PAIDEIA IN THE POETRY OF GREGORY NAZIANZEN

James Joseph McDonald (MA, MRes)

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES

Submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the Degree of PhD

Abstract:

In this thesis, I explore Gregory's conception and use of *paideia* in his poetry as understood in four main ways: (1) Gregory's knowledge of, familiarity with, and utilisation/manipulation of the literary tradition. (2) His use of *paideia* as a communication code for self-fashioning, as well as for fashioning his friends and enemies. (3) His pedagogy, that is, the didactic methods used to teach biblical knowledge and theological doctrine. (4) The place of classical culture in the Christian (ascetic) life. In other words, Gregory's conception of (a Christian) *paideia*. This thesis focuses upon particular (groups of) poems by Gregory that explore how exactly he puts into practice the episcopal identity which he forges for himself as *prytanis* of both sacred and profane wisdom.

Contents

Acknowledgements:

First and foremost, I must thank prof. Jan Stenger and prof. Isabel Ruffell for their continuous support and without whose encouragement, criticism, and guidance, I could not have completed this thesis. I must also thank the various people who attended the conferences at which I presented parts of this research for their helpful feedback. Thanks also goes to Giuseppe Celico and Katharina Patommel, for helping me better understand scholarship in Italian and German respectively; and Simon Hanzal for helping me "crunch the numbers" for my analysis of the metre in the poems discussed in chapter two. Dr. Arianna Gullo provided tremendous encouragement and support with chapter one of this thesis, thus improving it vastly. Finally, a great debt of gratitude I owe to my mother and father for their unfailing support and love, to my wife, Shuxin, for her continued support, encouragement, and hot meals, and to Theodore my son for keeping things in perspective. This research was funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (Grant ref. no.: AH/L503915).

Abbreviations

Abbreviations of authors and their works are the same as found in the *LSJ* – except patristic authors who are abbreviated in accordance with *Lampe*.

EG	G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca* (Berlin, 1878)
Lampe	G.W.H. Lampe (ed.), *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1968)
LSJ	H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th edition revised by H.S. Jones and R. McKenzie (Oxford, 1940)
LXX	Rahlfs, A. (ed.), *Septuaginta*, revised ed. by R. Hanhart (Stuttgart, 2006)
OCD	S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds.) *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th Edition (Oxford, 2012)
PGRSRE	Janiszewski, P., Stebnicka, K., and Szabat, E., *Prosopography of Greek Rhetors and Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 2015)
PLRE	A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale and J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol.1 (Cambridge, 1971)
SGO	R. Merkelbach and J. Stauber (eds.), *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*, 5 vols. (Berlin, 1998–2004)

Introduction

The Research Question

On my desk, there sits an icon of Saint Gregory Nazianzen, an image of a bearded man, dressed in a pallium with a book in his left hand and his right hand held out with three fingers extended and held together (no doubt a sign of the Trinity which he so strenuously defended). The interesting thing, I find, with such icons, is that there is little to distinguish one (episcopal) saint from another. Most of them are bearded, holding books, wearing a pallium, and so on. All that can distinguish these images (at least to my untrained eye) are the inscriptions: *ho hagios Gregorios*, or whatever the name might be.

Just as with icons, most lay Christians would think there is not much difference between one Church father and the next. They all preached the same faith, and, therefore, had the same outlook on most other things. Of course, this is not the case for the scholar, but even within scholarly circles it is very easy to see Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, and Gregory Nyssen as a homogenous whole, the "Cappadocian fathers". Again, this is not to say that all scholars have seen no difference between the three bishops of the fourth century – and certainly the trio has generated a considerable amount of scholarship in recent years[1] - but if one major difference between the three could be pointed out, it is this: only one of them wrote poetry, Gregory Nazianzen. This in itself distinguishes the once Archbishop of Constantinople from his contemporaries, and yet it has only been in recent years (from the end of the 19th century) that scholarship on these poems have steadily grown. We still do not yet have a complete critical edition and translation of these, circa, 18,000 extant lines of poetry, but more and more editions and translations of these poems are appearing.[2]

But why did Gregory write poetry? As a literary medium it was not exactly the most popular form of composition in the fourth century AD Greek world – though many prominent examples do survive before, during, and after Gregory's life (originating especially from Egypt).[3] His closest contemporaries, Basil and Nyssen, focussed more on the production of sermons, letters, and treatises, and no doubt their self-distancing for traditional Greek education and culture (as I shall make clear below) has much to do with their complete avoidance of a medium which Alan

[1] This shall be given below as we deal with each father.
[2] Various editions and commentaries on parts of Gregory's corpus exist, see Simelidis (2009:265-266) for a comprehensive bibliography of these. On the manuscript tradition(s) of Gregory's poetry, see Höllger (1985), Gertz (1986), and Sicherl (2011). See also Demoen (2009:47-50) and O'Connell (2019:1-2, fns. 4, 6) for a summary of recent scholarship that has aimed to reform the scholarly view of Gregory's poetry.
[3] See Cavero (2008:3-5) for a summary of poetry which Late Antiquity (3rd-6th century AD) produced, see also Cavero (2018) for a summary and overview of Christian poetry. On the rapid decline of poetry in the 2nd-3rd Centuries and its revival in the 4th, see Cameron (2006). Trypanis (1981:411) seems to think that Gregory's poetry is 'second-rate … long winded, and the flat and moralizing didactic tone that prevails tends to become tiresome … because of his learned language and metres, Gregory's poetry remained aloof from the people …'. This is a sentiment shared by many scholars (which I will cite below *passim*) and one which I will to some extent challenge.

Cameron would term '*paideia* in its most concentrated form' (2007:31). Furthermore, poetry was not universally considered in the Greco-Roman world as an appropriate literary medium for education.[4] A cursory glance of Gregory's poetry makes Cameron's statement all too clear; for his mastery of the various Greek metres, Homeric diction, and clear allusions to multiple classical authors show just how well educated he was. What is more, his ability to replicate these things in his own work makes clear just how thoroughly imbued Gregory was with Greek *paideia*.

Therefore, our research questions can thus be stated as follows: What can Gregory Nazianzen's poetry tell us about his conception of *paideia*? How does he make use of *paideia*? What role does it play in the formation of his Christian identity? Many of these questions and various answers to them have been proposed (albeit in different language) by various scholars. Demoen (1993) expresses a dissatisfaction with answers to the question of Gregory's use (and "rejection") of Greek culture. I agree with the conclusion of Demoen (p.252) that 'Gregory himself was convinced of the value of *logoi* and the possibility or even necessity of integrating them with Christianity; in order to convince others, though, he felt forced to engage in a sort of continual give-and-take.' Ultimately, it is Gregory's self-constructed identity as *prytanis* of sacred and profane wisdom and the 'give-and-take' – that is, Gregory's attempt to placate and appeal to multiple (overlapping) audiences ([non-] Christian, [ill-]educated, ascetic, elite) – that will be explored in this thesis. Needless to say, a PhD thesis cannot propose to provide definitive answers to any of the questions raised within it – if, indeed, any work that deals with the ages of antiquity can provide definitive answers on anything. Furthermore, given the vast nature of Gregory's poetic corpus, and given the sheer lack of a critical editions, commentaries, or translations for many of these poems, it makes sense to focus on particular poems or groups of poems that not only could provide insight into Gregory's conception and use of *paideia* in his forming of identity, but also poems for which some form of commentary, edition, or translation is available, so as to make the process of analysing these texts much smoother. Furthermore, I will show how the poems treated within have, in ways, been misinterpreted by scholars, and will show how a better understanding of Gregory's conception and use of *paideia* can lead to more interesting and sounder analysis of these poems.

What is *Paideia*?

Paideia (παιδεία) is a term of much importance in Greco-Roman antiquity, and one that has been extensively studied.[5] Nevertheless, despite the attention given it by ancient Greek writers and later

[4] For a summary of views on poetry and education, see Russell (1981:84-98). The topic is raised further below.

[5] Scholarship on this shall be stated below *passim*, but see particularly Jaeger (see bibliography), Marrou (1956), Barclay (1959), Festugière (1959) who provides great insight into the cultural and educational world of Antioch through a Pagan (Libanius) and Christian (John Chrysostom) lens, Clarke (1971), Av. Cameron (1997), Morgan (1998), Bloomer (2015); Joyal, McDougall, and Yardley (2009) pp. 231-267 provide a selection of (non-)Christian sources on education from Late Antiquity to the Byzantine age. The edited volume of Hague and Pitts (2016) provide some discussion on the interaction of early Christianity with Greek education, though focusses more on the Scriptures and works that pre-date Gregory. White (2017:27-57) provides an overview of Greco-Roman and Jewish educational institutions.

scholars alike, it is not the easiest word to define – or rather, it is difficult to give it a specific, clear-cut definition. Take for example two different translations of *The Dream, or Lucian's Career*, in which Lucian, the author, must choose between *paideia* or *techne* (specifically the craft of sculpting which his father practised) personified in his dreams and vying for his service. Lucian ultimately chooses *paideia*, but for Harmon (1921) the term means "education", whereas for Costa (2005), it means "culture".[6] These two words are, indeed, the most common words used to translate the term *paideia*, but this does little to help us towards an understanding of the concept.

Any discussion of *paideia* cannot neglect the seminal work of W. Jaeger, his three-volume work *Paideia*, later translated into English by G. Highet.[7] Here Jaeger notes how *paideia* is inextricably linked with the "State", the community at large (1939:xxv-xxvi). In other words, for Jaeger, there is something essentially political about *paideia*. In his discussion of the role of the Homeric poet as educator, Jaeger notes that the poet is the educator of future generations; he is to be for society its 'teacher', a 'constructor' of community (1939:40). The idea of poet as teacher is one that we will explore in this thesis. It is in volume II that we see the importance of *paideia* in understanding the divine, something which Jaeger attributes to the work of Plato, especially his *Republic*. Knowledge of the Good (of God) becomes the end of *paideia*. Nevertheless, Plato treats (imitative) poetry with grave suspicion, for the 'poets have neither knowledge in the philosophical sense nor true opinion like the … practical man' (1943:362). Poetry is not, for Plato, directed at the 'best part of the soul – reason – but to the emotions and passions which it stimulates unduly' (p.363). The only kind of poetry that is suitable are hymns and poems in praise of great men (p.365). Plato's influence on later Greek culture is undoubted, but that is not to say that there was ever unanimous agreement in Greek society on culture or education throughout its history.[8] We have not time (nor need) to provide a detailed history of *paideia*. But what we can take from Jaeger is that *paideia* is concerned with the shaping of (elite) Greek society in its cultural *praxeis*, literary output, moral education, and theology. Therefore, we cannot simply look at *paideia* and Christianity as an exploration of 'the role of "natural reason" in theology' (Kaldellis 2007:123) – that is, the role of Greek philosophy in Christian thought. For it was not simply the equivocation of Hellenism with Paganism that made *paideia* so problematic to Christians. With this in mind we

[6] Even the word "culture" itself has multiple meanings, as the work of Williams (1967), which looks at the various meanings of the word in English writers from 1780-1950, makes clear.
[7] See also Jaeger (1954 and 1961).
[8] This is something we must keep in mind throughout this thesis. Kaldellis (2007:120) sums up this complication of the picture: 'Within [Hellenism] … Plato's legacy was ever at odds with the tradition of ancient rhetoric, while [within Christendom], the bodily mortification and obscurantism of the desert anchorites was admired but not necessarily imitated by the more urbane and learned Church Fathers.' Kaldellis goes on to explore the complexities of Hellenic identity in early Christian writers such as Tatian (pp. 124-131), showing how the lines are often blurred between what and who exactly is Greek or Barbarian, thus making the dichotomy between Greek and Barbarian wisdom less straight forward. As we shall see, such a conflict exists within the works of Gregory too. Kaldellis is not the first to note the complexity of this issue. See also Chadwick (1966), Lyman (2003b) who notes the complexities of the synthesis of Greek *paideia* and Christianity in the conversion of Justin Martyr, and Kahlos (2007) for the idea of the *incerti* – those who were not quite Christian or Pagan.

will see how much more open Gregory could be than his Christian contemporaries to the many facets which *paideia* had.[9]

As we move into the Imperial period of Greek(-Roman) society, Schmitz in his monograph *Bildung und Macht* (1997) provides enlightening insights into the role of *paideia* in the Greek *polis*.[10] That which comes to the fore much more in this era of Greek society (at least in Schmitz's analysis) is the use of *paideia* as a means of competing for dominance both among the elites of a *polis,* as well as between the various *poleis* of the Greek world. Schmitz invokes the example of Dio of Prusa, who exhorts his fellow citizens to support his building project, less the neighbouring *polis* be considered above theirs (p.100). Internally, the vying for first place within a city was played out at festivals that supported not only athletic competitions, but also competitions in the recitation of literature (speeches, poetry).[11] These victories are then recorded for posterity in inscriptions (p.98). Kaldellis (2007) has pointed out how this very aspect of *paideia* - more than the question of Pagan religion's close proximity to Greek education and culture – was one of the main points of contention for Christians for (2007:132):

> Scripture blessed the meek, the poor, the humble, the weak, the foolish, those … who lacked sophistication and refinement; it condemned ambition and intellectual pride … [The message of Scripture] was addressed to those who counted for nothing in a world ruled by emulators of Achilles and Plato.

Indeed, this dichotomy between a *Bildung* that was inextricably tied up with *Macht* and the Scripture's favour for the meek and mild lead many Church fathers 'to condemn every aspect of Greek literature' (p.133). Writers such as Tatian would rather vaunt the "barbarian wisdom" of Christianity' (p.124),[12] but Gregory seems much prouder of his Hellenic heritage, something that comes across in his letter to Amphilochus (*Ep.* 62), his cousin who has recommended a certain Armenian (Eustathius of Sebaste?)[13] to Gregory's displeasure:

> Οὐ βάρβαρον τὸ ἐπίταγμα τῆς ἀμιμήτου σου καλοκἀγαθίας, ἀλλ' ἑλληνικόν, μᾶλλον δὲ χριστιανικόν. Ὁ δὲ Ἀρμένιος, ἐφ' ᾧ πάνυ φιλοτιμῇ, βάρβαρος ἄντικρυς καὶ πόρρωθεν τῆς ἡμετέρας φιλοτιμίας.

[9] Again, see Kaldellis (2007:123, fn.6) for a scholarly overview of scholarship which views the area of Christianity's interaction with *paideia* purely on the grounds of philosophy and theology.
[10] Schmitz is building upon the seminal work of Brown, *Power and Persuasion* (1992), which we will discuss below. There has been a myriad of works written upon the period of the Second (and Third) Sophistic, for which see Ch.1 of this thesis where I discuss the Second/Third Sophistic in more detail. See also Brown (1971b:34-45) for an overview of the Roman empire in the fourth century, who notes that this time was a time of prosperity, openness, and artistic diversity, a time when backwaters such as Cappadocia, could produce such figures as the Cappadocian fathers (p.41).
[11] On this, see especially B.E. Borg (2004) *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*.
[12] See also Bernardi (1995:242-243), Rappe (2001), Bakke (2005:205-215) Lössl (2014) who discusses the place of the Pagan past in early Christianity, Gemeindhardt (2012) who discusses three different Christian biographies and their varying portrayals of Greek *paideia*, Urbano (2013:207-228) on Athanasius' very negative view of Greek *paideia*, Bingham (2017) who discusses Irenaeus as 'an early, if not the earliest Christian thinker who appropriates classical education …' (p.324), and Georgia (2018), who discusses the implication of Tatian's *Against the Greeks* on his understanding of *paideia*. The opposition of Greek and barbarian, of course, pre-dates Christianity, on which, see, for example, Clark (1999).
[13] This is the opinion of Gallay (1964:81, fn.1).

