται),  
οὔτ' ἐπὶ σάρκας ἰόντες, ὅπερ δ' ἐγένοντο, μένοντες. [50]  
 τοῖς μέτα παρθενίη θεοεἶκελος, οἶμος ἐτοίμη  
 πρὸς Θεὸν, ἐσπομένη τε νοήμασιν Ἀθανάτοιο  
 νωμῶντος μέγαλοιο σοφῶς οἰήϊα κόσμου·

ἐν δὲ καὶ οὐρανίδην, χθόνιον, μεγαλήνορα, θνητὸν,  
ἀνθρώπων μογερῶν ἱερὸν γένος, εὖχος Ἄνακτος. [55]<sup>479</sup>

*Poem. arc. 6.1–26*

Οἷη δ' ὑετίοιο κατ' ἥερος εὐδιόωντος,  
ἀντομένη νεφέεσσιν ἀποκρούστοις περιωγαῖς,  
ἀκτὶς ἡελίοιο πολύχροον ἱρὶν ἐλίσσει,  
ἀμφὶ δέ μιν πάντη σελαγίζεται ἐγγύθεν αἰθῆρ,  
κύκλοισιν πυκινοῖσι καὶ ἔκτοθε λυομένοισι· [5]  
τοίη καὶ φαέων πέλεται φύσις, ἀκροτάτοιο  
φωτὸς ἀποστίλβοντος αἰὲ νόας ἥσσονας αὐγαῖς.  
ἦτοι ὁ μὲν πηγὴ φαέων, φάος οὐτ' ὀνομαστόν,  
οὐθ' ἐλετόν, φεῦγόν τε νόου τάχος ἐγγὺς ἰόντος,  
αἰὲν ὑπεκπροθέον πάντων φρένας, ὥς κε πόθοισι [10]  
τεινώμεσθα πρὸς ὕψος αἰὲ νέον. Οἱ δέ τε φῶτα  
δεύτερα ἐκ Τριάδος βασιλήϊον εὖχος ἐχούσης,  
ἄγγελοι αἰγλήεντες, αἰδέες, οἳ ῥα θόωκον  
ἀμφὶ μέγαν βεβαῶτες, ἐπεὶ νόες εἰσὶν ἐλαφροὶ,  
πῦρ καὶ πνεύματα θεῖα δι' ἥερος ὥκα θέοντες [15]  
ἐσσυμένως μεγάλῃσιν ὑποδρήσσουσιν ἐφετμαῖς,  
ἀπλοῖ τε, νοεροὶ τε, διανυγέες, οὐτ' ἀπὸ σαρκῶν  
ἐρχόμενοι (σάρκες γὰρ ἐπεὶ πάγεν αὐθις ὀλοῦνται),  
οὐτ' ἐπὶ σάρκας ἰόντες, ὅπερ δ' ἐγένοντο μένοντες.  
ἤθελον εἰπεῖν ἀμπαν ἀτειρέες· ἀλλ' ἄνεχ' ἵππον [20]  
καὶ μάλα θερμὸν ἔόντα, νόου ψαλίοισιν ἐέργων.  
καί ῥ' οἱ μὲν μεγάλοιο παραστάται εἰσὶ Θεοῖο·  
οἱ δ' ἄρα κόσμον ἅπαντα εἰς κρατέουσιν ἀρωγαῖς,  
ἄλλην ἄλλος ἔχοντες ἐπιστασίην παρ' ἄνακτος,  
ἄνδρας τε, πτόλιάς τε, καὶ ἔθνεα πάνθ' ὀρόωντες, [25]  
καὶ λογικῶν θυέων ἐπίστορες 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.<sup>480</sup> By contrast, the lines are indispensable in *Carm. arc.* 6, where they develop the opening simile of the sunbeam and introduce the following section on angels. Likewise, I think Zehles and Zamora are right to see

<sup>479</sup> As these lines appear in a technical appendix, I have left them untranslated.

<sup>480</sup> See my section entitled “Repetitions” in Chapter Three.



*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.”<sup>481</sup> Zehles and Zamora acknowledge the syntactical connection, but wrongly assert that the verses are dispensable in terms of content.<sup>482</sup> 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 νύξ ἐκάλυπτεν.  
 οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔην ἡοῦς ἐρατὸν φάος· οὐδὲ κέλευθον  
 ἡέλιος πυρόεσσαν ἐπέσσυτο ἀντολίηθεν. [60]  
 οὐ μήνη κερόεσσα φαίνετο, νυκτὸς ἄγαλμα.  
 πάντα δ' ἄμ' ἀλλήλοισι φορούμενα, μᾶψ ἀλάλητο  
 πρωτογόνου χάος ζοφεροῖς δεδμημένα δεσμοῖς.  
 ἀλλὰ σὺ, Χριστὲ μάκαρ, Πατρὸς μεγάλου φραδίῃσι  
 πειθόμενος τὰ ἕκαστα διέκρινας εὖ κατὰ κόσμον. [65]  
 ἦτοι μὲν πρώτιστα φάος γένεθ', ὥς κεν ἅπαντα  
 ἔργα πέλοι χαρίεντα φάους πλέα. Αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα  
 οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα κυκλώσας, θαῦμα μέγιστον,  
 ἡελίῳ μήνη τε διαυγέα. Τοῖσιν ἔειπας,  
 τῷ μὲν ἄρ' ἡριγένειαν ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισι φαίνειν [70]  
 φωτὸς ἀπειρεσίῳ ῥοαῖς, καὶ ὥρας ἐλίσσειν·  
 τῇ δὲ κνέφας σελάειν, καὶ δεύτερον ἡμαρ ὀπάζειν.

<sup>481</sup> 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.

<sup>482</sup> “*Inhaltlich entbehrlich*” (Zehles and Zamora 1996 2).

τῷ δ' ὑπὸ γαῖαν ἔθηκας ἐμὸν ἔδος, ἐν δὲ θάλασσαν  
 Γαίης ἀγκαλίδεσσιν ἔδησας, γῆν δὲ θαλάσση  
 ὤκεανοῦ κόλποισι περίρρυτον. ὥς<sup>483</sup> δὲ τὰ πάντα [75]  
κόσμος ἔην, γαίῃ τε, καὶ οὐρανὸς, ἡδὲ θάλασσα,  
 Οὐρανὸς οὐρανίοισιν ἀγαλλόμενος φαέεσσι,  
 Πόντος δὲ πλωτοῖς, πεζοῖς δέ τε γαῖα πελώρη,<sup>484</sup>  
 ἀθρήσας τότε ἔπειτα καὶ ἄρμενα πάντα νοήσας,  
 τέρπετο Παιδὸς ἄνακτος ὁμοφρονέουσιν ἐπ' ἔργοις. [80]  
δίξετο καὶ σοφίης ἐπιίστορα μητρὸς ἀπάντων,  
καὶ χθονίων βασιλῆα θεουδέα, καὶ τόδ' ἔειπεν·  
ἦδη μὲν καθαροὶ καὶ αἰέζωοι θεράποντες  
οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν, ἀγνοὶ νόες, ἄγγελοι ἐσθλοὶ,  
ὑμνοπόλοι, μέλποντες ἐμὸν κλέος οὔποτε λῆγον· [85]  
γαῖα δ' ἔτι ζώοισιν ἀγάλλεται ἀφραδέουσι.  
ξυνὸν ἔτ' ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐμοὶ γένος εὖαδε πῆξαι  
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.  
ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, καὶ μοῖραν ἐλὼν νεοπηγέος αἴης,  
χείρεσιν ἀθανάτησιν ἐμὴν ἐστήσατο μορφήν.  
τῇ δ' ἄρ' ἔης ζωῆς μοιρήσατο· ἐν γὰρ ἔηκε  
πνεῦμα, τὸ δὴ θεότητος αἰδέος ἐστὶν ἀπορρώξ. [95]  
ἐκ δὲ χορὸς πνοιῆς τε βροτὸς γένητ', ἀθανάτοιο  
εἰκῶν· ἥ γὰρ ἄνασσα νόου φύσις ἀμφοτέροισι.  
τοῦνεκα καὶ βίοτον τὸν μὲν στέργω διὰ γαῖαν,  
τοῦ δ' ἔρον ἐν στήθεσσι ἔχω θεῖην διὰ μοῖραν.  
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ θεῖον μὲν ἐπὶ χθονὶ πλάσμα φαάνθη, [100]  
 καὶ χθονὸς, ἐν γυάλοισιν αἰθαλέος παραδείσου,  
 τῷ δ' οὔπω τις ἀρωγὸς ὁμοίῳ ἔσκε βίοιο,  
 δὴ τότε μητιέταο Λόγου τόδε θαῦμα μέγιστον·  
 τὸν βροτὸν, ὃνπερ ἔτευξεν ἐοῦ θηήτορα κόσμου,  
 ρίζαν ἐμὴν, καὶ σπέρμα πολυσχιδέος βιότοιο, [105]  
 ἄνδιχα μοιρήσας μεγάλη ζωαρκεῖ χειρὶ,  
 πλευρὴν ἐκ λαγόνων μούνην ἔλε, τήν ῥα γυναῖκα  
 δειμάμενος, καὶ φίλτρον ἐνὶ στέρνοισι κεράσσας,  
 ἀμφοτέροις ἐφέηκεν ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι φέρεσθαι·

*Poem. arc. 7.53–83*

ἡμέτερον δ' αἰίοις ψυχῆς πέρι μῦθον ἄριστον.  
 ἔνθεν ἐλὼν, τέρψιν δὲ μικρὴν ἀναμίξομεν οἴμη.

<sup>483</sup> Caillau prints "ὥς.

<sup>484</sup> Caillau prints here a full stop.

ἦν ποτε ἦν ὅτε κόσμον ἐπήξατο νοῦ Λόγος αἰπὺς, [55]  
 ἐσπόμενος μέγαλοιο νόῳ Πατρός, οὐ πρὶν ἔόντα.  
 εἶπεν ὅδ', ἐκτετέλεστο ὅσον θέλεν. Ὡς δὲ τὰ πάντα  
κόσμος ἦν, γαίῃ τε καὶ οὐρανὸς ἡδὲ θάλασσα,  
δίζετο καὶ σοφίης ἐπίστορα μητρὸς ἀπάντων,  
καὶ χθονίων βασιλῆα θεουδέα, καὶ τόδ' ἔειπεν· [60]  
«ἤδη μὲν καθαροὶ καὶ αἰίζωι θεράποντες  
οὐρανὸν εὐρύν ἔχουσιν ἄγνοὶ νόες, ἄγγελοι ἐσθλοὶ,  
ὑμνοπόλοι μέλποντες ἐμὸν κλέος οὔποτε λῆγον·  
γαῖα δ' ἔτι ζώοισιν ἀγάλλεται ἀφραδέεσσι.  
ξυνὸν δ' ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐμοὶ γένος εὐαδε πῆξαι [65]  
θνητῶν τ' ἀθανάτων τε νοήμονα φῶτα μεσηγύ,  
τερπόμενόν τ' ἔργοισιν ἐμοῖς, καὶ ἐχέφρονα μύστην  
οὐρανίων, γαίης τε μέγα κράτος, ἄγγελον ἄλλον  
ἐκ χθονός, ὑμνητῆρα ἐμῶν μενέων τε, νόου τε.»  
ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, καὶ μοῖραν ἐλὼν νεοπηγέος αἴης, [70]  
χείρεσιν ἀθανάτησιν ἐμήν ἐστήσατο μορφῇ,  
τῇ δ' ἄρ' ἐῆς ζωῆς μοιρήσατο. Ἐν γὰρ ἔηκε  
πνεῦμα, τὸ δὴ θεότητος ἀειδέος ἐστὶν ἀπορρώξ.  
ἐκ δὲ χοῶς πνοιῆς τε πάγην βροτὸς ἀθανάτοιο  
εἰκῶν· ἡ γὰρ ἄνασσα νόου φύσις ἀμφοτέροισι. [75]  
τοῦνεκα καὶ βίοτον τὸν μὲν στέργω διὰ γαῖαν,  
τοῦ δ' ἔρον ἐν στήθεσσι ἔχω θείαν διὰ μοῖραν.  
 ἦδε μὲν ἀρχεγόνοιο βροτοῦ δέσις. Αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα  
 σῶμα μὲν ἐκ σαρκῶν, ψυχὴ δ' ἐπιμίσγετ' αἴστως,  
 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,<sup>485</sup> 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.<sup>486</sup> However, the phrase *δίξετο 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 uncusomary location. Callimachus used this technique relatively frequently.<sup>487</sup> Even if we find asyndeton more likely than anastrophe, Gregory uses asyndeton frequently enough that its presence should not outweigh the contextual factors mentioned above.<sup>488</sup>