> The decree of your inimitable goodness is not barbarian, but Greek and rather Christian. But the Armenian, upon whom you have lavished exceeding honour, is quite frankly a barbarian and far from our distinction.

It is clear, therefore, that one can be Greek and Christian in Gregory's opinion, and that being Christian – rather than being something 'barbarian' – is in no way opposed to being Greek. This thesis shall explore this joining together of what was, for some, irreconcilable parts as portrayed in his poetry.[14] Nevertheless, the use of *paideia* (or being recognised as a *pepaideumenos*) in order to further enhance or cement one's social standing continues into the era of Christian dominance,[15] and – as we shall see below – is made explicit in the epistolary poem of Nicoboulus Sr. to his son Nicobuolus who prays that his son might take the first place among his peers in whatever place he decides to pursue *mythoi* (culture) (see below). Furthermore, this agonistic context, in which displaying one's *paideia* is the means to victory, is explicitly explored and utilised by Gregory (as we shall see in Chapter 3). Despite writers such as Tatian and Tertullian making clear their disdain for "Athens" and the Greek wisdom it represented, there seems to have been little desire for such men to set up Christian schools for Christian students and teachers.[16] Christians, therefore, by and large saw no great problem in being taught by and with non-Christians on a non-Christian curriculum that had changed little over the centuries of (Greco-)Roman rule.[17]

One of the more interesting ways of displaying one's *paideia* (though only recently better valued and understood by scholars) is the practice of producing literature in the second degree - auxiliary literature.[18] Here, the purpose of literature is not so much to produce something that is captivating or innovative; there is rarely any sort of narrative to these kinds of works, and little of originality may be attributed to them. Nevertheless, as König and Whitmarsh point out (2007:22):

> What you know says a great deal about who you are. Knowledge is intimately tied up with social self-positioning. In the east of the empire, for example, mastery of abstruse rhetorical or literary knowledge was widely associated with social distinction.

For many of Gregory's contemporaries, the Bible would have been an abstruse piece of literature, in that it did not make up any part of their formal (and often extensive) education, except for what may have been taught within the household (discussed more below). As we shall see in the second chapter of this thesis, Gregory utilises this kind of literature to display his own expertise in an obscure, but increasingly more socially relevant, body of literature that would come to be the canon

[14] On Hellenism in Late Antiquity and the various (non-)Christian views on "Greekness", see Bowersock (1990).
[15] For a general discussion of the development of Christian Society form a sociological/anthropological perspective, see Becker (2011), and Vuolanto (2013) on the socialisation of elite children. It should be noted that I use the word *pepaideumenos* loosely to denote someone who is a well-educated, elite member of Greco-Roman society.
[16] On the schools of Athens associations with "Paganism", see Wilson (1983:36-42). The work of Breitenbach (2003:127-256) shows just how central Athens was in shaping the lives and writings of Basil and Gregory Nazianzen.
[17] On this, see particularly Marrou (1956), Clarke (1971:119-129), Cribiore (1996 and 2017), Morgan (1998), and Webb (2017).
[18] For scholarship on this area, see Chapter 2 this thesis, in which this matter is discussed in much more detail.

of the Bible. For most scholars, this group of poems has been worthy of little attention and much scorn; but we shall see that the 'repetitive patterns' found in these poems that recount the miracles of the Gospels, the plagues of Egypt, and so on, aid the reader in accumulating scriptural knowledge, 'imprinting the grooves of knowledge on to the reader's mind through their relentlessly recurring yet endlessly varying rhythms' (p.23). As we shall see, the idea of varying rhythms is quite central to these polymetric poems.

In Brown's *Power and Persuasion*, we see the use of *paideia* not only as a means of being powerful, but also as a means of speaking to or setting boundaries on power and the powerful. His brief analysis of Ammianus Marcellinus' history shows just how much violence and the loss of order played on the mind of the late 3rd/early 4th century elite male. Those who were lacking in *paideia* were often in power – like the irate Valentinian I – and a lack of proper education tended, for Ammianus, to go hand in hand with a propensity for anger and violence. *Paideia*, therefore, is a means of bringing measure and order not only into one's speech/literary output, but also into one's actions, as well as that of society as a whole.[19] Bringing measure to his work is one of the reasons Gregory gives for writing poetry, as we shall see below. The *pepaideumenoi*, therefore, was supposed to have a certain *parrhesia* (freedom of speech), the ability to speak frankly to the powerful and violent through the common code of communication and the network of friendships that *paideia* provided the elite man (pp.61-70). This role was traditionally that of the philosophers, but a new figure emerges with the rise of Christendom and its influence on those who held power, the bishop and the ascetic. As Brown notes (p.78):

> Acting, frequently, in alliance with monks, bishops could display a form of *parrhesia* that was better calculated to sway the will of the emperor … than was the discreet lobbying of the men of *paideia*. For they claimed to speak for the populations of troubled cities at a time of mounting crisis.

The men of *paideia*, such as Eunapius and Libanius, could often be incredibly negative of themonks, seeing them as an uneducated rabble, a blight on the countryside and a menace in the cities (pp. 71-75). The bishops and other early apologists of Christian belief could also be incredibly negative and suspicious of *paideia* and its fruits, writers such as Tertullian and Jerome (both well-educated men) could speak very negatively of the Classics and the fruits that they bore. We have not the time to discuss this in detail here, but we will look much more closely below at Gregory's close contemporaries and their views on *paideia*, so as to better understand how clearly Gregory Nazianzen stands out from his Cappadocian contemporaries.[20] It suffices to say here that it will quickly become apparent that Gregory sees his role as Bishop as one that incorporates, of a necessity, the fruits of *paideia*, and that the ideal bishop is one who is a master of both sacred and profane wisdom (discussed in ch.1 of this thesis).

[19] Gregory has a poem *Against Anger* (*Carm*. 1.2.25), on which, see Oberhaus (1991).
[20] See also the comments of Jaeger (1962:78) on Nazianzen's *paideia*, as well as this work in general for his thoughts on *paideia* and early Christianity.

Finally, mention must be made of the highly influential article by Alan Cameron, *Wandering Poets* (1965), which outlines a phenomenon that begins near the end of the fourth Century: the habit of (particularly Egyptian) poets to wander the Roman world from city to city in search of patrons, power, and influence. We can take for example the poet Olympiodorus of Thebes, whom, Photius tells us, was a poet by trade. He became highly influential at the Imperial court, and it seems that his profession as poet qualified him to take on diplomatic duties for the empire, acting as ambassador for Rome to the Hunnic king Donatus in 412 (p.490).[21] Cameron makes clear just how often poets would use their craft to try (and perhaps fail miserably) in obtaining real power in the Roman empire – either through the awarding of an Imperial post or through holding high position in the court of an emperor or prominent general or politician (pp.497-507). On the one hand, Gregory is quite unlike the wandering poets discussed by Cameron. He does not write the kinds of poetry (panegyrics and epithalamia) that were the bread and butter of these poets; nor does he wander from *polis* to *polis* in search of patrons, for whom he might write poetry, or pupils, whom he might teach as a grammarian. However, as we shall see throughout this thesis, Gregory is concerned with his poetry having an influence on his readers – not only about the subjects of these poems (such as Scripture, asceticism and marriage, and the Trinity) but also concerning his own self-image.[22] In other words, scholars must look beyond the image which Gregory himself generates in his poem *On His Own Verses* of the old, withering poet who writes these verses as a sort of swansong, a comfort in his old age, and see the possibility that these poems – like the poems of the wandering poets – where a means of Gregory exercising his power and influence over his audience through these displays of his *paideia*. After all, '[t]he reason poetry qualified a man for office no less than rhetoric is that poetry, classicizing poetry, was *paideia* in its most concentrated form' (Al. Cameron, 2007:31). And so, an exploration of Gregory's conception and use of *paideia* should naturally start with (or at least include in detail) an exploration of his poetry.

I have provided above a very brief excursus into the realm of *paideia*, long enough, however, to show just how elusive and "catch-all" (and, therefore, unhelpful) this word can be. If we were to go with the definition of Werner Jaeger, that 'literature is *paideia*' (1962:92) then I could very well be talking about anything to do with Greek literature and culture when I discuss the concept of *paideia*. Nevertheless, I would like to identify four areas of *paideia* (education/culture/literature) that are of importance to this thesis and provide for it its main research focus(es): (1) Gregory's knowledge of, familiarity with, and utilisation/manipulation of the literary tradition. (2) His use of *paideia* as a communication code for self-fashioning, as well as for fashioning his friends and enemies. (3) His pedagogy, that is, the didactic methods used to teach biblical knowledge and theological doctrine. (4) The place of contemporary, high (profane) culture in the Christian (ascetic) life. In other words, Gregory's conception of (a Christian) *paideia*. Each chapter will deal with one or more of these areas, as will be made clearer in our

[21] On Olympiodorus, see Cavero (2008:10-11).
[22] See Al. Cameron (2007:31).

thesis outline below. These four criteria will shape our answering of the first two of our three research questions outlined above: What is Gregory Nazianzen's conception of *paideia* in his poetry and how does he make use of *paideia*? The final question (What role does it play in the formation of his Christian identity?) will, of course, also be shaped by these criteria, but in particular we shall be looking at Gregory's conception of the ideal bishop (outlined in ch.1) who is *prytanis* (leader) of both sacred and profane wisdom, thus guiding the majority of our discussion (chs.2-4) towards poems of a more Christian/theological bent and an exploration of how Gregory brings together his sacred and profane learning.

Methodology

Except for the first chapter, which deals with the epitaphs written by Gregory, all of my chapters deal with poems which the Migne edition of the poems, found in the *Patrologia Graeca*, vol.37, terms *carmina dogmatica* or *moralia* – that is, poems which deal with explicitly Christian themes, such as the Bible (ch.2), asceticism and virginity (ch.3), or the Trinity and Salvation history (ch.4). The reason for this shall become much clearer once I outline my hypothesis. The Migne edition distinguishes the poems on a reasonable, even if somewhat arbitrary, basis but I did not set out to explore only the poems that had an explicitly theological/religious bent – and it is true that other poems within other groupings (such as poems concerning himself, and the poems concerning others) could possibly be considered and of use to my thesis. In other words, other poems by Gregory could well help us understand his use of conception of *paideia*, and the poems discussed below are not the only ones that are of interest to my research question.

However, as my methodology involves conducting close, detailed analyses of the poems, and since little scholarship has been conducted which involves looking at these poems closely (given that we are still waiting for a critical edition/commentary/translation for most of the poems, and since the poems are normally used by scholars as a sort of data mine to provide evidence for discussions on his life or theology), I believe that it is worth focussing closely on a select number of poems that have been misinterpreted or misrepresented by scholars thus far (as shall become clearer as the thesis progresses). In this way, I hope that the research contained within this thesis will show the need for scholars concerned with the works of Nazianzen to truly get to grips with his poetry, to examine it closely (a difficult task given the lack of the necessary scholarly tools for now), and not to view them only as a source from which we can mine interesting data about his life, for prosopographical details of others', or further evidence for his theology – mostly understood by theologians through his orations. Rather, these poems should be viewed as literary works by (and for) an educated and eloquent (Greco-Ro)man, and so a better understanding of Gregory's *paideia* is essential to a sounder reading of his poetry. Also, in focussing on particular poems, I am able to bring the poems into a dialogue with Gregory's other works (both orations and epistles), in order to conduct a much clearer and more focussed analysis of these poems, and to outline more clearly the conception of *paideia* in Gregory's poetry, which, as we shall see, is used and evoked differently in his other forms of literary output. Scholars have done much to move our understanding of Gregory's poetry beyond the conception of these works as shoddy versifications,

the scribblings of an old, frail and embittered bishop, towards understanding these poems as literary works that, although they do not reach the heights of a Homer, Callimachus or Nonnus, are in fact intricate and well-crafted pieces that reflect not only his theology, but the culture and education (*paideia*) of their writer and his peers.

Therefore, my analysis of these poems sits more within the school of reception theory, that values the contemporary reader's reception of these works, as well as the texts' reception of other texts.[23] This is not to say that a search for the "meaning" of these poems is of no interest to me – or that there is no meaning at all but that which the reader gives it – but rather, my concern is the role that *paideia* plays in creating an identity for the author/narrator, establishing a relationship between author and reader (as well as a mode of communication), and providing a ground upon which the author/narrator can play with or manipulate the readers' expectations based on their shared bond of *paideia* as common education and shared culture (that is, what we read, how we read, and the cultural spaces/moments that a text inhabits – as noted above).

Nevertheless, it should be noted that I do not take any hard line on the theory which informs my reading of these texts. After all, we do not talk so much about "reception theory" as "reception theories" and the many different kinds of readers which theorists have created (the mock reader, the implied reader, the elite/lay reader, and so on). However, it is worth noting that, giving the erudite nature of the particular poems studied in this thesis, and of ancient Greek poetry itself, it would not be too bold an assertion to make if we claim that Gregory's contemporary readers – and all those who read his works in the original Greek – are *pepaideumenoi* to some degree. That is, they share in the *paideia* in which Gregory was extensively schooled in his formative years throughout the Mediterranean world – from Caesarea Mazaca, to Caesarea Palestine, Alexandria and Athens which was the centre, if not the birthplace (as Jaeger may have it), of *paideia*.[24] In short, my claim to be influenced by reception theory is that I will be concerned not with the text in and of itself, existing in a sort of vacuum, but with the contemporary reader, the author, and the text of the poems as they exist in relation to each other and to other texts which would form the foundations of Greek *paideia*. I am, therefore, attempting to address a gap in the scholarship which McGuckin (2006:194) identifies when he notes how few scholars have analysed 'the poetry in terms of its own matrices and intellectual contexts, that is the rhetorical and literary expectations of Second Sophistic rhetoric' – and to this we should add the literature and culture of the Second/Third Sophistic more generally. Furthermore, by focussing on explicitly "religious/theological" poems, I will dispel the views of scholars such as Stroumsa, who suggests that the rise of Christianity in Late Antiquity meant that 'identity became defined in religious terms, rather than in mainly ethnic or cultural-linguistic ones, as was the case in the Hellenistic and

[23] It should also be noted that Reception theory was to a degree influenced by the close reading and textual analysis of formalist theories such as New Criticism and Formalist theories in general – this can be seen most clearly in Chapter 2 of this thesis. On these theories see Holub (1984) for an introduction and overview of Reception Theory, and Willis (2018), especially her chapter on readers (pp. 68-107).
[24] See Whitmarsh (2001:7-9) on the centrality of Athens in the education of Greece and the formation of Hellenism.

Roman worlds' (2012:179). Gregory's letter to Amphilochus quoted above is enough to show that cultural and linguistic acumen was (just as) important as religious credentials. Nevertheless, this thesis will hope to elucidate upon this further. Finally, I hope to contribute to the growing change of perspective amongst scholars, who are moving away from the opinions of the likes of Keydell (1950b:142-143), who see Gregory's poetry as *ein Seitenschössling am Baum der griechischen Literaturgeschichte* coming from a personality that was devoid of Greek *Bildung* (education) due to his deeply help Christian convictions. As we will see, nothing could be further from the truth.