### *Hymn Virg.* 137–155 and *Poem. arc.* 8.32–52

#### *Hymn Virg.* 128–155

Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κόλποι τε καὶ εὐρέα πείρατα γαίης,  
 ἀντολίῃ τε, δύσις τε, νότου πλευρῇ, βορέου τε  
 πλησθεν ἐφημερίων, ὕβριν δ' ἐξέξεσεν ἰλὺς, [130]  
 καὶ πολλοῖσι πάρος παιδεύμασι πλάσμα δαμασθὲν  
 γλώσσαις τεμνομένησι, καὶ ὕδασι, καὶ πυρὸς ὄμβροις,  
 καὶ γραπτοῖο νόμοιο διδάγμασιν, ἡδὲ προφήταις,  
 οὐκ ἔθελε πρῶτης κακίης ἀπὸ δεσμὰ τινάξαι,  
 ἀλλ' αἰεὶ στερεοῖσιν ἐν ἅμμασιν εἶχετο σαρκὸς, [135 ]  
 μαχλοσύναις τε, μέθαις τε καὶ εἰδώλοισι μεμνηνὸς,  
ὑστάτιον τοιῆσδε φίλον γένος ἔμμορε τιμῆς  
νεύμασιν ἀθανάτοιο Πατρὸς, καὶ ἔργμασι Παιδός.  
Χριστὸς, ὅσον βροτέω ἐνὶ σώματι κάτθετο μοίρης  
οὐρανίης, λεύσσων κακίης ὑπὸ θυμοβόροιο [140]  
δαπτόμενον, σκολιὸν τε βροτῶν μεδέοντα δράκοντα,  
ὥς κεν ἀναστήσειεν ἐὼν λάχος, οὐκέτι νοῦσον  
ἄλλοισιν ἐφέηκεν ἀρηγόσιν, (οὐ γὰρ ἐπαρκὲς  
τοῖς μεγάλαις παθέεσσι μικρὸν ἄκος·) ἀλλὰ κενώσας  
ὄν κλέος, οὐράνιος τε καὶ ἄτροπος οὐρανίοιο [145]  
εἰκῶν, ἀνδρομέοις τε καὶ οὐ βροτέοις νόμοισι,  
σεμνοῖς ἐν σπλάγχνοις ἀπειρογάμοιο γυναικὸς

<sup>485</sup> Zehles and Zamora 1996 3.

<sup>486</sup> Zehles and Zamora 1996 3 follow Wyss 1946 167.

<sup>487</sup> See my remarks in Chapter Three, section “Syntax.”

<sup>488</sup> 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).

σαρκωθεὶς, ὧ θάμβος ἀφανροτάτοισιν ἄπιστον,  
ἦλθε Θεὸς θνητός τε, φύσεις δύο εἰς ἓν ἀγείρας,  
τὴν μὲν κευθομένην, τὴν δ' ἀμφαδίην μερόπεσσιν, [150]  
ὦν Θεὸς ἢ μὲν ἦν, ἢ δ' ὕστατον ἄμμιν ἐτύχθη,  
τῆμος, ὅτ' ἐν σπλάγχνοισι μίγη Θεὸς ἀνδρομέοισιν·  
εἷς Θεὸς ἀμφοτέρωθεν· ἐπεὶ θεότητι κερασθεῖς,  
καὶ βροτὸς ἐκ θεότητος ἄναξ καὶ Χριστὸς ὑπέστη.  
καινὴ δ' ἐπλετο 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 ὑπο θυμοβόροιο [35]  
δαπτόμενον, σκολιὸν τε βροτῶν μεδέοντα δράκοντα,  
ὥς κεν ἀναστήσειεν ἐὼν λάχος, οὐκ ἔτι νοῦσον  
ἄλλοισιν ἐφέηκεν ἀρηγόσιν (οὐ γὰρ ἐπαρκὲς  
τοῖς μεγάλοις παθέεσσι μικρὸν ἄκος)· ἀλλὰ κενώσας  
ὄν κλέος ἀθανάτοιο Θεοῦ Πατρὸς Υἱὸς ἀμήτωρ [40]  
 αὐτὸς καὶ δίχᾳ πατρὸς ἐμοὶ ξένος υἱὸς ἐφάνθη·  
 οὐ ξένος, ἐξ ἐμέθεν γὰρ ὅδ' ἄμβροτος ἦλθε βροτωθεὶς  
 παρθενικῆς διὰ μητρὸς, ὅλον μ' ὅλος ὄφρα σάωσῃ.  
 καὶ γὰρ ὅλος πέπτωκεν Ἀδὰμ διὰ γεῦσιν ἀλιτρήν.  
τοῦνεκεν ἀνδρομέοισι καὶ οὐ βροτέοισι νόμοισι, [45]  
σεμνοῖς ἐν σπλάγχνοισιν ἀπειρογάμοιο γυναικὸς  
σαρκωθεὶς (ὧ θάμβος ἀφανροτάτοισιν ἄπιστον!)  
ἦλθε Θεὸς θνητός τε, φύσις δύο εἰς ἓν ἀγείρας,  
τὴν μὲν κευθομένην, τὴν δ' ἀμφαδίην μερόπεσσιν  
ὦν Θεὸς ἢ μὲν ἦν, ἢ δ' ὕστατον ἡμῖν ἐτύχθη. [50]  
εἷς Θεὸς ἀμφοτέρωθεν, ἐπεὶ θεότητι κερασθεῖς,  
καὶ βροτὸς ἐκ θεότητος ἄναξ καὶ Χριστὸς ὑπέστη·  
 ὥς κεν Ἀδὰμ νέος ἄλλος ἐπιχθονίοισι φανθεῖς,  
 τὸν πάρος ἐξακέσαιτο, πετάσματι δ' ἀμφὶ καλυφθεῖς  
 (οὐ γὰρ ἦν χωρητὸς ἐμοῖς παθέεσσι πελάσσαι), [55]  
 καὶ πιτυτὸν δοκέοντα ὄφιν σφήλειεν ἀέλπτως,  
 ὥς μὲν Ἀδὰμ πελάσσοντα, Θεῶ δέ τε ἀντιάσσοντα,  
 τῷ περί κάρτος ἔμελλεν εἶς ἄξιον κακότητος,  
 τρηχείην περὶ πέτραν ἀλίκτυπον 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 Virginité? 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;<sup>489</sup> *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 result of this careful analysis is a more nuanced account of the compositional history of 1.2.1(a/b).<sup>490</sup> 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 suggest 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*.<sup>491</sup> Around the same time, he probably composed the *Praecepta* (1.2.2a) as a successor. That Gregory revisited 1.2.1a/b in his retirement and

---

<sup>489</sup> Sykes wrongly rejects Apollinarianism as the target in *Poem. arc.* 8.40–44. See Sykes and Moreschini 1997 *ad loc.*

<sup>490</sup> 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.

<sup>491</sup> 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.

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,<sup>492</sup> 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 the corpus of 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,<sup>493</sup> but the poems exhibit such unity that Keydell has argued that they constitute a single poem.<sup>494</sup> Keydell went too far, but he was right to recognize that the sequence constitutes an

---

<sup>492</sup> 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.

<sup>493</sup> See Sykes and Moreschini 1997 ix.

<sup>494</sup> See Keydell 1951. For more recent analyses that treat the poems as a sequence, see Faulkner 2010 and Daley 2012.

aesthetic unity, as Sykes and Moreschini have noted.<sup>495</sup> 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.<sup>496</sup> 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.<sup>497</sup> 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*.<sup>498</sup> 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 organized by meter, however, is

---

<sup>495</sup> See Sykes and Moreschini 1997 55 and Moreschini 1997.

<sup>496</sup> Piottante 1999 26–27.

<sup>497</sup> See, e.g., Bady 2008 338.

<sup>498</sup> Sicherl, Höllger, and Werhahn 1985 17–34.

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.<sup>499</sup> 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 *Orationes* and *Letters* for publication, but does not seem to have done as much for his poetry."<sup>500</sup>

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:

εὐρώς δ' ἀμφὶ βίβλοισιν ἑμαῖς, μῦθοι δὲ ἀτέλειστοι,  
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."<sup>501</sup>

Simelidis is most likely right that by μῦθοι ("words") Gregory refers to poems, though it is possible he refers to prose orations.<sup>502</sup> 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" (ἀτέλειστοι) 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 written in the 370s, was subsequently

---

<sup>499</sup> Sicherl 2011 3.

<sup>500</sup> McGuckin 2001 376 n. 29.

<sup>501</sup> Simelidis 2009 154 n. 69.

<sup>502</sup> 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.

edited during Gregory's retirement in the 380s.<sup>503</sup> 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.<sup>504</sup> I have thus paid close attention to the transmission of the poems analyzed. Yet the lack of uniformity in the *akolouthia* 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,<sup>505</sup> 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.<sup>506</sup> Though I doubt they

---

<sup>503</sup> See Bady, Tuilier, and Bernardi 2004 LI and notes on lines 612–15.

<sup>504</sup> See Bady 2008.

<sup>505</sup> Slicherl 2011 3.

<sup>506</sup> *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 ἑμαυτόν) 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 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.

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.<sup>507</sup> 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 precludes certainty; yet the accumulation of various internal and external clues is to my mind 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.

---

<sup>507</sup> 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 that order). Scholars have pointed to a number of formal and thematic features that show evidence of Callimachus' arrangement of the collection.<sup>508</sup> Stephens notes, for instance, that *hAth* and *hDem* both feature vignettes of their respective goddesses punishing transgressors.<sup>509</sup> 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 (πολυωνυμία), 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 (Φοίβω δ' ἐσπόμενοι πόλιας διμετρήσαντο). Zeus tells Artemis in *hArt* 36 that she will also construct cities (πόλιας διαμετρήσασθαι). At no other point in his *Hymns* 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

---

<sup>508</sup> See most recently Stephens 2015 12–14 and Ukleja 2005 21–108.

<sup>509</sup> Stephens 2015 13.

κέν Πυθῶνα παρέλθοι (“One would easily pass by Pytho” *hArt* 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.

These internal cross-references often carry programmatic force. 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 / εἶην 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 αἰόντος ἃ 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.<sup>510</sup>

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 κείνω τῷ Μοῦσαι πολλὰ νέμοντι βοτὰ / συν μύθους ἐβάλοντο παρ’ ἵχνιον 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’ ἵχνιον ὀξέος ἵππου / Ἡσιόδῳ Μουσέων ἔσμός ὅτ’ ἠντίασεν (“When a swarm of Muses met the shepherd Hesiod, who was tending / his flocks near the

---

<sup>510</sup> Hes. *Theog.* 27–28. See discussion in Stephens 2015 on *hZeus* 65.

footprint of the swift horse” tr. Harder modified). Callimachus was thus one important model for the ring-structuring common in Hellenistic and later verse.<sup>511</sup>

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*.<sup>512</sup> 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.

---

<sup>511</sup> 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.

<sup>512</sup> See Harder 2012 *ad loc.* and Gutzwiller 1998 184 for discussion.



## 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 his treatment of the poetic *sphragis* Kranz regards Ovid's practice as the culmination of the technique.<sup>513</sup> Though Gregory probably did not read Latin, Ovid's work is worth a brief examination because his internal cross-references are so prominent and his work is better preserved than Gregory's Greek models. It is thus fruitful to juxtapose the Sulmonan poet's Callimacheanism with Gregory's.

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;<sup>514</sup> 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).<sup>515</sup> 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 cedit 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 dense complex

---

<sup>513</sup> 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)*.

<sup>514</sup> See, for instance, Oliensis 2014.

<sup>515</sup> 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.

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 tennues*, 31; cf. *ἐκάς ἐκάς 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 αἰδόντεσσι 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 agitare[m] 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 πρῶτιστον 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 iuventas*) 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”),<sup>516</sup> which

---

<sup>516</sup> See Bömer 1969 *ad loc.*

Callimachus uses to describe the poetry preferred by his gauche critics (ἄεισμα διηνεκές *Aet.* fr. 1.3). By embracing “continuous song” Ovid marks his departure from Alexandrian precedent.<sup>517</sup> 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.<sup>518</sup> 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*.<sup>519</sup>
  - 2.1.15 *De seipso post reditum ex urbe Constantinopolitana*.<sup>520</sup>
  - 2.1.16 *Somnium de Anastasiae ecclesia*.<sup>521</sup>
- Revised

---

<sup>517</sup> 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.

<sup>518</sup> 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.

<sup>519</sup> For the date, see Simelidis 2009 152–55.

<sup>520</sup> 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.

<sup>521</sup> 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*.<sup>522</sup>
- 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.<sup>523</sup>

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,<sup>524</sup> while 2.1.15 is transmitted in groups 5 and 6.<sup>525</sup> 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 closely upon 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 that Gregory had a larger ordering in mind 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, he would be following Callimachean precedent, for the

---

<sup>522</sup> 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.

<sup>523</sup> 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.

<sup>524</sup> In L, *carm.* 2.1.10 comes after *carm.* 2.1.16 and 2.1.13.

<sup>525</sup> See Sicherl, Höllger, and Werhahn 1985 18.

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 adduced 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.<sup>526</sup> 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, he found ecclesiastical affairs 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 pressuring 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 the episcopacy—among other concerns, it would give ammunition to his opponents in the capital who had asserted Gregory's ineligibility to become bishop of Constantinople because he was

---

<sup>526</sup> See Storin 2011, McGuckin 2001 371–402, and McLynn 1997, McLynn 2006, and McLynn 2015.

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;<sup>527</sup> within a year he subsequently orchestrated a 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.<sup>528</sup> 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*)<sup>529</sup>

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” (Ὡς θυσίας πέμποντες ἀναιμάκτους, ἱερῆες, / καὶ μεγάλης μονάδος λάτριοι 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 ἔδος μεγάλου 3–4). His final address is for the city itself, whom Gregory addresses somewhat ironically as a city that far surpasses others (ὀπλοτέρη

---

<sup>527</sup> 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 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).

<sup>528</sup> See Storin 2011 and McGuckin 2001 376–84.

<sup>529</sup> I cite *carm.* 2.1.10 according to Simelidis 2009. An English translation may be found in Abrams Rebillard 2003.