Thesis Outline

I will begin the thesis by outlining the debate surrounding *paideia* amongst Gregory's contemporaries, beginning with the emperor Julian whose school edict made the education of Christians a source of great contention and debate amongst Christian (and Pagan) writers. Then I shall look at the concept and use of *paideia* in the writings of Basil (especially his *Ad Adulescentes*) and Gregory of Nyssen (focussing particularly on his *Life of Moses*), for whom we have much more direct and detailed discussions of the topic in their writings. Finally, I will move on to Gregory himself, focussing here on his *Orations* 4-5 against the Emperor Julian, then moving on to his poem *On His Own Verses* and two epistolary poems (*Carm.* 2.2.4-5), one addressed from Nicoboulus jr. to his father, Nicoboulus, and the other addressed from the father to the son. These two epistolary poems are the clearest exposition by Gregory of his views on the merits of education and, as we shall see, will be vital to our understanding of *paideia* in the other poems discussed throughout this thesis.

In my first chapter, I will explore the epitaphs of Gregory, focussing in particular on his portrayal of deceased (mostly male) contemporaries, as well as the epitaphs for himself. Here we will see how deep Gregory's knowledge of and familiarity with the literary tradition is, as well as how much he appreciates *paideia* as a mode of self-fashioning and projecting one's elite status. Furthermore, we will begin to see just how nuanced Gregory's understanding and use of *paideia* can be, especially when we compare Gregory's portrayal of the deceased in the epitaphs with his portrayal of them in his orations, or in his correspondence with them, thus questioning whether or not Gregory even has one particular conception of *paideia*. Finally, we see that Gregory's image of the ideal bishop is one who is a leader (*prytanis*) in both sacred and profane literature, in other words, the bishop must be master of both Scripture and the Classics in order to form Gregory's ideal of a leader, and teacher, of the ecclesiastical community – and so we have a clearer understanding of Gregory's ideal pedagogue of the Christian faith. It is this aspect in particular, Gregory's concept of the learned bishop, that shapes the rest of this thesis. For we shall see just how Gregory brings together sacred and profane learning by exploring explicitly theological poems that, I will argue, can be better understood and appreciated once examined through the lens of sophistic (profane) Greek culture (*paideia*).

In chapter 2, we begin this exploration by looking at the biblical poems (*Carm.* 1.1.12-27). These polymetric poems have offered little to scholars looking for autobiographical or theological

information on Gregory, as there is little to no exegesis contained within these lines, and the poems often simply catalogue events/information that can be found within the Scriptures (in shoddy verse, no less). However, as we shall see, a closer examination of Gregory's metre will show a conscious effort to adjust the metre (without completely abandoning the quantitative metre, as would happen in later centuries) to accommodate the developments of spoken Greek, thus reflecting efforts by other poets, such as Nonnus. Gregory's attempt not only to restructure the metre, but also to put such a difficult subject matter (due especially to the Semitic names) into metre, show clearly that Gregory seeks to display his *paideia* within these poems, increasing his credentials among his peers as a Christian litterateur by versifying in Greek metre a text originally written in a barbarian tongue. Furthermore, once read within the context of the secondary literature produced by the Second Sophistic writers, we gain a better understanding of why Gregory wrote such poems and what pedagogical functions they may have had within Gregory's contemporary, literate audience – even if these poems offer little in the traditional fields of biblical didactic (such as exegetical or philological insight into the Scriptures).

In chapter 3, we move on to *Carmina* 1.2.1, a poem on Virginity. Asceticism was a topic which generated much debate and discussion in the fourth century – among Christians and Pagans alike. Indeed, it could be an area of high contention, not only because Pagans (and Christians) often saw ascetics as a nuisance to the cities and a scourge upon the countryside – as well as a cause of grave scandal – but also because their life seemed inimical to the values of educated, elite, Greco-Roman society. The poem begins with a hymn in praise of virginity followed by a contest (*agon*) between Marriage and Virginity personified. Klaus Sundermann (1991) published a commentary of the poem in which he expresses the belief that the opening 214 lines, the hymn, make up a separate poem altogether. I argue, however, that the poem is in fact a unity, and that this unity can be fully understood once the poem is examined through the lens of the sophistic, cultural practice of agonistic display. Therefore, it is only once we establish the importance of *paideia* - both its various literary manifestations and its display in agonistic social practices – that this poem (and Gregory's poems in general) can be better understood and appreciated in regards both to its meaning(s) and the readers' response(s) to it. We also see that Gregory, unlike many of his contemporaries, did not necessarily see profane culture as inherently opposed or harmful to the ascetical Christian life as Virginity personified displays a vast education in her response to Marriage.

Finally, in chapter 4, we shall re-evaluate the *Poemata Arcana* of Gregory, a group of poems that have received the most scholarly attention amongst the poems studied here. I propose in this chapter to reconsider these poems, and the general impression which scholars have of Gregory's poetry as a whole, an image which Gregory himself perpetuates, that of the old bishop writing verse as a final swansong (see our discussion on the *Poem On His Own Verse* below). In bringing these poems into conversation with the *Theological Orations* written upon the same topic and delivered at Constantinople during his ministry there, we see that a proper understanding of the Trinity can only be found with a proper understanding of *paideia* one that does not obsess over

Aristotelian logic so important in the various dialogues of antiquity (and Gregory's opponent, Eunomius), but that taps into the whole literary range of Greek culture, especially its more esoteric/mythological realms. These poems, therefore, are an example of Gregory's *paideia* in action. *Paideia* was vital to Gregory's identity as a bishop whose duty it was to propagate and defend the Faith. For Gregory, this could only be done by one who was a leader of both sacred and profane learning. *Paideia,* then, is not an inheritance which must be viewed with constant suspicion, kept at arm's length, or meticulously censored, but a vital tool to the bishop in evangelisation. After all, as we shall see below, *paideia* is a gift of Christ, and the very summit and seal of Gregory's own learning.

In essence we could see this thesis as four studies on our research question, looking specifically at the four focuses outlined above. However, it must be noted that our first chapter does direct the focuses of the following three, as we look more specifically at Gregory's practice/actualisation of his identity as bishop/*prytanis* of sacred and profane wisdom. In our final conclusion, I will outline our findings from each of the chapters under the four research focuses outline above, as well as finishing with some more general concluding remarks.

Before moving on, I would like to address the question of Gregory's audience. For all of these poems, it is very difficult to ascertain who exactly his audience were and when the poems were written and disseminated. Dates and potential audience will be discussed *passim* throughout the thesis were relevant but what is important for our thesis is to establish that these poems were most definitely read by those who could be considered as *pepaideumenoi* – that is, those who have had an extensive education in Greek literature, as it would be very difficult to read and understand Gregory's archaic (at least for his contemporaries) language and metre.

Education and Culture in the works of Gregory's Contemporaries:

Julian[25]

The emperor Julian (known as 'the Apostate') is one of the most influential figures in Gregory's writings.[26] It is largely thanks to the work of Gregory that Julian became, in the minds of later Christians, the devilish figure who abandoned Christ and persecuted his once fellow Christians.[27] We will look at this influence on Gregory in more detail below, but for now we must look briefly at Julian's ideas of education and culture. The work of Bouffartigue (1992) is certainly the most

[25] On Julian, see *PLRE* s.v. Fl. Claudius Iulianus (29), Hauser-Meury (1960:101-109) and Simmons (2017).
[26] Elm (2012) is most relevant to our discussion as it compares the life and work of Julian and Gregory – see also Limberis (2000) which conducts a comparison of Julian, Gregory, and Libanius. See also the two-volume work of Negri (translated by Arese [1905]), Leipoldt (1964), Bowersock (1978.), Kaldellis (2007:143-154), Browning (1975), Athanassiadi (1981a) for a biography of Julian and for a discussion of Julian's *paideia* (pp.121-160), and Smith (1995) who discusses Julian's education and anti-Christian polemics/politics.
[27] See especially Elm (2012b:9-15) and Teitler (2017) who looks at how the image of Julian as a Pagan "bogey-man" was sustained throughout antiquity.

extensive monograph on Julian's reception and attempts and manipulation of Greek culture, and the author draws his conclusions from an extensive reading of the extant works of Julian. [28]

As Bouffartigue notes, *paideia* is essential (along with good birth and nature) to the making of the virtuous man. When understood properly, it will also lead him away from the ravings of the Galileans to the sound doctrine of the Hellenists (Pagans) (p.586) – although not all Pagans need have *paideia*, for even the priests, Julian accepts, do not need it more than they need piety and pity for the poor (p.592-593). It's importance, however, goes beyond its shaping of the individual towards the shaping of elite society, and the elite individuals' ability to operate within it. *Paideia* provides for elite society a code of communication for its members, a way for one to recognise the education and culture of another. Furthermore, it provides the means by which one can trump one's elite peers in displaying more successfully one's *paideia*, or convincing one's audience that your understanding of Greek literature and culture is much grander than the other's; and so *paideia* can provide a means to strengthen the bonds between members of elite society (a shared *paideia*), as well as to diminish your enemy's standing within society by "showing them up" for their lack of *paideia* (pp.588-590). Given that sound *paideia* would inevitably lead, for Julian, to religious Hellenism, it is also clear that there is an explicitly religious element to Julian's *paideia*. The ideal teacher for Julian is not one who simply imbues his pupils with all the learning of literature, rhetoric, and the philosophers, but who acts also as a spiritual guide to his pupils (pp. 594-596).

When it comes to poetry, Bouffartigue notes that poetry is for Julian '*l'objet d'une appreciation hésitante, qui oscille entre le rejet et la reverence*' (p.614). Dramatic poetry (or rather the theatre) is held in particularly low regard by Julian (p.615). Nevertheless, the poets – such as Homer and Hesiod – do contain essential truths that are mixed in with their fictions, and the problem is not so much with poetry as versification, but poetry that contains myth (fiction). Finally, Julian does not completely reject myth but notes its usefulness in conveying mystical knowledge which can only be for the initiated. Myth therefore, can be used theologically (such as in Plato and Orpheus) or ethically (such as in Xenophon) (p.618). We will see below that Gregory – although not outlining a clear doctrine of myth – is happy to use this word in a number of ways and to make his own myths (sometimes in Orphic fashion) to expound his theological views.

The conflation of *paideia* with a particular religious and moral outlook is best exemplified in Julian's school edict – normally known as his school edict "against Christian professors", but I believe that the edict issued by Julian aimed not only at Christians. I discuss this in more detail in Ch.1, but for now it suffices to say that the edict – whether interpreted as a strict ultimatum to Christian teachers or (as McLynn [2014:127-130] argues) an edict which has ambiguous language and was enforced selectively and not uniformly throughout the empire – clearly shows that education, culture, and religion were inextricably linked for Julian. In essence, this edict sought to restrict Christian teachers from teaching the liberal arts, since they did not believe in the gods of the authors which they taught, and so Julian accuses such Christian professors of dishonesty. There is

[28] See also Tanaseanu-Döbler (2012:105-117).

little evidence to suggest that this edict was also aimed at students too, but it would, nevertheless, imply that Christians students would be equally dishonest as Christian teachers if they were to engage in such learning. It was a move that was not widely applauded, even by non-Christian figures – such as Ammianus Marcellinus. Nevertheless, the edict – both for Julian's contemporaries and scholars of today – is considered Julian's act of throwing down the gauntlet for his Christian subjects. Either conform to the *true* understanding of *paideia*, or face exclusion from elite society. As Kaldellis notes (2007:144), '[Julian's] legacy was a constant reminder that Hellenism was not, as many wanted to believe, merely a docile handmaiden of the faith but rather could be activated as a powerful alternative to it.' Gregory Nazianzen would go on to issue a direct response to Julian after his death, but before we examine this, we must consider how Gregory's closest contemporaries viewed (without explicit mention of the Apostate) the problem posed by Julian: Basil, his closest (and most problematic) friend, and Basil's brother Gregory Nyssen.[29]

Basil

Basil, who became archbishop of Caesarea Mazaca, is one of the most influential and well-known fathers of the Church.[30] Like Gregory Nazianzen, Basil was a well-educated man who travelled to many of the centres of education in the Roman world to acquire the *paideia* that was needed for any elite Roman to advance in society, notably studying with Libanius in Antioch and then later in Athens along with Gregory Nazianzen before returning to his family in Cappadocia. It is after his departure from Athens that he then went on quite a different journey, no longer in search of teachers who could lead him further in the ways of *paideia*, but in the ways of the Christian ascetics. Much has already been written about Basil's life and writings, but we must concern ourselves with a speech (often called a 'letter', however) which Basil delivered, most likely in a period of personal transition from the life of a sophist and man of the *polis* to the life of a Christian clergyman and ascetic, circa 365 AD:[31] Basil's *Address to Young Men: How they might profit from Greek Literature* (from here on simply the *Ad Adulescentes*).

This speech delivered to Basil's nephews - and perhaps also their parents and teachers – concerns itself primarily with the merit of reading Greek literature.[32] However, as we shall see, the interpretation of this speech, and what exactly Basil's purpose is, has not readily found consensus amongst scholars. Fortin (1981:189-190) argues that '[h]is specific purpose in the present case is to explain how the works of the pagan authors can lead to a better understanding of the Christian

[29] On the social class of the Cappadocian fathers, see Kopecek (1973).
[30] On Basil, see *PGRSRE*, s.v. Basil of Caesarea (209) and Hauser-Meury (1960:39-44). See Rousseau (1990 and 1994) for a biography of Basil and the edited volume of Fedwick (1981) in two parts that covers a wide range of scholarship on Basil. See also the PhD thesis of Fitzpatrick (1988) for a discussion of education in Basil, Nazianzen, and John Chrysostom, Hose (2004:34) quoting Jaeger (1963:60) says that this speech is a *Magna Charta aller christlichen Bildung fur die kommenden Jahrhunderte* and is important for distinguishing the difference between Latin and Greek poetry, of which the former is vibrant and innovative and the latter stale and but a pale imitation of Homer. See Campbell (1922) for the influence of the Second Sophistic on the orations of Basil.
[31] I agree with the dating outlined by McLynn (2010:112-113).
[32] We must keep in mind that this was not a particularly Christian preoccupation, for even Plutarch concerned himself with how the young man should read poetry, on which, see Whitmarsh (2001:49-54) and Hunter (2009:169-201).

faith.' Yet Fortin goes on to point out how Basil distorts his plethora of classical references, such as the story of Odysseus' encounter with the sirens, thus making his classical literary *exempla* much more problematic to the attentive listener/reader, as the examples – once properly examined – are not so useful in providing an example of virtue. Fortin believes such distortions to be a calculated move by Basil (p.194). Basil does this, Fortin believes, so as to precondition the young minds of his listeners to read the Classics as books devoted primarily to the praise of virtue (p.196):

> If the secret of Basil's success lay anywhere, it was … in his ability to fill the ears of his students with the metaphorical wax of Christian principles. The immediate impact of such a device was less to teach the student to discriminate between the objectionable and the non-objectionable parts of the works that he read than to blind him … to the true nature of the objectionable parts.