Ῥώμη, τόσσον προφέρουσα πολλῶν, / ὁσάτιον γαίης οὐρανὸς ἀστερόεις 5–6). After this elaborate introduction, the poet announces his theme: his own sufferings at the hands of Envy.<sup>530</sup>

ὕμέας εὐγενέας ἐπιβώσομαι, οἷά μ' ἔοργεν  
ὁ φθόνος· ὥς ἱερῶν τῇλε βάλεν τεκέων,  
δηρὸν ἀεθλεύσαντα, φαεσφόρον οὐρανίοισι  
δόγμασι, καὶ πέτρης ἐκπροχέαντα ῥόον. [10]

I shall declare to all you noble ones,  
just what hath Envy done to me, how He  
hath cast me far away from children dear,  
though long I labored true on their behalf,  
lifting aloft the light of heav'nly teaching,  
and flowing forth as 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, βασιλεια, καὶ ἄσπεα, καὶ ἱερῆας / ἀσπασίως προφυγῶν 27–28) and “rise above them and take delight in stillness” (Αὐτὰρ ἔγωγε / ἔνθεν ἀφορμηθεὶς, τέρψομαι ἀτρεμῇ 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” (εὔτε Θεὸς 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 stripped off everything for Christ” (Οὗτος

---

<sup>530</sup> I use “Envy” to translate the Greek φθόνος, capitalizing it because for Gregory φθόνος is principally an appellation for Satan.



Γρηγορίου 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.<sup>531</sup> 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.<sup>532</sup> Not only does Gregory suffer like Christ, but he 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;<sup>533</sup> 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 which Chastity and Prudence appeared to him and called him to a life of virginity (2.1.45 197–268), which we will

---

<sup>531</sup> Demosthenic orations typically begin ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι (“O Men of Athens!” e.g. *Olynthiac* 1–3). The prologue to Callimachus’ *Aetia* does not immediately begin with direct address of critics, but this is not long postponed (fr. 1.7).

<sup>532</sup> See 1 Cor 10:4.

<sup>533</sup> See Bady, Tuilier, and Bernardi 2004 LI and notes on 2.1.1 612–15.

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***

The temporal setting of *car. 2.1.15* is Gregory's return to Nazianzus from the capital.<sup>534</sup> 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.<sup>535</sup> 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.<sup>536</sup>

A number of features connect *car. 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

---

<sup>534</sup> The best edition remains that of Caillau, reprinted in *PG* 37.1250–53. An English translation may be found in Abrams Rebillard 2003.

<sup>535</sup> 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 *car. 2.1.54*, for which see Simelidis 2009 41. For an ancient discussion of the "speech of arrival" see Men. Rhet. 2.3. For modern discussion see Cairns 1972 17–33 and his analysis of Theoc. *Id.* 12.

<sup>536</sup> Ovid used a similar technique in his *Metamorphoses* by playing on the dual meaning of *perpetuum* ("long-lasting" or "continuous") in 1.4. Only the former meaning is reprised at the end of the long epic.

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 ἄλλοδαπῶν ἦλυθον 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 ὦδε 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 Ἀναστασίας ... ἔδος 49), thereby reprising the language he used in 2.1.10 4 for the "renowned seat" of the great Constantine (κλεινὸν ἔδος). 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 his death is quite striking: the poet depicts himself as confident of divine vindication.

### 2.1.16 *Somnium de Anastasiae ecclesia*<sup>537</sup>

*Carm.* 2.1.16 opens with the poet asleep: εὔδον 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

---

<sup>537</sup> 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.

(ὑψιθέοντα καὶ εὐστροφον 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. ἡ τότε 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 daydream. 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 Trinity and a seal describing the poem as the “lament of Gregory who yearns for Anastasia” (Γρηγορίου γόος οὔτος 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 οὔτος Ἀναστασίην ποθέοντος, / τῆς ποτέ μιν φθονερῇ 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 *ἔξεσθαι 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* / *στήσεν* 2.1.16 1–2; *παρίστατο τοῖος ὄνειρος* 2.1.45 229). In both, the poet rejoices (2.1.16 46 *γῆθεον*; 2.1.45 251 *μέγ’ ἐγῆθεον*). The priamel in 2.1.16 67–76 may be paired with 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*<sup>538</sup>

*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 asceticism, 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).

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 then employs an elaborate priamel to develop further the theme of the poem:

οὔτε μόνον παίδων τις ἔων ἐκλάυσσας τόσσον,  
 ἢ κεδνῶν τοκέων, ἢ φίλης ἀλόχου,  
 οὐ πάτρην γλυκερὴν μαλερῶ πυρὶ τεφρωθεῖσαν, [5]  
 οὐ νόσφω στυγερῇ ἄψα 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,

---

<sup>538</sup> 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.

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” (ὕπὲρ τεκέων) 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.<sup>539</sup> 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

---

<sup>539</sup> Πρεσβυτέρω μὴ ἐπιπλήξης ἀλλὰ παρακάλει ὡς πατέρα, νεωτέρους ὡς ἀδελφούς.

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, / εὕδιον ἐς λιμένα σῆς βασιλείας ἄγοις). Compare 2.1.10 31–32: ἐκ μεγάλου δὲ / χείματος ἐν σταθερῷ πείσμα βάλον λιμενί (“I have cast my cable from a great storm into a sure harbor”).<sup>540</sup> 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 ἦκε 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 ἀπαλός), but not extremely young.<sup>541</sup> He had already received training in virtue from his pious parents (209–10).<sup>542</sup> 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 wear finely wrought silks nor *chitones* of soft linen, nor do they wear make-up. They do not have contrived hair. Each wears a simple *peplos* that extends to her ankles and is bound by a girdle. Their heads and cheeks are covered with veils. They remain silent, but then kiss

---

<sup>540</sup> Cf. also the nautical imagery at 2.1.15 1–2.

<sup>541</sup> 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.

<sup>542</sup> 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 did something similar with his self-epitaph, *epigr.* 29 (G.-P.), which overlaps substantially with fr. 1.37–38 of the prologue to the *Aetia*.



Gregory (αἱ δὲ με καὶ φιλέεσκον 253), after which Gregory asks them who they are. They reveal themselves to be Chastity (ἀγνεία) 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” (συμμίξας 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 συμμίξας the summary reflects Callimachus’ language. Gregory’s self-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.<sup>543</sup> 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 (ἀπαλὸς παῖς 205) makes him a fitting object of desire (cf. Meleag. *epigr.* 117.2–3). Both use the

---

<sup>543</sup> For other instances of Gregory’s appropriation of erotic epigram, see Simelidis 2009 43–44.

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 ἀφθορίας); 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 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 χεῖλη 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 ἡμετέρῃσι / καὶ πρᾶπίδεσσι 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.<sup>544</sup> 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 θάλλω more common in epigram (*e.g.* Meleager *epigr.* 117.4).<sup>545</sup> Moreover, if Gregory's dream is depicted in highly literary fashion, he goes out of his way to assert the dream is more than literary fiction.<sup>546</sup> 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*)<sup>547</sup>

Gregory sets *carm.* 2.1.34a and b<sup>548</sup> 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

<sup>544</sup> For μίγνυμι in Homer, see the *LjGRE s.v.* For epigrammatic examples of μίγνυμι used with wine, see Meleagr. *epigr.* 12.2 and 127.4.

<sup>545</sup> 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 θάλλω occurs 16 times, 6 of which are in erotic contexts: 2.1 166 (Christodorus), 5.165, 166, 173 (all Meleager), 5.210 (Asclepiades).

<sup>546</sup> For poetic consecrations as literary fiction, see Ovid's amusing disclaimer at *Arx. am.* 1.25–30, discussed above.

<sup>547</sup> 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.

<sup>548</sup> 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 αἰοίτε σιωπῆς). Moreover, six of the ten

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:

Ἦνίκα σάρκας ἔδησα, Θεοῦ βροτέοις παθέεσσι  
 μύστιν ἄγων θυσίην, ὥς κε θάνω βιότῳ,  
 ἤμασι τεσσαράκοντα, νόμοις Χριστοῦ βασιλῆος, [5]  
 εὔτε καθαιρομένοις σώμασιν ἔσπετ' ἄκος,  
 πρῶτα μὲν ἀτρεμίῃ νόον ἥδρασα, οἷος ἀπ' ἄλλων  
 ναιετάων, ἀχέων ἀχλὺν ἐφессάμενος,  
 εἴσω πᾶς ἐαλεις, φρένας ἄκλοπος· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα  
 ἀνδρῶν εὐαγέων δόγμασιν ἐσπόμενος, [10]  
 χεῖλεσι θῆκα θύρετρα.

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.<sup>549</sup>

---

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, by contrast, rejects the division between the two poems.

<sup>549</sup> 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 παραστήσαι 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 παθέεσσι ("through the human sufferings of God"). Crimi and Kuhn also rightly render the εὔτε in line 6 as temporal rather than causal (cf. Abrams Rebillard 2003 and White 1996). All four scholars have taken ἀχέων ἀχλὺν ἐφессάμενος 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 ἐφессάμενος 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 χαλεπήσῃ σὺν ἐλπωρήσῃ δαμείην / ἐξοδίην κακότητα ἐφессάμενος 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.

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 σιγῇν). The preparatory time of solitude before the silence fast also looks back to the end of 2.1.10; compare the use of ἀτρεμῖη ("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 ἀτρεμῖη). 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" 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 suggest that Dunkle was mistaken in denying an apologetic aspect to the poem.<sup>550</sup> 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

---

<sup>550</sup> Dunkle 2008 388 regards 2.1.34b as a later addition to 2.1.34a, though the manuscript evidence 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.

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:

“Ἡρην γάρ κοτέ φασι—κύον, κύον, ἴσχεο, λαιδρέ  
 θυμέ, σύ γ’ αἰεῖσσι καὶ τὰ περ οὐχ ὁσίη· [5]  
 ὦναο κάρτ’ ἔνεκ’ οὐ τι θεῆς ἴδες ἱερὰ φρικτῆς,  
 ἐξ ἂν ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶν ἥρυγες ἱστορίην.  
 ἢ πολυιδρεΐη χαλεπὸν κακόν, ὅστις ἀκαρτεῖ  
 γλώσσης· ὥς 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,  
 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.<sup>551</sup> 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.<sup>552</sup> 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

<sup>551</sup> “*L’inizio è solenne*” 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.

<sup>552</sup> See Gowers 2012 for a brief treatment of the technique in Latin literature.

story. Yet the crime would be even more an act of aesthetic impiety; Callimachus uses the incident to highlight both his great erudition (πολυδρεΐη) 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 ethical and the aesthetic. If Callimachus appropriated the language of sacrality for 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.<sup>553</sup> 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 (ῥυμνον ἄνακτι φέρω 70).<sup>554</sup> 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.<sup>555</sup>

---

<sup>553</sup> For festal praise as the ultimate end of humanity, see 2.1.45 25–34.

<sup>554</sup> On this passage, see Simelidis 2009 35 and Hollis 2002 47.

<sup>555</sup> 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

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).

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 loftiest 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 θεοῦ 69), but ends by stating that his tongue

---

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.”



is the instrument (τόσσω 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*.<sup>556</sup> 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.<sup>557</sup> 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 στερήσης 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

---

<sup>556</sup> 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, and ascension (*Poem. arc.* 8).

<sup>557</sup> 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.*

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 ἐστί· σὺ δ' ἐς πλόον ἄλλον ἐπείγῃ. / ἄλλος ἀπ' ἄλλοίου πνεύματος ὄρμον ἔχοι. 149–50).<sup>558</sup> *Poem. arc.* 1 begins: "I know that we are setting out on a great voyage in a small raft" (οἶδα μὲν ὡς σχεδίωνι μακρὸν πλόον ἐκπερώωμεν 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;<sup>559</sup> 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 αἴτιτε 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

---

<sup>558</sup> The mention of a "different sort of wind" (ἀπ' ἄλλοίου 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.

<sup>559</sup> 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.

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 prudence” (ὄμμα δ’ ἐνὶ βλεφάροις πῆξα σαοφροσύνη) with 2.1.45 310: “I placed my neck under austere prudence” (ἀνχέν’ ὑπὸ στερεῇ θῆκα σαοφροσύνη).

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:<sup>560</sup>

... ὦ φθόνε, καὶ σύ  
 Ἐξ ἐμέθεν τι λάβοις. Ἴσχεο, γλῶσσα φίλη  
 Βαιὼν δ’ ἴσχεο, γλῶσσα· τό δ’ ἔς τέλος οὐ σε πεδήσω.  
 Οὐτόσον 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.<sup>561</sup> He promises that Envy will soon receive his own word, but he checks himself for the moment, because his tongue is bound to silence.<sup>562</sup> After a

<sup>560</sup> Callimachus apostrophizes Envy and Blame (Φθόνος and Μῶμος) at *hAp* 111–13.

<sup>561</sup> Gregory does something similar also at *Poem. arc.* 3.49.

<sup>562</sup> 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.

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 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*)<sup>563</sup>

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” (*Χριστέ ἄναξ, σὲ πρῶτον, ἐπεὶ λόγον ἡέρι 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

---

<sup>563</sup> *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.

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 the ear. Yet I pray that you would allow me to do both in a holy manner” (σοὶ καὶ γλῶσσαν ἔδησα, καὶ οὐάσι μῦθον ἔλυσα· / λίσσομαι ἀλλὰ πόροις ἀμφότερ’ εὐαγέως 29–32).<sup>564</sup> 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 ἀλλὰ in 32.<sup>565</sup> 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.<sup>566</sup> 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.