Basil, then, sets up his nephews to read the Classics with a Christian bias, seeing in them only the seeds which blossom in the Gospels and the rest of Scripture. Rousseau's analysis of this speech (1994:48-57) concludes that the speech is not at all well organised, as Basil admits himself that he loses the thread of his thought at one point (p.55). For Rousseau, this text ultimately shows Basil's general trajectory away from the Classics and the received culture and education of the Greeks towards the Christian asceticism which he cultivated in his time after Athens.[33]

My own view is much more in line with that of Fortin, and more recently McLynn (2010) who argues – along a similar line to Fortin – that the oration is, in essence, a backhanded compliment to the traditional curriculum of educating young, elite men - indeed the only curriculum available. Basil, therefore, could not exhort his nephews to abandon their education, since he himself was so steeped in the *paideia* which his nephews also craved (as well as their parents, who no doubt hoped their sons go on to hold prominent positions within society which a good education promised). The best for which Basil could hope would be to show up the learned professors in his audience, making clear that their education held little real value for these children outside the winning of temporal fame and wealth; and – a point which McLynn does not touch upon – to entice his nephews to follow in his footsteps. For he tells them at the very opening of his oration not to surrender their minds to those men completely (1.4-5) – that is, the authors of the Classics as well as its teachers – and then goes on to make clear that the real height of education, the learning which needs the fullness of maturity, is the learning of Scripture. His main audience, his nephews, have yet to reach that maturity (2.4), and their uncle ultimately leaves off his speech unfinished, promising to recommend the rest of his advice 'through the whole of my life' (10.8). Basil is clearly enticing his nephews to keep their eyes on him and his example. It is difficult to know how his audience might have received this (deliberately unfinished) speech. Perhaps he impressed his audience with his great learning, perhaps rubbed a few of them up the wrong way in his infantilization of them, but perhaps also Basil has goaded them too to follow their uncle in one day leaving behind their education and what their family would expect of them (a career in the civil service) to follow in his trend-setting footsteps. Basil may not have been the first Christian ascetic,

[33] See also Cazeaux (1980), Van Dam (2002), Beneker (2011), the PhD thesis of Gane (2012) who gives a thorough outline of the scholarship on this work, and Stenger (2016:91-97).

but he was certainly one of the figures who made the greatest contribution to its most popular manifestations.[34] Nevertheless, what is clear here is that the classical tradition, education, and culture did not sit easily with Basil, and was something which he consciously and increasingly distanced himself from throughout his life. In other words, Basil makes clear that he is a *pepaideumenos* in this speech, but he also declares his intention to no longer inhabit the cultural space of *paideia* (as far as a man of his position and education could), favouring instead something which had long been considered opposed to it, the Scriptures.[35] I will argue below that Gregory Nazianzen through his poetry has a much more favourable view of the *pepaideumenoi* and *paideia*, though this view becomes much more nuanced – and complicated – once read in conjunction with his other literary works.[36]

Gregory Nyssen[37]

Basil's brother Gregory has generated an increasing amount of scholarship in recent years and is seen as an able philosopher within the Platonic tradition – perhaps even more so than his brother and Nazianzen – who seems to come into his element after the deaths of Basil and Nazianzen.[38] Although Nyssen does not have an explicit discussion on the merits and shortcomings of Greek literature – like Basil – his work *The Life of Moses* discusses extensively the role of profane learning in Moses' formation and mission.[39] It is this work that Krolikowski (2010:568-575), in his entry on *paideia* in *The Brill Dictionary of Gregory of Nyssa*, uses to elaborate on Nyssen's understanding of Greek education and culture.[40] In book one of *The Life of Moses*, Gregory provides a brief retelling of the life of Moses in accordance with the Scriptures. In book two, he then goes on to elaborate on these various episodes and the deeper, spiritual meaning behind them. We have not time to go over this in great detail, and so it will suffice to focus on particular passages which focus on the role of profane education in Moses' life.

Gregory throughout his *Vita* describes profane education as ἡ ἔξωθεν παίδευσις, often translated as 'Pagan learning', but perhaps a much more accurate translation would be simply 'foreign learning' – as 'Pagan' gives this phrase an overly religious tone which Gregory perhaps does not have in mind. It is clear that Gregory values a good education for the Christian, and that it

[34] On this see Elm (1994) in particular. Other scholarship on asceticism will be given at the start of Ch. 3.
[35] See, also, Breitenbach (2003:253) who notes how little Basil mentions Athens compared to his companion in Athens, Gregory – thus providing further evidence for Basil's desire to distance himself from his secular education once he had left Athens.
[36] We should, therefore, be wary of taking one Cappadocian father's view as reflective the views of the others, as Pelikan does as regards the *Ad Adulescentes* (1993:11).
[37] *PGRSRE* s.v. Gregory of Nyssa (431) and Hauser-Meury (1960:91-92).
[38] See McLynn (2018) where he explores the relationship between Nyssen and Nazianzen as portrayed through their epistles.
[39] See Geljon (2002), Elm (2018:51, fn.5) for bibliography on the date of this work, an interesting article on the role of dress in the first book of the *Life of Moses*; Daniélou (1968) on the text of this work. See, also, the thorough essay of Mosshammer (1997) on Nyssen and Hellenism which highlights just how complex the relationship of Christianity and Hellenism is – though it focusses much more on Nyssen's developing relationship with Platonic philosophy. See also Gager (1972:80-112) which note how Moses was a figured misunderstood and derided by non-Christian figures, such as the emperor Julian.
Krolikowski (2010: 568-575) also notes that Nyssen's relation to *paideia* becomes much more strained and antagonistic, especially with the succession of Julian the apostate to the position of Augustus.

provides protection from life's currents. For Gregory, Moses' basket made from different boards (Κιβωτὸς … διαφόρων σανίδων συμπεπηγυῖα) is the education that is put together from various teachings (ἡ ἐκ ποικίλων μαθημάτων συμπηγνυμένη παίδευσις) that help Moses (i.e. Christians) stay afloat above the waves of life (2.7). Nevertheless, the παίδευσις which is ἔξωθεν is always barren (2.11) and is represented in the life of Moses by his time in the Egyptian palace, where he receives this education. But even in the palace Moses was not separated from his mother's milk, as she served as his wet nurse, despite also being his real mother. For Gregory, this means that, if we must receive a profane education, we must not be separated from the milk of our mother, the Church (2.12).[41] Preferably, the Christian, like Moses, will leave behind his education and go towards higher things.[42] This is presented, rather drastically, in the killing of the Egyptian who fought with the Hebrew. For Gregory, Moses is here siding with virtue and slaying its adversary, and Moses' flight is his fleeing from the wickedness of profane education to pursue the higher mysteries (2.15-16).

Gregory then finishes this exposition on this particular episode with some sort of advice for those who must go through a profane education – that is, the boys (and girls) of families who belonged to the elites who inevitably went through an educational curriculum that had not changed at all with the advent of Christianity.[43] If, like Moses after his flight from Egypt, we must live among foreigners – that is, associate of a necessity with foreign wisdom (τουτέστι κἂν τῇ ἔξω συγγενέσθαι σοφίᾳ καταναγκάζῃ ἡ χρεία) – then we must scatter the shepherds at the well – that is, the teachers of the wicked who converse in the imperfect use of education (τοὺς τῶν κακῶν διδασκάλους ἐπὶ τῇ πονηρᾷ χρήσει τῆς παιδεύσεως διελέγξαντες) (2.17). Gregory, much like his brother Basil, gives us little indication what exactly a good (or bad) education looks like or what it entails. Perhaps the vagueness on their part is deliberate. Undoubtedly all of those reading/listening to these works would have been devoted for a while, if not a long time, to the acquisition of *paideia*. Going into specifics about what a good or bad education is risks alienating their audiences who were inevitably immersed in the education that was for Nyssen foreign (ἔξωθεν). It is enough for both writers to simply plant a seed of doubt in their audience about the value of the education which they received (or were receiving). Gregory's belittlement of profane education, therefore, is less about declaring the Greek education and culture, in which he was formed, anathema, and more about encouraging his audience to reconsider the value of their profane education and to look towards higher things. The goal is to live alone, no longer entangled with or mediating between adversaries (ἰδιάσομεν, οὐκέτι μαχομένοις τισὶ συμπλεκόμενοί τε καὶ μεσιτεύοντες) (2.18). What Gregory is asking his audience to do here is to leave behind the very thing which their education had trained them for, the great, societal contest to be first amongst their

[41] See Penniman (2015), an interesting article on the role of nourishment in Roman society which discusses this passage of Gregory and the importance of *paideia* as nourishment.
[42] Compare this with Nazianzen's use of the Exodus story – as noted by O'Connell (2019:3) – where God's command for the Israelites to despoil the Egyptians is seen as God's chosen people taking what is good from the otherwise wicked Egyptians (*Or.* 45.20).
[43] As Clarke notes (1971:119): 'Even Tertullian, so hostile to pagan culture, did not forbid Christians to send their sons to [secular schools]'.

peers, and to lead a solitary life or, at least (as ἰδιάσομεν may suggest) a private life away from the *agones* (contests) of civic life. We see, then, the similarity that exists between Nyssen and Basil: both call on their peers to look to 'higher things' and to value less, if at all, the things which their education had taught them to appreciate – high social standing, prestige, and glory within their *polis* and the whole empire. Yes, the Cappadocian fathers and their fellow churchmen– as we shall see *passim* throughout this thesis – made good use of their profane education, especially in their correspondences with their contemporaries. But never did they have any outright praise for profane education and the temporal glory and honours which it won. Or did they?[44]

Gregory Nazianzen

Gregory of Nazianzus provides for us the most direct response to Julian's take on *paideia*.[45] *Or*.4, delivered in 364, shortly after the emperor Julian's death in 363 has received much attention from scholars.[46] The main thrust of this oration is clearly an invective against the late emperor, and given his brother Caesarius' close proximity to the Imperial court, scholars have often seen this Oration as a source of Christian gossip on the goings on within the court of Julian. Much has been said on Gregory's response here to Julian's attempts to rob Christians of their access to a system of education that was vital for the elite Roman to participate in society.[47] But I would like to limit my excursus on these orations to some points of interest that will arise later in this thesis.

The most important point of Gregory's argument against Julian's view of education and culture is that Julian is wrong to suggest that *logoi* (words/eloquence) belong only to the worshippers of the Greek pantheon. Gregory makes it clear from the beginning of his oration that Christ Himself is the *Logos* and that it is this epithet which Christ values the most (4.4). As we shall see below, this point is made again in *Carm*. 2.2.5, an epistolary poem from Nicoboulus to his homonymous son in response to another epistolary poem from his son. A little later in this oration, after having made several allusions to the Scriptures, Gregory proclaims (4.17):

> Ὁρᾶτε ὅπως πλέκω τὴν ᾠδὴν θείοις καὶ ῥήμασι καὶ διανοήμασι; καὶ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἀλλοτρίοις ἐπαίρομαί τε καὶ καλλωπίζομαι, καὶ ὥσπερ ἔνθους ὑφ' ἡδονῆς γίνομαι· ἀτιμάζω δὲ ἅπαν ταπεινὸν καὶ ἀνθρώπινον, ἄλλα ἄλλοις συμβιβάζων καὶ συναρμόζων, καὶ εἰς ἓν ἄγων τὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Πνεύματος;
>
> Do you see how I weave my song with divine thoughts and words, and (I do not know how) I am uplifted and adorn myself with the words and thoughts of others, and how I become inspired by pleasure? I disdain everything lowly and human,

[44] See Pelikan (1993:3-21, 169-183) which discusses the Cappadocian fathers and their views of Classical culture. Pelikan here makes a nuanced argument, pointing out that the Cappadocians' relationship to the Classics is anything but straightforward. Nevertheless, the poetry of Gregory is only ever sparsely invoked despite the connection (as I have made clear above) of poetry with *paideia* – for writing poetry can be said to be the highest display of one's *paideia*.

[45] For prosopography, see PLRE, stemma 17 for his family tree, PGRSREs.v. Gregory of Nazianzus (430). See Gallay (1943) and McGuckin (2001) for biographies of Gregory; Moreschini (2006) also provides a biography and overview of Gregory's literary output, philosophy, theology and his reception.

[46] For date of Or.4, see Kurmann (1988). Scholarship will be cited below.

[47] See especially Jaeger (1963:58-64) McGuckin (2001:123-126) Elm (2012:344-401), and De Carvalho (2017).

> ordering and joining these different things together and leading into one the things of the Spirit Himself.[48]

Kurmann (1988:74-75) interprets the ἀλλοτρίοις as the citations from the Bible, but that is already referred to in the opening phrase (θείοις καὶ ῥήμασι), the divine words to which Gregory refers. Furthermore, it would be strange for a Christian to refer to the words of Scripture as ἀλλοτρίοις, which could well be translated as 'foreign things' – the way in which Christians like Gregory of Nyssen often termed non-Christian literature. I believe that it makes much more sense for ἀλλοτρίοις to refer to this Non-Christian literature, to *paideia* as the body of literature which made up the curriculum of Gregory's education. Certainly, Gregory has just given a plethora of biblical exempla before this section, but he does begin here with a very Pindaric reference (πλέκω τὴν ᾠδὴν) and the very idea of the inspired (ἔνθους) singer is also found throughout Greek literature, as Kurmann points out. Gregory will go on to make reference to many parts of Greek literature and philosophy in this oration. It may not be entirely clear in this oration, but Gregory is here referring to the weaving together of sacred and profane learning that – as we shall see – becomes central to his identity as a bishop and the mission which that ecclesiastical role entails for him. For this thesis will make clear that, unlike his Cappadocian contemporaries who would (at least feign) to prefer to leave their profane *paideia* behind them in the land of Egypt, Gregory in his response to Julian makes the Greek literature and culture that Julian would have hoarded for his own religious purposes the servant and gift of Christ.

If we were to read this oration in isolation form Gregory's other works - particularly his poetry, which many scholars thus far have done (and which this thesis aims to put right)[49] – we could perhaps come away with the impression that Gregory had quite a negative view of Greek culture and education. Take, for example, 4.106-109 where Gregory lists the non-Greek origins of important parts of "Greek" culture, such as the alphabet, poetry, or the practice of initiation ceremonies so dear to Julian. Such a tactic was used by various Church fathers to denigrate or distance themselves from Hellenism.[50] Furthermore, if we were to look at Gregory's use of the word 'sophist' (σοφιστής), which can have both positive or negative connotations depending on the author, the use of this word in this oration is always pejorative. There are five examples in total in this speech: at 4.27 when he terms Julian the Sophist of wickedness (τῷ σοφιστῇ τῆς κακίας); 4.55, where Julian is led by a sophist (explicitly opposed to a wise man) into a subterranean sanctuary for a theurgic experience (τοῦ σοφοῦ τὰ τοιαῦτα, εἴτουν σοφιστοῦ); 4.85, where Gregory speaks of Julian's 'sophistical dogma' (τοῦ σοφιστικοῦ δόγματος); 4.94 where Gregory makes clear that it would take a sophist to defend Julian's crimes and hide the truth; and 4.112 where Julian is an evil teacher and sophist (ὁ καινὸς δογματιστής τε καὶ σοφιστής). This in itself would suggest that

[48] All translations are my own unless stated otherwise.
[49] I have in mind here particularly works such as Elm (2012), which has contributed immensely to our understanding of Gregory's work in relation to Julian, but focuses mostly on his Orations and epistles, leaving little room for any extensive discussions of particular poems or his poetic corpus as a whole.
[50] On this, see Kaldellis (2007:124-129), who makes clear just how immersed the topic of Hellenism and Christianity is in shades of grey, for different writers inevitably meant different things when they spoke of Greeks, and not all of them necessarily equated "Hellen" with "Pagan" as many modern scholars do.