<sup>564</sup> Frangeskou 1984 *ad loc.* is right to 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 azioni descritte ... possono essere considerate o come due azioni distinte e consequenziali, 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” (οὐάσιν).

<sup>565</sup> Callimachus *hZens* 87 similarly ends a form νοέω, there the aorist subjunctive instead of the future indicative. For postpositive ἀλλὰ, see Call. *hZens* 18: Λάδων ἀλλ’ οὐπω μέγας ἔρρεν (“The great Ladon river, however, was not yet flowing”).

<sup>566</sup> See especially *Aet.* fr. 75.4 θυμέ, σὺ γ’ αἰεῖσθαι καὶ τὰ περ οὐχ ὁσίη· (“Soul, you will sing even what is against divine law”).

“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 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 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.<sup>567</sup> 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 ἤχον ἔπνευσα μεμυκότα χεῖλεα σιγῇ / λύσας· 49–50). He asks Christ to receive him as a chorus-leading harp (ἀλλά μ’ ἔχοις ὕμνοπόλον 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

---

<sup>567</sup> See Frangeskou 1984 *ad loc.* and Piottante 1999 *ad loc.*

consecrate something to the mighty Spirit, if he wish it” (Νῶ νόον ἔνδον ἔρεξα, λόγῳ Λόγον· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα / ῥέξω καὶ μέγῳ Πνεύματι, ἣν ἐθέλη. 51-52). As Frangeskou and Piottante note,<sup>568</sup> the epithets for God the Father (νοῦς) and God the Son (λόγος) correspond to the opening invocation of Christ in line 5, “Word of the Great Mind” (μεγάλοιο Νόου Λόγε). Gregory’s mention of a forthcoming work “for the mighty Spirit” (μέγῳ Πνεύματι) is probably another reference to his *Poemata arcana*, especially *Poem. arc.* 3 (*De spiritu*), which he was perhaps then presently composing.<sup>569</sup> 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 Other 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-

---

<sup>568</sup> See Frangeskou 1984 *ad loc.* and Piottante 1999 *ad loc.*

<sup>569</sup> 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.

line *carm.* 2.1.13 (*Ad episcopos*).<sup>570</sup> Gregory signals the connection by opening both poems with the same line: “O priests who offer bloodless sacrifices!” (ὦ θυσίας πέμποντες ἀναιμάκτους ἱερῆς. 2.1.10 1 and 2.1.13 1). *Carm.* 2.1.13 is biting and satirical,<sup>571</sup> and Gregory 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; κύμα βιώμενεν ἔνδοθι λάβρω / πνεύματι 2.1.13 20) and the language of childbirth (ὠδίνοντα κατίσχης / μῦθον 2.1.34a 131–32; ῥηγνυμένης ὠδίνος 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 ἡέρι 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

---

<sup>570</sup> 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.

<sup>571</sup> 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 the existence of such poetry, even if he did not read it himself. His cousin Euphemius, for instance, wrote poems in both Greek and Latin (*AnthPal* 8.122–23).



Ovid. Gregory has, I argue, put considerably more editorial energy into his poetic *oeuvre* 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 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*).<sup>572</sup> 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.<sup>573</sup> 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’

---

<sup>572</sup> Compare 2.1.37 5 “the wise bound my tongue” (γλώσσην 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).

<sup>573</sup> For *Iamb.* 13, see discussion in Kerkhecker 1999 250–70 and Acosta-Hughes 2002 60–103.

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.<sup>574</sup>

---

<sup>574</sup> 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).

## Appendix of Text Critical Discussions

### 1.1.3 (*Poem. arc. 3: De spiritu*) 29.

βαιὸν τοῖσδ' ὑπέλαμψε, τὸ δὲ πλεόν ἡμῖν 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 ἡμῖν, 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.<sup>575</sup>

### 2.1.1 *De rebus suis* 294.

Νῦν δὲ δὴ ἐξαπόλωλε κειμήλια πάντ' ἀπ' ἐμοῖο  
ψυχῆς.

Tuillier 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 γαμήλιον (“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.<sup>576</sup> 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 καλὰ (“But now all the lovely heirlooms have disappeared from the house”). According to the TLG, *DRS* 294 is the only other

---

<sup>575</sup> For ἧμιν, see for example *Il.* 17.417; for ἄμμιν see *Od.* 12.275.

<sup>576</sup> Simelidis 2009 91.

hexametric line attested that begins νῦν δὲ δὴ ἑξαπόλωλε. There are two 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 θεμέλια (“foundations”). The sense works well, “But now all the foundations have disappeared from my soul.” Reading θεμέλια here would also increase the resonance with *DRS* 322 θεμέλια σείετο πάντα, where the foundations of Greece are shaken in an earthquake, and *DRS* 359 καὶ νηοῦ μέγαλοιο θεμέλια χερσὶ βάληται, where the foundations of Solomon’s temple are destroyed by the Babylonians. If I am correct, the corruption of θεμέλια to κιμήλια occurred quite early. Not only would the corruption be easier in uncial, but Hesychius’ entry for κιμήλιον almost certainly derives from this passage.<sup>577</sup>

### 2.1.1 *De rebus suis* 313–14

Νηὸς ἐνὶ πρύμνῃ κείμεν, Θεὸν ὑψιμέδοντα  
κικλήσκων λιτῆσι. Τὸ δ’ ἄφρεε κῦμ’ ἐπὶ νῆα.

The ι in λιτῆσι 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’

---

<sup>577</sup> For Gregory’s works as source material for later lexicographers, see Simelidis 2009 48 n. 84, 75–76.

only false quantity in the entire *Dionysiaca*, according to Alan Cameron,<sup>578</sup> was with the adjective λιτά: ἀγρονόμων λιτά δεῖπνα, φιλοξείνῳ δὲ νομῇι (*Dion.* 17.59). It would be easy to emend λιτῇσι to εὐχῇσι, though difficult to explain how the corruption occurred in the first place. We might also write κικλήσκον <δὲ> λιτῇσι, 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.<sup>579</sup>

### 2.1.1 *De rebus suis* 353

... πάτρην δ' ἐπὶ θείαν ὁδεύη.

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.<sup>580</sup> 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”).<sup>581</sup>

### 2.1.32 (*De vitae huius vanitate atque incertitudine*) 7

Ἦθελον ἢ ἐπέλεια τανύπτερος, ἢ χελιδῶν  
ἔμμεναι, ὥς κε φύγοιμι βροτῶν βίον, ἢ τιν' ἔρημον  
ναιετάειν θήρεσσιν ὁμέστιος (οἷ γὰρ ἔασι

<sup>578</sup> Cameron 2006 339.

<sup>579</sup> Cf. *DRS* 63 οὐ με γάμος δ' ἐπέδησε. Cf. also the section in chapter three on syntax.

<sup>580</sup> Oberhaus and Sicherl 1991 27.

<sup>581</sup> Gignac 1976 75.