Gregory thought the word sophist, and those who termed themselves so, as despicable. Ruether (1969:156-167) discusses Gregory's attitude to Greek literature and also notes the disdain with which he speaks of sophistry which seeks only to win applause.[51] Speaking generally of Gregory's views, Ruether says (p.156):

> Much of the time [Gregory] sounds as if Christians should have nothing to do with pagan culture or the niceties of sophistic eloquence … In terms of content his writings achieved in a high degree the synthesis of Christianity with classical culture, and yet there seems to be little development of a corresponding theoretical rationale for his synthesis.

Firstly, there is at least one example of Gregory using the term 'sophist' positively for his teacher Prohaeresius, as we shall see in our discussion of the *Epitaphia* (Ch.1). Even if this is the only example of a positive use of the term σοφιστής, it is enough for us to at least see that Gregory's view of the sophists (that is, those who thought themselves to be preeminent embodiments of Greek *paideia*)[52] is not as straightforward as this oration on its own would suggest. Secondly, we must come to terms with the fact that scholars who have tended to focus on Gregory's orations – with the epistles taking second place, and the poems a distant third – have (perhaps unexpectedly) skewed the picture by ignoring this corpus of poems (if not heaping large helpings of scorn and derision upon them).[53] We shall see below that, once particular poems are closely analysed and brought into a dialogue with his other works (and the works of his contemporaries), Gregory's concept and use of *paideia* quickly become much more intricate, interesting, and vibrant, even if he does not provide the 'theoretical rationale' which Ruether seeks.

But before we look at Gregory's poetry and what it can tell us about his *paideia,* we must briefly consider *Carm.* 2.1.39, the poem *On His Own Verse*.[54] This poem outlines Gregory's reasons for writing poetry.[55] Gregory himself outlines four reasons for writing verse upon which scholars have focussed most of their attention (vv. 34-57): (a) To restrain his lack of measure in writing/speaking, as the metre is a struggle for him (Καμὼν τὸ μέτρον); (b) for the delight of young people who take pleasure in literature in order to lead them to more useful things, making sweet the harsh commandments (γλυκάζων τὸ πικρὸν τῶν ἐντολῶν); (c) Gregory cannot abide 'Pagans' to have greater eloquence than 'us' (οὐδ' ἐν λόγοις / Πλέον δίδωμι τοὺς ξένους ἡμῶν ἔχειν); (d) to find comfort in writing verse in his sick, old age. Hose (2004:24) believes that motives (a) and (d) do not necessitate the writing of poetry – other literary outlets could fulfil the same function (epistles, for example) – and (b) and (c) are, in his opinion, not met when one examines the poems

[51] Yet we should keep in mind that sophists themselves would inveigh against their fellow orators whose only aim was to please the crowd – such as Aristides, as Gleason points out (1995:122).
[52] We shall discuss the sophists (and the Second/Third Sophistic) in much more detail in Ch.1.
[53] Ruether focusses mostly on the orations and epistles, but only looks at two poems in her analysis, *Carm.* 2.1.11 and *Carm. Ad Seleucum* (*Carm.* 2.2.8). For such scorn of Gregory's poetry among scholars, see Ch.2.
[54] For a broad overview of Gregory's poetry see Dihle (1989:604-607).
[55] I agree with Demoen (2009:55-58) that this poem is not an *Ars Poetica*, providing Gregory's definitive opinion on his poetry and reasons for writing it. I hope to correct through my thesis some of the overemphasis which scholars have placed on – a very few lines of - this poem and show that we cannot let this poem completely shape our understanding of Gregory's poems, for it is unlikely that he meant this to be a programmatic poem for his entire corpus.

themselves.[56] Hose then goes on to briefly mention some of the poems discussed in this thesis, such as the poem on Virginity (*Carm.* 1.2.1) and says that these poems could simply be read as prose treatises once the metre has been broken up. Hose, ultimately, is following Wyss and Keydell (discussed *passim* in this thesis) who argue that Gregory's poetry is merely versified prose, *dass er damit in der Tradition der Rhetorik-Schule steht.* Hose concludes with a remark from Wyss that *seine Gedichte gehören nicht zu jener Poesie, die über Zeiten und Volker hinweg immer neue Herzen zu erobern vermag* (Hose, 2004:25). But even if we were to take the poem on Virginity mentioned by Hose, we will soon see that German scholarship (in the form of a commentary on the poem by Sundermann [1991]) is quick to dismiss (and, in Sundermann's case, butcher) Gregory's poetry without even considering the possibility that there is anything of merit to Gregory's poetry; that perhaps it is more than a rhetorical exercise fit for the classroom alone.[57] As we shall see, the poem on Virginity (discussed in Ch.3) is an intricate weaving together of various literary traditions that shows Gregory's in-depth understanding of Greek literature, an ability to put it into practice and to innovate upon the tradition, and an awareness of the (agonistic) culture in which Greek literature was performed.

Furthermore, this poem has much more to offer in understanding Gregory's impetus behind writing poetry than the four reasons outlined by himself. Firstly, McGuckin (2006:210) notes that there is a fifth reason here, 'to enter into Gregory's innermost mind' (vv. 58-59). McGuckin notes that 'this is a clear evocation of Plato's representation of Socrates' *paideia* as the fulfilment of Delphic piety', but what is of more interest here is that Gregory, in opening up his inner-self within poetry, can only be fully understood if one has had (and embodies) the same extensive education in Greek literature and culture which Gregory himself has had. It is also worth considering the opening lines of this poem (vv. 1-24). In these lines Gregory proclaims that he has seen his contemporaries writing words without measure (Λόγους ἀμέτρους), expending great effort on these words and all for no reward. For Gregory, these words are worthless as the sands of the sea or like the flies of Egypt (Ψάμμου θαλασσῶν ἢ σκνιπῶν Αἰγυπτίων) (v.7). Instead, Gregory advises the following: πάντα ῥίψαντας λόγον / Αὐτῶν ἔχεσθαι τῶν θεοπνεύστων μόνον (throwing away every word, hold on to the divine words alone) (vv. 9-10). Gregory is here talking about the Scriptures (not, as McGuckin [2006:206] argues, his own poetry). But, Gregory goes on, since it is impossible for people to read Scripture only – since the world has become so divided by opposing arguments and a war of words – Gregory has decided to write verse. These opening lines remind one of Juvenal's first *Satire* (not that Gregory would have read it), where he proclaims that, because all are wasting their time writing and reciting Epic, Juvenal would cut his own path by

[56] It should be noted that the sentiment of (c) is not only found in Gregory, but also *AP* 4.3b.113 by Agathias (as noted by Gullo [forthcoming]), and so this is not so much the sentiment of a Christian bishop combatting "pagans", but a writer seeking to surpass his predecessors.

[57] See also Hose (2006) who concludes that there was little impetus in the Greek speaking world to create a Christian poetry (unlike in Latin), and that the general consensus was that poetry was perhaps for non-Christians, though having some didactic value for Christians (as he argues from Clement of Alexandria and Bsail). Gregory, therefore, is an anomaly that Hose would much rather write off as unimpressive and of little value as poetry.

writing satires. A similar idea is found here. Where others write pointlessly their words without measure (speeches, treatises) Gregory will write poetry. But the difference lies deeper than a difference of literary medium. For the works which Gregory's contemporaries write are written with indisputable arguments (Ἀναμφιλέκτους λόγους) which come from their worldly thoughts (τοῖς κάτω νοήμασιν) (vv. 16-17). Gregory's poetry, on the other hand, is divinely inspired. McGuckin notes that Gregory presents himself as 'the resolution of the old schism between the philosopher and the mantic poet' and that just as the Spirit inspired the Scriptures, so too does it inspire Gregory's works, 'and allows him to speak of things which he has seen not from material archetypes, but heavenly ones' (2006:206-207). In this thesis we shall see how Gregory goes about this task of using his poetry as a means of cutting a new path towards getting his theological message across (Ch.4 in particular); but what we shall see that is of interest to our topic in particular is how he wields *paideia*, and forms of literature that *are* explicitly Pagan in a religious sense of the word, in order to argue his point and persuade his reader towards his (Nicene) way of thinking.

Gregory, therefore, makes clear that his poetry marks a change of direction in his literary work, not just by versifying his thoughts (as earlier scholars make out) but also in how he would argue his point (as we shall see). He was to be better than his contemporaries who spouted a myriad of words to no avail; he was an eagle flying higher than his fellow crows, one who was closer to the divine source of everything, and his poetry was to be inspired by this source. Furthermore, it was clearly something which Gregory felt needed justification – hence this poem on his own verses – perhaps because he was unique amongst his close contemporaries for writing such poetry on a wide range of topics and of styles. After all, as far as Basil and Nyssen are concerned, poetry is something from which the Christian – at most – can find some examples of virtuous conduct, if he can discern this from the many examples of nefarious gods and men. It was something that belonged to the learning of the others (ἔξωθεν παίδευσις), and there is no hint in their writings that they ever thought that a Christian should or could write poetry.[58] Contrast this with the sentiments of an epigram found in the *Patrologia* (*PG* 38.96) where Gregory makes it clear that Christians can take delight in poetry:

> Παίζει καὶ πολιή· τὰ δὲ παίγνια, παίγνια σεμνὰ,
> Μιγνυμένης Χριστῷ τῆς ἀταλαφροσύνης
> Καὶ βλοσυρὸν γελόων, τέρπω φρένας. Οἱ δ' Ἑλικῶνες
> Ἔρρετε, καὶ δάφναι, καὶ τριπόδων μανίαι.
>
> Even the old and grey make merry. But little poems, little poems are reverent, when child-like innocence is mixed with Christ. Laughing manfully, I cheer my mind. But the revellers that dwell on Mt. Helicon, be gone with your laurels and madness around the tripods.

[58] We can add, with Hose (2006:84-85), Clement of Alexandria alongside Nyssen and Basil.

Gregory makes clear here that one can engage in the composition of poetry for pleasure without renouncing Christ (or one's masculinity). Furthermore, these poems (παίγνια) can be reverent and Christian. But how does this change in direction, this use of poetry as a medium (along with the literary-historical baggage that comes with it), affect how he conceived of and used *paideia* – especially in relation to the views he espouses in *Or*.4? It is in turning to two epistolary poems which explicitly discuss the merits of *mythoi* (culture) that we shall begin to find answers.

Carm. 2.2.4-5 are two out of the seven epistolary poems in the *PG* (*Poemata quae spectant ad alios*), written in dactylic hexameter and addressed from Nicoboulus to his homonymous father and vice-versa respectively.[59] Gregory wrote these two epistolary poems in the *persona* of the son and father and most likely intended these poems to have a wider readership than the homonymous pair. In the poems, the son begins by insisting (in a way unbecoming of an obedient son of a nobleman) that his father spare no expense in letting him pursue the power of *mythoi* (μύθων κράτος [v.58]), that is, *paideia*. Nicoboulus' plan is to follow the illustrious example of his uncle Gregory, pursue every facet of Greek learning and culture, and then dedicate his *logoi* to the *Logos*.[60] The father then goes on to rebuke the son for his much too forthright exhortation, but grants his request, nevertheless. He makes it clear, however, that he and his son are actually walking a middle path between the lowly path that leads to perdition and that lofty path – the life of an ascetic – which leads one more quickly and closely to God. It is unclear whether – like the *Ad Vitalianum* – these two poems are alluding to a real rift or disagreement between the two, or if the whole thing is simply a fiction which its initial recipients, the father and son, might have found amusing.

But before we look more closely at these two poems to see what they can tell us about Gregory's conception and use of *paideia*, it should be noted that a reading of these poems is somewhat complicated by the fact that the *personae* of these poems are not Gregory but the son and father respectively. This complicates matters in that we cannot say for certain that these are Gregory's views per se, and it is difficult to say how much of these poems are Gregory and how much we should attribute to the *personae* of the narrators, the real Nicobouli. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that Gregory would pen (even if there is a clear distinction between author and *actor*) two poems in his name that would contain views that would massively veer from his own. However, we shall keep this in mind in our analysis of the poems below.[61]

---

[59] These seven poems make up the last section in the *PG* 37 of Gregory's poems *Quae spectant ad alios*. On these poems generally see Demoen (1997a, 2009: 61-66) McLynn (2006), McLynn (2012) looks more specifically at the poem *Ad Hellenium* (*Carm.* 2.2.1); Demoen (2006) and Brodňanská (2012) have a discussion of the poem *Ad Vitalianum* (*Carm.* 2.2.3), as well as McLynn (1998) who discusses the link between this poem and the poem *Ad Olimpiadem* (*Carm.* 2.2.6); see also the editions, introductions and commentaries of *Carm*. 2.2.4-5 by Moroni (2006) and of *Carm*. 2.2.6 by Bacci (1996).

[60] See also Kaldellis (2007:138), who notes that Clement of Alexandria believes 'Greek *paideia* originated in God and so could be known by Christians.'

[61] Gregory shows a preoccupation with the relationships of father and sons in his works. See particularly Horn (2009) on Gregory's views on children – and parents – in his epistles.

It is from line 58 in *Carm.* 2.2.4 that Nicoboulus jr. begins to reveal his desire for a traditional education, outlining its benefits: history makes the mind beautiful as it gives an insight into the minds and wisdom of many men (vv. 61-62); grammar whittles away one's barbarous accent, the best helper of the noble, Greek tongue (62-64); rhetoric can both conceal the truth but also make it well renowned (65-66); an education gives one access to knowledge of the natural and supernatural world, and an understanding of the Divine (69-76). Then, Nicoboulus goes on to say that, once he has been educated in his youth, he will then give his mind to the divine Spirit and walk the way of everlasting life with Christ as his guide (77-88). Nicoboulus then goes on to make clear that he is not alone in choosing such a course of life, for his exemplar is his great maternal uncle, Gregory himself (89-93):

> … ὃς περὶ πάντων
> Μύθοισι πυκινοῖσι κεκασμένος, οὓς συνάγειρεν
> Ἐκ περάτων, γλώσσῃσί τ' ἐνὶ πλεόνεσσι καθίζων,
> Ὑστάτιον κληῖδα λόγων ποιήσατο, Χριστὸν
> Καὶ βίον αἰπήεντα.
>
> … who surpasses all with his firm grasp of culture, which he has gathered from the ends of the earth, dwelling in places of various tongues. Finally, he set Christ and his lofty life as the key to his words.

Throughout these two poems there is no hint that an extensive education could lead one away from Christ and His religion or that it was superfluous, if not downright dangerous, to the soul of a Christian. Instead, we see that they can in fact be compatible with the Christian life, even the life of chaste celibacy that is implied by βίον αἰπήεντα. Later on, Nicoboulus even suggests that there is a proper time for education, the time of youth, Ἡνίκα θερμότεροι ψυχῶν πλείουσιν ἔρωτες (when the passions of the soul blow more ardently) (v.108). This would imply that for Nicoboulus (and Gregory) education was a means of quelling the (unchristian) desires that are often associated with youth. If education is a remedy for *eros*, then it would also suggest that it is something which can aid the ascetic in his/her ascent to the Divine and to keep their chastity intact (something which we shall explore more in Ch.3).

In order to convince his father further to fulfil his desire for *mythoi* Nicoboulus lavishes extravagant praise on his father (114-126):

> Αἰδέομαι τοὺς σοὺς μύθους, πάτερ, οἷς σύ γ' ἄριστος
> Εὐδρομέων γλῶσσάν τε καὶ οὔατα, καὶ νόον ὠκὺν
> Ἐν πάντεσσι νόμοισιν ὁμῶς, ἀδέτοις τε δετοῖς τε,
> Οὐδὲ μόγοις πολλοῖσι, τὸ δὲ καὶ θαῦμα περισσόν.
> Οἶδά σε καὶ βασιλεῦσι παριστάμενον μεγάλοισι,
> Καὶ μετ' ἀριστήων τιμώμενον, εἴ ποτ' ἔην γε,
> Ἡνίκα θούριον ἔγχος Ἀχαιμενίδῃσι τίνασσες·
> Καὶ πλούτῳ κομόωντα, καὶ αἵματι, καὶ πραπίδεσσιν,
> Εἶδός τε μέγεθός τε· παλαιοτάτοισιν ὅμοιος
> Αἰακίδῃσιν ἔης, ἢ Αἰτωλῷ Μελεάγρῳ.
> Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς μῦθοί σε πλέον κλήϊσσαν ἁπάντων,
> Ἔμπεδον, ἀστυφέλικτον, ἀγήραον, ἄτροπον, ἐσθλὸν,
> Αἰὲν ἐπερχομένοισιν ἀεξόμενον λυκάβασι.

> I stand in awe of your culture, father, by which you are the best, leading the pack in speech, listening, and your mind agile in all forms of literary composition, both with and without measure alike, and without much difficulty, an extraordinary marvel. I know that you have attended to great emperors and been honoured with the best, if there ever was, when you brandished the furious spear against the Achaemenids. You also abound in wealth, good relations, and understanding; your looks and stature are akin to the ancient sons of Aeacus or Aetolian Meleager. But, even so, it is your culture more than anything that celebrates you as one who is firm, unshaken, imperishable, immutable, excellent, always better with the passing of the years.

Such lavish praise of one's worldly accomplishments is not something which a bishop would often (if ever) give. One certainly couldn't imagine a Basil or Nyssen or Jerome waxing lyrical about someone's *paideia,* and here it is not so much Gregory as the son of Nicoboulus who is lavishing on the praise. Yet, as we shall see, such praise is not uncommon in Gregory's epitaphs for his deceased friends and relations. Indeed, what we have here from Nicoboulus is the very image of the *pepaideumenos* to which young men of Gregory's aristocratic background were made to aspire: well-read in prose and verse, an eloquent speaker, an outstanding record of civil service both in peace and war, as well as wealth, good relations, and good looks (the use of the patronymic Αἰακίδῃσιν and the invocation of Meleager gives his father a Homeric heroic air). What is more, it is his culture that makes him immortal (ἀγήραον) and imperishable (ἄτροπον) (125). These are ideas that seem not at all Christian. Surely it is baptism that makes one immortal, not the renown which comes with *paideia*. I think that the hyperbole as to what *mythoi* can achieve is here deliberate and is soon tempered by the response of his father, as we shall see.

Nevertheless, we have seen thus far that Gregory (in the voice of Nicoboulus) is quite open to and supportive of education as a good in the life of the (Christian) elite man. Something that can even help temper the passions. For Nicoboulus then goes on to distinguish culture – as outlined above – from some of the more negative aspects which are often associated with Greek society: love of wealth, athletics, chariot racing, and the theatre (154-161). For Gregory, these things are like a frivolous gold ornament wrapped around a monkey, it does not change the fact that it is a monkey (174-180), and such are those humans who are extolled only on the outside according to Gregory (Τοῖος γὰρ βροτός ἐστιν, ὅτ' ἔκτοθε μοῦνον ἀερθῇ [180]). This implies therefore that a true education in history, grammar, rhetoric and literature can actually mould the inner man for good and keep him away from harmful desires – not just sexual but those that are found in athletics, the theatre and so on.

Nicoboulus' reply to his son rebukes him for his (as he sees it) disrespectful words, unbecoming of a son speaking to his own father. Nevertheless, he recognises that his son in his desire for culture desires the best thing (τὰ φέριστα) (2.2.5.1). For culture comes from Christ the king, who has given it to mortals as a light of life (βίου φάος), a gift set apart from all others (ἀπ' ἄλλων Δῶρον) (vv. 3-4), and Christ Himself takes the greatest pleasure in the epithet *Logos* of all his epithets (5-6). After rebuking his son for his arrogant words, Nicoboulus recounts the three ways of life (116-157), the first is the lowliest, broad and soft (effeminate) and quickly leads to Tartarus; the second is steep and narrow, not traversed by many but leads towards the starry

heavens and eternal glory; the third road is the one which Nicoboulus and his son traverse, the middle way, that leads not to excessive glory nor excessive ruin, it partakes little in the Divine and is concerned with wives and children, earthly concerns. It should be noted that the outlining of these lives has little to do with culture. Those who walk in all three ways of life may have it to a greater or lesser extent, but we shall see that culture for Nicoboulus sr. (and by extension Gregory) is what allows man to better serve God and obtain the Divine as much as is possible in this life.

Firstly, culture is what separates man from beasts, it is the foundation of life (βιότοιο θεμείλιον [165]) and gives man the capability to raise up cities and to hymn God (166-167). With culture, man can raise up the glory of a shining virtue and dominate the forces of evil (οἷσιν ἀείρω / Τῆς φαενῆς ἀρετῆς ὑψοῦ κλέος, οἷσι δαμάζω /Τῆς στυγερῆς κακίης πικρὸν σθένος [167-169]). God has taught culture, the words of the wise confirm it, and faith supports it (173-174), Nicoboulus goes on (175-177):

> Πῶς δ' ἀγαθῶν ἀρετὴν ἕλκει χρόνος ὑστατίοισιν
> Ἥμασι, δεῖγμα φέρων γραπτὸν κλέος, ὣς δὲ κακίστων
> Δυσκλείην, στήλῃσιν ἐν ἀθανάτῃσι χαράσσων.
>
> How time brings the virtue of the good to the end of days, bringing as a model a clearly depicted glory, just as it writes out the infamy of the most wicked on everlasting *stelai*.

Here we find a clear allusion to Gregory's fourth oration against Julian, which was to be a *stelographia* (4.20) outlining Julian's crimes.[62] We should see these two poems, therefore, as a continuation of the discussion on *paideia* and a response to Julian's controversial views on the topic. Yet rather than rejecting Greek education and culture or treating it with suspicions, Gregory, in the voice of Nicoboulus, goes on to outline the merits of culture with various Pagan exempla (182-194): Culture is a remedy for desires, it quells anger and brings measure and order into one's life, providing both hope and caution; it leads kings and draws in the people it flourishes in the agora and rules over festivities, it can be a warrior in battle but also a gentle, soothing light that can soften the iron might of power, Gregory/Nicoboulus even notes that Ὀρφείη κιθάρη μῦθος πέλεν, ὥσπερ ἐΐσκω, / Πάντας ἄγων μελέεσσιν, ὁμῶς ἀγαθούς τε κακούς τε (The lyre of Orpheus is culture , as I think, leading everyone with its melodies, good and bad men alike [193-194]). We shall see just how Gregory wields this lyre in chapter four, but all that Nicoboulus has said about culture is what we find in our discussion above on *paideia*. There is nothing particularly Christian(ising) about it, but it is a good, an everlasting good, which brings peace and order to the world – unlike the *paideia* of Julian which actively sought to bring division within the (aristocratic) community. It instils *parrhesia* in those who embody culture and makes them inherently virtuous, like Odysseus before the Phaeacian princess (208-213).[63] Culture makes a man worthy of respect (207).

---

[62] See Elm (2012b) for a more in-depth discussion of this oration as *steleographia*, and Nimmo Smith (2016) who discusses all the occurrences of monumental imagery in Gregory's works.

[63] It should be noted here that this episode is alluded to in Basil's *Ad Adulescentes*, but, as I believe, with a slightly more problematic overtone – which McLynn points out: Is there really *nothing* erotic about the naked

Nicoboulus briefly mentions the medicine which the Guide (Hermes) gave to Odysseus to help his comrades turned to swine (196-199). Brodňanská (2016:9) notes that this medicine is often interpreted in antiquity as being synonymous with *logos*, the word by which Odysseus controls his desire. What is more, Hermes is often presented as an embodiment of eloquence,[64] which, like in the myth of Odysseus, guides and advises him in times of distress. One cannot help but notice the subtle equation between Hermes and Christ that occurs a few lines after this episode is recounted, when Nicoboulus says to his son πομπὸς δέ σ' ἄγοι πατρώϊος ἐσθλός (Would that the good Guide of the Father lead you) whether he desire to go to Athens, Alexandria or Beirut – that is to study rhetoric, medicine, or law respectively (224-228); then again further below (265-166):

> Χριστὸν ἔχοις ἐπέων ἡγήτορα, καὶ βιότοιο
> Σῶν λόγον, ὃς μύθων προφερέστατός ἐστιν ἁπάντων
>
> Would that you have Christ as a guide of your words and the Logos of your life,
> He who is most excellent in all parts of culture.

Like Julian, Gregory is associating *mythoi* with religion. Christ is the source and summit of culture, the *pepaideumenos* par excellence. But unlike Julian he does not attempt to exclude non-Christians from *mythoi*. Instead he simply claims that Christ is its true originator, not Hermes or any other god.

We have in these poems an interesting mix. On the one hand, we have outright praise of every facet of *paideia*, even parts that may have been irreputable to Christians, such as the worldly wealth and glory that came with it and was for some its ultimate prize. Nicoboulus sr. prays at the end of his letter that his son be counted among the first students by his teachers (238-241), a common prayer amongst many elite men Christian and non-Christian alike (as we shall see more clearly in ch.1).[65] On the other hand, we have a great awareness of Christ who is the giver of the gift of culture. Culture is not only to win one fame and glory, but also a means of fortifying oneself against desires and of becoming virtuous. The Nicobouli may walk that middle road which is not on its way to perdition nor leading straight to God, but that is not to say that culture belongs to this road. For Gregory is the exemplar who flies higher than his nephew, who only hopes to get as

---

Odysseus? In the context of Basil's oration along with its overall tone, I think that this problematic suggestion is clearly present. In Gregory's epistolary poem, however, it is quite clear that Gregory holds Greek education (and literature) in high praise – as will become clearer as our analysis continues. Furthermore, as we shall see, Gregory does not have a great problem (or puritan reservation) on erotic literature. This will be seen more clearly in Ch.1, but see also Børtnes (2000).

[64] See *OCD* s.v. Hermes. Versnel (2011:316, fn.19) notes that the association of Hermes with orators is found in Artemidorus, 2.37, where Artemidorus also notes that he is a patron of travellers, something that is important here too since the young Nicoboulus (and Gregory during his education) will have to travel far to reach one of the centres of learning in the Mediterranean world. See also *Ep*. 61c.422d–423a of the Emperor Julian, speaks of Hermes as one of the gods who inspired ancient Greek writers such as Homer and Thucydides.

[65] On the *Rangstreit* in the ancient eastern world, see Steinschneider (1908), Burckhardt (1998:160-213) provides a comprehensive introduction to the agonal nature of Greek society. See also Schmitz (1997:109) who notes that the agonistic tendencies in the education of Greek, aristocratic society carried over into the Christian era. Although I do not consider John Chrysostom in this thesis, as he is active a little later than Gregory, it is worth noting how his treatise *On Vainglory or the Education of Children* 'is almost completely silent on secular schooling,' and the Greek heroes are to give way entirely to the Scriptures – something which Gregory clearly does not countenance here (Stenger 2016:87-89).

close to his uncle's greatness as possible. We have noted above that these poems are written by Gregory but in the personae of the Nicobouli. For both the father and the son Gregory is *the* model to emulate, yet both have very different views of the ultimate goals of *mythoi*, one driven by the desires and ambitions of youth, the other tempered by the wisdom of old age. One wonders if we have here two possible contemporary views of whom Gregory was and to whom Gregory's life and career appealed. In other words, the young Nicoboulus sees his uncle as the embodiment of *paideia* which all elite men would seek to emulate, that they might gain temporal glory and honour; but his father makes clear that their relative is much more than this, for he has put his words at the service of the Word. There is a tension here between sacred and profane views of *paideia* which shall be explored throughout this thesis.

We have only looked briefly at these poems, but we have gleaned enough from them to see that Gregory is not quite like his contemporaries Basil and Nyssen – or Julian for that matter – in his understanding of how their aristocratic education and culture might be utilised in their episcopal careers, a career that was becoming increasingly attractive to such educated men who may have traditionally gone into the civil service or teach rhetoric or grammar. As we have seen and shall see, Gregory does not share his episcopal contemporaries' skittishness when it comes to displaying and using his *paideia*; he seems less inclined to hold it at a distance or to view it as something which by and large remains in their past; nor does Gregory see himself as a 'monstrosity' like Tatian, a mixture of barbarian wisdom and Greek *paideia* (as Georgia [2018] makes clear). In fact, we shall soon see that the Orphic lyre, or the Homeric bard, can play a prominent (if not dominant role) in the construction of his poetry on explicitly Christian matters. This is something which we would not expect from Gregory, if we were to only read orations such as *Or*. 4 dealt with above, where the Greek myths are derided and the sophists become synonymous with wickedness; but, as our exploration of these two epistolary poems have shown, the poems cast Gregory in a different light, one where the glory which *paideia* brings to those who embody its principals is lauded, where Greek education and culture become a gift of Christ, *logoi* from the *Logos*.[66] And so, it must be asked (as we done so above): What can the poetry of Gregory tell us about his conception and use of *paideia* – in accordance with the four categories (or focuses) which we have outlined?

In order to do this, we must first better understand the exemplar himself, Gregory. How did he portray himself and view his own ministry as a bishop, as one who was fully imbued with this gift from Christ, *mythoi*, *paideia*? What role does *paideia* play in his portrayal of his other contemporaries? From there we shall take a closer look at how Gregory weaves together these Christian and non-Christian strands, Scripture and *paideia*, and how he sought to put his extensive, profane education at the service of the one true God, the *Logos*.

[66] See Pollmann (2017:161-175) for Latin attempts in poetry to "Christianise" culture.

Chapter 1: Gregory's *Epitaphia*

In the introduction, we have put Gregory in the context of his close contemporaries, Julian, Basil, and Gregory Nyssen, and briefly discussed their own conception of *paideia* – often discussed in works explicitly concerning this subject – before finally looking at what Gregory tells us about his impetus for writing poetry in his poem *On His Own Verse*, and then his most explicit discussion of education in the two epistolary poems, one addressed to Nicoboulus Sr. from Nicoboulus Jr., and the other his father's response.

In this chapter, we will take a close look at the *Epitaphia* which Gregory dedicated to various members of his family, his friends, and teachers – as well as for himself. Some literature already exists on the epigrams of Gregory.[67] Firstly, Consolino (1987) provides a broad analysis of the funeral epitaphs as found in the Palatine Anthology (book VIII). In this article, Consolino highlights where Gregory has adhered to or departed from the established custom for literary epitaphs. Some poems are profane in style and content, whereas others have a clear, Christian theme – Gregory's major contribution to the genre according to Consolino (p.410). The cyclical nature of these epitaphs (that is, multiple epitaphs for one person) does have precedence in Greek literature, but the sheer number of epitaphs in these cycles (such as for Basil or his mother Nonna) reflect a preference in the author to let emotional – as opposed to literary – sensibility hold sway in these epitaphs (pp. 413-414).[68] The epitaphs, for Consolino, add little to our knowledge of the people commemorated, and the experimentation with Christian themes does not – according to Consolino – catch on with other Christian writers after Gregory, much preferring the established Hellenic tradition of Greek epigraphy. Two other works by Corsano (1991) and Floridi (2013) focus on the epigrams dedicated to Martinianus and the epitaphs against the desecrators of tombs. These works highlight further the role of Classical themes and tropes in the epitaphs, such as the use of *Themis* (the goddess of justice) in these particular epitaphs and show that references to *Themis* "do not remain simple reminiscences, ornaments of style, but contribute to form the structure itself of epigrams" (1991:180). In other words, Gregory's indebtedness to the Classical tradition is more than ornamental – something which we shall see throughout this thesis.[69] Alan Cameron (1993) has discussed the manuscript tradition of these poems (pp. 325-326), noting that we only have a selection of Gregory's epigrams as found in the *Greek Anthology* (p.146), and that these poems 'constitute a massive and homogenous block of Christian intruders in the middle of an

[67] The work of Vertoudakis (2011) remains – as Simelidis (2019:648) claims – the 'most comprehensive treatment of Gregory's epigrams.' Alas, my grasp of modern Greek is miniscule, and so I was unable to deal with this work.