πιστότεροι μερόπων), καὶ ἡμάτιον βίον ἔλκειν,  
 νηπενθῇ, νήποινον, ἀκηδέα· ἐν τόδ' ἄθηρον [5]  
 μῦνον ἔχειν, θεότητος ἴδριν νόον, οὐρανοφοίτην,  
 ὥς κε γαληνιόωντι βίῳ φάος αἰὲν ἀγείρω.  
 Ἦ τινος ἡερίης σκοπιῆς καθύπερθεν ἀερθεῖς,  
 βρονταῖον πάντεσσιν ἐπιχθονίοισιν αὖσαι·

According to the edition of Simelidis,<sup>582</sup> 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 (ἡερίης 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:<sup>583</sup>

Πρὸς ταῦτα νῦν γινώσκεθ' ἡμῖν, οἱ σοφοί,  
 τῶν ἐνδον εἰ δ' ἥττησθε, τῶν αὐτῶν λόγων  
 πλεῖστον τὸ χρῆμα καὶ τὰ παιζόντων λόγοι [60]  
 χωρεῖτε. μακρὸν δ' οὐδὲν οὐδ' ὑπὲρ κόρον  
 ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἄχρηστον ὥς ἐγῶμαι παντελῶς.

In line 59, De Blasi has removed the punctuation that Caillau placed after τῶν ἐνδον. However, the εἰ δέ that follows shows that τῶν ἐνδον belongs with the prior line, and that a new sentence begins.<sup>584</sup> We should thus punctuate with a full stop after ἐνδον, as did Caillau.

In line 60, I would punctuate after χρῆμα and then take the following καὶ as adverbial (“even”) rather than conjunctive (“and”). The end of the line (τὰ παιζόντων λόγοι) is nonsensical, as De Blasi notes.<sup>585</sup> Emending the nominative plural (λόγοι) to the dative plural

<sup>582</sup> Simelidis 2009.

<sup>583</sup> De Blasi 2018.

<sup>584</sup> A sense pause before the second princeps is attested in 8% of iambic lines, according to West 1982 41.

<sup>585</sup> De Blasi 2018 *ad loc.*

(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

μακρὸν δ’ οὐδὲν

οὐδ’ ὑπὲρ κόρον

οὐδ’ ἄχρηστον ... παντελῶς

*ep.* 51

οὔτε μακρότερα γραπτέον...

τὸ δ’ ἄπληστον

ἔστι δὲ μέτρον τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἢ χρεῖα

### 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." *J ECS* 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](https://doi.org/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](https://doi.org/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](https://doi.org/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 Poétiques: 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 IV<sup>e</sup> 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](https://doi.org/10.1111/ijst.12136).
- Bowie, E.L. 1989. “Greek sophists and Greek poetry in the second Sophistic.” *Aufstieg 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-Basilios: 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](https://doi.org/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 langue 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." *Koινωνία* 24 (1): 47–66.
- Consolino, F.E. 1987. "Σοφίης ἀμφοτέρῃς πρῶτανιν. 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](https://doi.org/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 prospettive*, 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.

- Demoen, K. 1996. *Pagan and Biblical Exempla in Gregory Nazianzen: A Study in Rhetoric and Hermeneutics*. Corpus Christianorum. Series Lingua Patrum; 2. Turnhout: Brepols.
- 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.
- 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. "Επισταμένοις 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. *Halientica*. Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Commentare. Stuttgart; Leipzig: Teubner.
- Fakas, C. 2001. *Der hellenistische Hesiod: Arats Phainomena und die Tradition der antiken Lehpik*. 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 V<sup>e</sup> 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.
- Institute for New Testament Textual Research. 2012. *Novum Testamentum Graece: Nestle-Aland*. 28th ed. Stuttgart: German Bible Society.
- 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](https://doi.org/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](https://doi.org/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 VIII° 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. "Τὸ σοφὸν 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 König, J. and Woolf, G.eds., *Authority and Expertise in Ancient Scientific Culture*, 203–20. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:[10.1017/9781107446724](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781107446724).

- Knox, P.E. 1985. "Wine, Water, and Callimachean Polemics." *HSPb* 89: 107–19. doi:[10.2307/311271](https://doi.org/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 Schweiggedichten 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](https://doi.org/10.2307/628455).
- Lloyd-Jones, H., and Wilson, N.G. 1990. *Sophocles 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](https://doi.org/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.
- Mastrorade, D. 2002. *Euripides: Medea*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McDonald, J. 2019. "Paideia in the Poems of Gregory 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: Gregory 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](https://doi.org/10.2298/ZRVI0845043M).
- Milovanović-Barham, C. 1997. "Gregory of Nazianzus: Ars Poetica." *J ECS* 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](https://doi.org/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](https://doi.org/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.

- 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.
- Rahlfs, A. 1979. *Psalmi cum odis*. 3rd ed. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Rahlfs, A., and Hanhart, R., ed. 2006. *Septuaginta*. 2nd ed. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- 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 ΕΠΙΕΩΝ. 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.

- Sakalis, I. 1977. *Γρηγορίου τοῦ θεολόγου. Ἀπαντα τὰ ἔργα*. Thessaloniki.
- 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: Libreria 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 Kynēgetika*. 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 Gedichtgruppe 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 Cynēgetica." *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](https://doi.org/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." *J ECS* 19 (2): 225–57.
- . 2012. "The Letters of Gregory of Nazianzus: 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](https://doi.org/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](https://doi.org/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." *HSPb* 90: 171–98.
- Toohy, 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 Sickel, J. 1981. “Poetics of Opening and Closure in Meleager, Catullus, and Gallus.” *CW* 75 (2): 65–75. doi:[10.2307/4349339](https://doi.org/10.2307/4349339).
- Vardakas, P. 2011. “Επιτάφια Επιγράμματα του Γρηγορίου Ναζιανζηνού του Θεολόγου.” PhD thesis, Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Vergados, A. 2013. *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes: Introduction, Text and Commentary*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Vertoudakis, V. 2011. *ΤΟ ΟΓΔΩΔΕΚΗ ΒΙΒΛΙΟ ΤΗΣ ΠΛΑΤΙΝΗΣ ΑΝΘΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ*. Athens: ΚΑΡΔΑΜΙΤΣΑ.
- Villemain, A.F. 1874. *Tableau de l'éloquence chrétienne au 4. siècle*. Paris: Didier.
- Volk, K. 2002. *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- von der Mühl, 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](https://doi.org/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.
- . 2008. “‘Sugaring the Pill’: Gregory of Nazianzus’ Advice to Olympias (Carm. 2.2.6).” *Ramus* 37 (1-2): 79–98. doi:[10.1017/S0048671X00004914](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00004914).
- 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 Muehl 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.
- Ziegler, J., ed. 1983. *Isaias*. 3rd ed. Vol. 14. Septuaginta. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.