[68] Simelidis (2019:635) notes that these epigrams possess and 'unusual feature: an excessive repetition of the same topics.'

[69] Examples of Gregory's familiarity with Greek epigrams are highlighted below. One example not discussed however, but that makes clear his familiarity with it is found in *PG* 38.81-82, an epigram or Gigantius the builder. Gregory clearly echoes the end of a line found in *GA* 9.58.1, and makes an allusion, I believe, to 9.708.

otherwise secular anthology.[70] But, as we shall see, these epitaphs are not as different from their non-Christian counterparts as Cameron makes them out to be.[71]

The above scholarship has done notably little to highlight how these poems, despite introducing Christian themes and imagery, are often indistinguishable from what Cameron would call their "secular" predecessors. Very often, in fact, Gregory's relationship with and portrayal of the deceased is communicated not through a shared Christian faith, but rather a shared and exemplary grasp of Greek *paideia.* In our chapter, we will look at what these various epitaphs for people of various careers, religions, and walks of life, can tell us about Gregory's conception of *paideia*. I will begin by framing our discussion within the context of the second (and third) sophistic and demonstrate that epitaphs had historically been used as a means of displaying to the reader/listener the *paideia* of the deceased, who are often portrayed as exemplary embodiments of the values of Greek education and culture. Then, I will begin my analysis of Gregory's epitaphs with a group that I term the *pepaideumenoi*: that is, those deceased men who lead lives in service to their local (and Imperial) community, either as rhetors, doctors, military men, governors. Here we will see that Gregory does not necessarily have the need to make *paideia* "Christian", or that it is only praiseworthy in Christians.[72] Rather, Gregory unreservedly calls upon his and the deceased's *paideia* in order to fashion their image for the reader, and thus these Christian men are indistinguishably a part of (secular) high society. Nevertheless, the picture of our conception of Gregory's *paideia* becomes more complicated when we look at the epitaphs for his brother, Caesarius. Finally, we will discuss the epitaphs for the bishops Basil, Gregory's father, and Gregory himself. Here we will see that the bishop in particular was to be an embodiment of both sacred and profane wisdom. Throughout this chapter, therefore, we will be concerned with three of our four research focuses: Gregory's knowledge and utilisation of the literary tradition; his use of *paideia* for self-fashioning and communication; and the place of culture in the Christian life.

Paideia and the Second (and Third?) Sophistic[73]

Schmitz (2011:305) aptly summarises the scholarly debate over the phenomenon known as the "Second Sophistic":

---

[70] See, also, Gow & Page (1965:xxxii-xli) for the origins of the manuscripts.

[71] See also the recent essay of Zimmermann (2019) whose work I had not the chance to deal with when writing this chapter. However, her essay adds little to our topic but does show some points of agreement in our analysis of the epigrams of Gregory.

[72] This is something that has been briefly pointed out by Ševčenko (1980:58-59). Nevertheless, it certainly deserves a closer analysis as we have conducted here. I neglect to discuss the epitaphs which Gregory wrote for women – apart from the epitaphs for Livia. Scholars never fail to note the sheer volume of epitaphs which Gregory wrote for his mother, Nonna, and scholarship has yet to devote adequate attention to this cycle of epitaphs that goes deeper than noting their volume.

[73] Much has been written about the Second Sophistic, and increasingly more about the idea of the Third Sophistic. Much scholarship will be mentioned *passim* throughout this chapter and the rest of this thesis, but see especially Bowersock (1969), Kerferd (1981), Anderson (1989 and 1993) – although I disagree with his statement that 'Christianity has emerged as a force ultimately inimical to the pagan presuppositions … of sophistic culture …' (1993:42); Bowie (1989); Brunt (1994) – though I am a bit less specific in my use of the word "sophist" than he is; Swain (1996), Goldhill (2001), Whitmarsh (2001), esp. ch.2 which highlights how *paideia* could both legitimise and subvert power- thus showing why it was so at stake for figures such as Julian and Gregory; Mountford (2005) and Milovanović (2005) for a discussion of the influence of the

> Some scholars have taken seriously Philostratus' claims that sophistic oratory had always been prominent in Greek culture;[74] they conclude that there was nothing special about imperial sophists and have even denied the existence of the Second Sophistic as a historical phenomenon. Others have accepted a much wider definition of the term; for them, the Second Sophistic is the dominant and most characteristic phenomenon of the entire culture of the second and third centuries AD.

He then goes on to give a narrower definition that sees the Second Sophistic as "a cultural movement that gained particular prominence in the second and third centuries AD, and that was characterized by linguistic classicism, improvised declamations on historical and judicial topics, and professional performers who would often come from the highest echelons of society in the eastern half of the Roman Empire." The importance of this movement among the upper classes of the Hellenic East is exemplified in the inscriptions and funerary monuments of the Imperial period, which emphasise the deceased's *paideia,* his status as a sophist or rhetor, and the (civic) virtue that such an education and status imbued within the deceased during his life (p.306). The acquisition of this *paideia*, therefore, was necessary for the aristocrats of the eastern territories in order to take full part in the society in which they found themselves.[75]

It was not only a means of expressing their own identity, but also of communicating with their contemporaries and – most importantly – of surpassing each other in honour and glory. Not just athletic, but literary contests provided a localised outlet to display ones *paideia* and prove one's superiority over one's peers.[76] Acts of euergetism through funding the construction of civic (and ecclesiastical) buildings, or providing funds for the education and maintenance of the poorer *aristoi* of one's *polis*, also displayed one's virtue and made clear to the public your status as an embodiment of *paideia*.[77] Furthermore, in a world that was becoming increasingly subject to disintegration and violence due to marauding bandits, invading barbarians, and inclement emperors, *paideia* and the values of the Second Sophistic sought to bring order and peace to an increasingly tempestuous world. As Brown states: "Rather than give way to incoherent rage, public figures were expected to compose themselves as carefully as they composed their speeches" (1992:50). As Brown points out later on the same page, this was something that Gregory sought to do in his own work, to bridle one's rage by means of measured words - though in the *Epitaphia* Gregory is more likely trying to bridle his grief than his rage. As we will see in our discussion of particular epitaphs below, the *pepaideumenoi* where by no means mere dilettantes, whose *paideia*

---

rhetoric of the Second Sophistic on Gregory's oratory, but on his poetry, see McGuckin (2011); Richter and Johnson (2017); Brent (2006) discusses the influence of the Second Sophistic on Ignatius of Antioch, and Eshleman (2012) broadens this discussion on the Second Sophistic and Christianity but does not go beyond the second Century AD.

[74] See especially Whitmarsh (2004) for a discussion of Greek literature and cultural history.

[75] This is certainly true for the period known as the Second Sophistic (up to the third Century AD) – as argued especially by Schmitz (1997); but see van Hoof (2013) who successfully questions the scholarly opinion – such as that of Malosse and Schouler (2008), more commonly rejected in emerging scholarship – that *paideia* lost its relevance by the fourth century and was no longer a means of social mobility. See also Quiroga (2007) for the increasing influence of rhetoric in the 4th Century, especially for bishops.

[76] See Van Nijf (2004) and Schmitz (1997:97-135) where he discusses the agonistic nature of education especially in the eastern Roman Empire.

[77] See P. Brown (1992: 82-82).

was simply an ornament to bolster their own self-image, but often served an integral function to their own *polis*, and to the Empire as a whole. It is in turning to the inscriptions of these Greek sophists and orators (and in particular the seminal work of Bernadette Puech [2002]) that we will see these values - and their importance to the *pepaideumenoi* and their society - displayed more concretely.

Before moving on with our argument, I would like to briefly address the matter of the "Third Sophistic", a term which some scholars use (tentatively). It is a term which I have avoided using thus far, and I believe that there is little difference between the elite sophists, rhetors, and philosophers of the Second Sophstic (ending *circa* 250 AD) and those of the Third Sophistic. Perhaps the most significant difference is that we could add the title "Bishop" to the other names/occupations by which the sophist can be known. This is something that we will see in due course, as we will see how Gregory brought together his faith with the training, practices and ambitions of his contemporaries and the *pepaideumenoi* that came before him – in short, how his conception of his identity as a bishop sought to fuse sophistic culture with his Christian faith.[78]

Epitaphs of the *Pepaideumenoi*

As Puech notes, the *pepaideumenoi* distinguish their status as men imbued with the values of *paideia* by the terms 'orator', 'sophist', and 'philosopher'. The words themselves have generated much debate as to what the distinctions are between them and what exactly do they mean. It is a debate that need not be elaborated upon here.[79] It suffices to know that these terms are used by the *pepaideumenoi* to identify themselves as men of culture and education, as people of distinction within their own community. Often in epitaphs, one of these words alone is enough to distinguish the deceased as a *pepaideumenos*. Even in one of the most western points of the Roman world, Gades, we find the simple epitaph *Troilus/retor/Graecus* (Troilus, rhetor, Greek). Gades was a city, according to Philostratus, that had an attachment to *paideia* (Puech, 2002:465). It would seem, then, that the further one was from the epicentres of *paideia*, the more one felt the need to cherish and display it.

Others are much more willing to flaunt their superiority in *paideia*. Take for example the epitaph for the rhetor Nilos (Puech, p.369):[80]

> Ἐνθάδε Νεῖλος κεῖται ἀνὴρ προφερέστατος ἀνδρῶν,
> ῥητορικός, μεγα θαῦμα, φέρων σημεῖον εφ' αὑτῷ
> Ἡσύχιος, κεδνὸς καὶ μείλιχος ἠδὲ σοφιστής.

[78] I have noted above in the footnotes various pieces of scholarship on the Third Sophistic; but see especially van Hoof (2010), Fowler and Quiroga (2014) which sets about defining the Third Sophistic through the continuity-change model, to which I ascribe, and van Hoof and van Nuffelen (2015) who emphasise the continuity between the Second and Third Sophistic.
[79] See Puech (2002:10-15) for this debate. She also notes that, although these terms can often be interchangeable, or used in combination, the combination of sophist and philosopher is never found.
[80] Inscription is from Ostia, 2nd or 3rd Century AD, see Puech for the editions in which this and other inscriptions can be found.

> Here lies Nilos, a man most excellent of all men, rhetor, a great marvel, who gave to himself the cognomen Hesychius, a cherished and gentle sophist.

We see in this epitaph a desire for the sophist Nilos to not only excel his peers, but also to be cherished (κεδνὸς) or esteemed by them. Another example (of unknown date) shows, however, more clearly the agonistic nature of the culture of the Second Sophistic (Puech, p.370):

> Εἰμὶ μὲν ἐκ Παρίου Ὄρτυ[ξ] σοφός αὐτοδίδακτος,
> Γράτου το[ῦ] μεγάλου, ὅς πάντα λόγοις ὑποτάσσει
> τούς τε ποιητογράφο[υς] καὶ τοὺς πα[λα]ίοντας ἀγῶνι.
>
> I am Ortyx of Parium, self-taught, son of the great Gratus, who subjects everything to eloquence, the writers of poetry and those who wrestle in contest.

These contests, as noted above, were not just athletic, but also intellectual. Ortyx (or perhaps his father Gratus) emphasises in this epitaph his dominance over his peers, without any indication as to their feelings towards him. There is some debate as to how exactly this epitaph is interpreted, or whether or not Ortyx (Gratus?) was in fact an orator;[81] but even if the commemorated was simply a poet (or a poet and wrestler), poetry still provided a means, as did rhetoric, for engaging with and/or surpassing one's peers in sophistic society.

Furthermore, it was not only necessary, then, to display one's own *paideia*, but also to emphasise the learning and culture of one's family and connections. We can take for example the inscription on the statue dedicated to the wife of the sophist Valerius Apsines,[82] in which family of note are mentioned, the high priest Claudius Lysiades and another priest Claudius Sospes (Puech, pp.124-125). Begetting descendants who were *pepaideumenoi*, or being descended from such prominent persons, secured for those who embodies *paideia* a certain *fama perennis*, as well as amplifying one's status within sophistic society – a rising tide raises all ships as they say. We will see below the importance of this in Gregory's portrayal and self-embodiment of *paideia*.

One need only read Alan Cameron's article *Wandering Poets* (1965) to see the use of poetry in securing for oneself positions of power and privilege. Cameron gives examples of a number of poets who obtained and held magistracies and prefectures through the practice of poetry (1965:497-500). Quite often these were gained through the performance of panegyrics but honouring a deceased governor with an epitaph was also a preoccupation of poets. Such as the epitaph for the Vicar of Asia, Musonius, who was killed by Isaurian bandits (Puech, p.357).[83] Homeric language, as we shall see in some of the epitaphs of Gregory, is quite common in the commemoration of the *pepaideumenoi*. Musonius, of course, died a heroic death by dying in battle, but the educated man of the Second Sophistic also engaged in his own *agones* when he displayed his *paideia* and successfully demonstrated to his peers his superiority in speech, or through the attainment of offices or teaching posts. Musonius provides a prime example of the importance of being an embodiment of *paideia* in the Second Sophistic; for being a *pepaideumenos*

[81] For this debate, see Puech (2002:370-371)
[82] This is a 3rd Century AD inscription either from Gadara or Athens, on which see Puech (pp.124-125).
[83] As Puech tells us, it is only through Eunapius that this inscription is preserved, thus it belongs to the 4th Century AD. See *PLRE* 1.613, and Amm. Marc. 27.9.6 for a full account of Musonius' exploits.

did not simply mean that you could speak eloquently, it was not simply a badge of honour or a way of standing out among one's peers, rather, to be a *pepaideumenos* was to be a virtuous and upstanding member of society.[84] The *pepaideumenoi*, therefore, were not simply (or not just) self-serving aristocrats who sought to race to the top in order to gain fame, glory or power, but were people who sought to serve their own *polis*, and even the empire, through the practice of their great learning. There is, then, a link between *paideia* and patriotism, one that (as we will see in this chapter) is (or, rather, can be) important for Gregory's portrayal of the *pepaideumenoi*, as well as in his portrayal of those whose *paideia* he considers to be inferior (i.e. his enemies – as we will see in Ch.4).

The statues and (grave) monuments dedicated to the deceased *pepaideumenos* were also a means by which his fame could be perpetuated, and so there was a certain anxiety among such orators and sophists that these markers of their excellence may not stand the test of time through vandalism, or that their final resting place be disturbed by robbers. The wife of the orator Antiochus entrusts his tomb to the protection of the infernal gods, swearing that, if anyone were to desecrate the tomb, then the earth and sea would become impassable for them (Puech, p.76). This particular epitaph is found in Athens, but the majority of such *arai* are found in Asia Minor for Pagans, Christian, and Jews alike. No clear explanation for this habit can be deduced. Sometimes these curses take on a legalistic tone, promising that the violators must pay x amount of money for violating the tomb (either to the city or the Imperial treasury). Other curses are slightly more general in nature, or simply outline consequences for violation for the violator and their kin – as the above.[85] Given that most of these kinds of inscriptions can be dated to Imperial times (Strubbe 1991:39), it would seem that they were quite popular within the societies of the Second Sophistic.

I would like to examine one more example of an *ara* before moving on to the epitaphs of Gregory. It comes from Egypt, and is dedicated to a certain Ioannia, who is a "companion of the Muses" and a rhetor (Puech, p.315):[86]

> Μουσοπόλον, ῥητῆρα, δικασπόλον, ἄκρον ἅπαντα,
> τύμβος ἥδ' εὐγενὴς Ἰωαννίαν ἔχω,
> ναυμάχον ἐν πελάγεσσιν, ἀρήιον ἐν πεδίοισιν·
> ἀλλ' ἀποτῆλε τάφου πρίν τι κακὸν παθέειν.
> Ἐκοιμήθη ἡ μακαρία Ἰωαννία, θυγάτηρ Ἀμμωνίου ἀπὸ Ἑρμουπόλεος, Μεχεὶρ πέμπτῃ, ἰνδ/ τέσσαρες δεκάτης. Κύριε, ἀνάπαυσον τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῆς.
>
> I, the noble tomb, hold Ioannia, companion of the Muses, rhetor, companion of justice, supreme in everything, a marine-warrior on the seas, a soldier on land. But keep far from this tomb, lest something wicked befall you. The blessed Ioannia has been put to rest, daughter of Ammonius from Hermopolis, on the fifth of Mechir, in her fourteenth year. Lord, grant repose to her soul.

This poem seems to open with two elegiac couplets. The pentameter of the first line, however, does not scan well at all, and the inscription ends in prose. Furthermore, the qualities attributed to

[84] See especially Brown (1978:27-55) where he talks about the rise of the city in Late Antiquity, and Schmitz (1997:136-146).
[85] See Strubbe (1991:33-59) for a discussion of motivations and the practice of *arai* in general.
[86] See, also, Simelidis (2019:644-645) for a discussion of this epitaph.

this young woman are rather bizarre – Ioannia is a warrior by land and sea. The explanation for this is quite straightforward: the first four lines are taken from an epitaph by Gregory for the prefect Martinianus. Scholars have wondered, however, how much of this epitaph truly applies to Ioannia, and what it can tell us about her. It has been suggested that perhaps the only titles that could truly apply to her are Μουσοπόλον and ῥητῆρα, and that she must have died whilst studying rhetoric (perhaps even law too, if we are to believe that she was δικασπόλον) (Puech, p.316). Nevertheless, what is clear is that the inscription of this tomb wants us to know that Ioannia was in life an embodiment of *paideia*. For the virtues that are praised and put front and centre before the readers eyes are those that are associated not so much with the Christian (although the closing of the epitaph would indicate that she was a Christian) as with the *pepaideumenos*.[87] For the purpose of our own study, we must also note that the epitaphs of Gregory (or at least this particular epitaph) were seen as a good enough source for an inscriber to create a metrical epitaph that praised the deceased's education and culture – even if the plagiarised inscription is not entirely appropriate for the deceased or well executed.

To conclude our discussion of the epitaphs of the Second Sophistic, we see that such inscriptions provide ample evidence for what we know about the culture and society of the Roman East of this time. *Paideia* is central to the identity of the upper-classes, and central to ensuring the cohesion of the upper class of Greco-Roman society in the Imperial period. Education provided a means not only for amplifying the glory and fortunes of oneself, one's family, or of one's *polis*, but also of creating a good citizen of the empire; one like Musonius who gave his life to fend off Isaurian bandits. To be an embodiment of *paideia* was to be an embodiment of virtue as well as eloquence. One might think that the introduction of Christian themes to Gregory's epitaphs would mean that the image of Christian virtue would eclipse the virtue and honoured associated with being a *pepaideumenos*, but things are not so straightforward, as we shall see, in the *Epitaphia* of Gregory. It remains to be seen just how important the culture of the Second Sophistic was to Gregory in his portrayal of the deceased in his epitaphs, men who were often not (just) Christians, but (also) orators and governors.

Thus far, we have begun our discussion by establishing the importance that some Greco-Roman's placed upon *paideia*, and – most importantly – their embodiment of Greek culture and education. More often than not, we see that one's status as a *pepaideumenos* was of much greater concern to Gregory's portrayal of the deceased commemorated in his epitaphs than their religion. We now turn to the *Epitaphia* of Gregory to see how exactly Gregory portrays the deceased relatives and friends commemorated in these lines. Firstly, we will discuss a group of epitaphs that Gregory has dedicated to people whom he primarily identifies with their *paideia*, making little to no reference to their religion or salvation. These epitaphs resemble very closely the above epitaphs and go some way in helping us better understand Gregory's conception of *paideia*.

[87] See also Agosti (2008:3-4) where he notes that such quotations to more eloquent poetry are often found in epigraphic inscriptions. It would seem, therefore, that Gregory's literary epigrams were considered eloquent enough to be quoted and were perhaps meant to be recognised by the reader as Gregorian.

The *Pepaideumenoi*

Thespesius and Prohaeresius[88]

Little is known of the teacher (termed *grammatikos* in the title of his epitaph in the *PG*) Thespesius.[89] Our only other source to mention him is from Jerome, who tells us that he was a teacher of the Arian Bishop of Caesarea, Euzoius, as well as the teacher of Gregory Nazianzen (*De Viris Illustribus*, 113).[90] McGuckin (2001:44) discusses this epigram and provides his own translation and analysis of it (*PG* 38.12-13):

> Αἴ, αἴ, καὶ σὺ θάνες, φθονερὴ δέ σε μοῖρ' ἐκάλυψεν,
> Θεσπέσιε· φθιμένου δ' ἄφθιτον ἐστί κλέος.
> Ἀρτιτόκοις ἐπέεσσι τόσος βρύζες· ἡ δ' ἐβόησε
> Ἀτθις· τίς ποτ' ἐμῆς δόξαν ἔχει σοφίης;
>
> What grief, what grief; for even you are dead Thespesios. The envy of the fates has brought you to the tomb; yet no tomb can rob you of your deathless fame. How much you savoured your tender words. Now your shade cries out in Attic forms: Who is there now sustains the glory of my craft? (Trans. J.McGuckin)

McGuckin believes the answer to the closing rhetorical question is in fact Gregory himself. Furthermore, he asserts that Thespesius would have been the teacher to introduce Gregory to Homer and would have been his first introduction to Hellenic culture and literature. I certainly agree with McGuckin that Thespesius, Gregory's first major teacher after his studies in Caesarea-Mazaca, would have introduced him to Homer and Greek literature in general. The very phrase ἄφθιτον ἐστί κλέος is in fact Homeric.[91] The verb βρύζες which translates as 'to savour' is first found in Archilochus (32.2)[92] with dubious meaning, but possibly refers to the fermentation process of ale. The intertextual reference is perhaps of little importance here, but Gregory's audience would certainly have recognised its origin as archaic, thus emphasising the erudition of Thespesius – and Gregory. However, I must disagree with the translation of ἡ δ' ἐβόησε Ἀτθις (Now your shade cries out in Attic forms). There is no way that this translation is feasible. Ἀτθις could certainly be translated adjectivally as "Attic", but even then, we cannot give it the sense which McGuckin gives it. Furthermore, given that the verb ἐβόησε is not one commonly, if at all,

[88] It should be noted that Gregory was also supposedly taught by Himerius during his times at Athens, on which see Barnes (1981) on Himerius and the reference to his teaching of the Cappadocians in the church histories of Socrates (4.26.6) and Sozomen (6.17.1). However, they also say that the pair were taught by Libanius, which is unlikely in Gregory's case. But considering that the Cappadocians were definitely at Athens, it is not too farfetched to believe they were taught by Himerius.

[89] McGuckin (2001:41-43) outlines why Gregory might have called Thespesius a *grammatikos*; but apart from the title of the epitaph – which may or may not be Gregory's title – nowhere does Gregory explicitly call Thespesius a grammarian. See also Kaster (1988:453-454) for his definition of the Greek *grammatikos*. He notes also here that the *Suda* Γ.450g gives Gregory the title of *grammatikos*.

[90] It is not clear whether he was a Christian or Pagan. Elm (2012:22) states that he is a Pagan, but I am unsure on what grounds. See *PLRE* s.v. Thespesius 2, *PGRSRE* s.v. Thespesios (1047), Hauser-Meury (1960:174), and also Kaster (1988:435) for a short prosopography of Thespesius, which makes no mention of his religion.

[91] *Il*. 9.413. See also *GA* 7.43, an epitaph for Euripides which contains the same phrase.

[92] Edition used is that of Bergk (1866).

associated with utterances of refined (Attic) rhetoric, McGuckin's translation makes no sense at all. My own translation runs as follows:

> Alas! Alas! You too are dead, and envious Fate has buried you, Thespesius. Your glory, though you be dead, is undying. You abounded greatly in new-born speeches. Attica cried out "Who in the world holds the glory of my wisdom?"

What we have here is Attica personified. It could well be that she is lamenting the passing of a great orator (Such laments are common in epitaphs – as we shall see below), but why would Attica lament the passing of an orator from Palestine? From the little we know of Thespesius, he was a rhetor who taught in Caesarea Palestine, but it is impossible to ascertain if his style was Attic or Asiatic. Therefore, I believe that what we have here is not a lament from Attica, but a question.[93] Here *sophia* would be human wisdom - which Gregory often distinguishes from divine wisdom and learning (as we shall see below). The answer that she (and perhaps many of Gregory's contemporaries) would expect is none other than the subject of the following epitaph, Prohaeresius.[94]

It is not entirely clear that these poems are to be read together. Nevertheless, I believe that the poems make better sense when done so, as I will argue. Furthermore, they are both written in the same metre (elegiac couplets) and appear one after the other in the *PG* (although I am not certain how strong the evidence is from the MS traditions in support of my claim). The epitaph for Prohaeresius runs as follows (*PG* 38.13):

> Μηκέτι, Κεκροπίη, μεγάλ' εὔχεο· οὐ θέμις ἐστὶν
> Ἠελίου τυτθὴν ἀντα θέρειν δαΐδα,
> Οὐδὲ Προαιρεσίου ῥήτρῃ Βροτὸν ἄλλον ἐρίζειν,
> ὃς ποτε ἀρτιτόκοις κσμον ἔσεισε λόγοις.
> Βροντὴν Ἀτθὶς ἔνεικε νεόκτυπον· ἀλλὰ σοφιστῶν
> Πᾶν γένος ὑψιλόγων[95] εἶκε Προαιρεσίῳ.
> Εἶξε μέν· ἀλλὰ μιν ἔσχε μόρῳ φθόνος· οὐκέτ' Ἀθῆναι
> Κύδιμοι· ὦ νεότης, φεύγετε Κεκροπίην.
>
> Boast greatly no longer, Cecropia. It is not right to compare a little torch to the sun, nor to pit another mortal against Prohaeresius in the art of rhetoric, who once shook the world with his newly-wrought speeches. Attica produced fresh crashes of thunder: "But ye, whole race of loftily spoken sophists, yield to Prohaeresius." They yield, but envy holds him in death. Athens is no longer glorious. O young men, flee Cecropia!

Once these two epigrams are read in conjunction with one another, a whole new narrative emerges.[96] At the beginning of the epigram for Prohaeresius, the narrator's voice responds to

---

[93] This interpretation is also found in the *PGRSRE* s.v. Thespesios (1047).
[94] On whom, see *PGRSRE* s.v. Proairesios (880) and Hauser-Meury (1960:150). See Kennedy (1983:135-141) on the sophists at Athens more generally. He notes that Gregory 'never mentions Prohaeresius in his accounts of his student days with Basil in Athens; this suggest that Gregory did not regard him as an outstanding Christian influence.' This is, of course, not entirely true as he clearly praises him in this epitaph.
[95] A *hapax legomenon*, according to Lampe.
[96] That epitaphs be read together in such a way is a feature of the literary epigram, on which, see Gutzwiller (1998:197,275-6) and Meyer (2007) on reading and writing in Hellenistic epigrams. For another interpretation of this epitaph, see Breitenbach (2003:248). However, I disagree with his reading of the epitaph as it is based upon the supposed Christianity of Prohaeresius which is far from certain – as I will argue below.

Attica's question. She - addressed with an archaic synecdoche, Κεκροπίη (referring to the mythic king of Athens and one of its 12, founding cities)[97] - is to cease from her boasting. For it is not right to compare Thespesius (whom I believe to be the other mortal [Βροτὸν ἄλλον]) to Prohaeresius, just as it is unfair to compare torch light to the splendour of the sun. For where Thespesius abounded in newly composed speeches, Prohaeresius shook the world with his. Given that this is the only place in which the word "sophist" appears in the *Epitaphia*, it seems clear to me that Gregory is invoking an important aspect of sophistic culture: the tendency to rank, grade, and compare sophists (Anderson, 1993:128). It is also a common trope of epigram that the deed/person honoured in the epigram outdoes those of previous peoples or persons (Coleman, 2019:63). Note that here, as in the epigram for Thespesius, Attica's interjections are not at all described in eloquent terms. In the first epigram she shouts (ἐβόησε) and here she produces loud crashes of thunder (Βροντὴν νεόκτυπον) – a sound that does not at all please the ears. She protests that all sophists yield to Prohaeresius. This may be true, the narrator says, but he is dead, and with his death has died the glory of Athens. Therefore, all young men must flee it. Upon closer inspection the message which Gregory wishes to get across to his reader is that Prohaeresius is no longer at Athens, and so Athens is no longer eloquent. Therefore, her boasting is but loud noises, crashes of thunder, and the young men would do well to flee her; for she cannot teach them the *logoi* that they desire anymore. Gregory, therefore, places the emphasis on the person over the place. In other words, there is no longer the high calibre of sophist (like Prohaeresius) at Athens anymore, so the young must flee it.[98]

McGuckin deals with this epitaph (2001:60-61), but only deals with lines 1-4, thinking that lines 5-8 are a different epitaph altogether. No reason is given for this. According to McGuckin, both Eunapius, Prohaeresius' disciple, and Julian wanted to make Prohaeresius an 'honorary Hellenist' – Eunapius by "canonising him as a pagan saint" and Julian making Prohaeresius the "sole exception to his legislation banning Christians from the rhetorical profession" (p.61). McGuckin even notes that Prohaeresius is the only Christian to make it into Eunapius' *Lives of the Philosophers*, but this is because the pupil's admiration was so great for his former teacher.[99] However, there is some debate amongst scholars as to whether or not Prohaeresius was a Christian. It is a question that is worth discussing in more detail here. For the question bears importance for our analysis of Gregory's epitaph.

There are two sources from which scholars have drawn conclusions on the religious affiliation of Prohaeresius. Firstly, the *Chronicon* of Saint Jerome states (ch.36, Helm [1913:242-243]):

[97] The use of the noun Κεκροπίη and its related adjective is quite common in epigrams for sophists, orators and philosophers. See Puech (2002:*passim*).
[98] Compare with Stenger (2020:163) who notes how even Libanius was disappointed by the calibre of sophist at Athens and finally turned his back on the city.
[99] For Julian's exception for Prohaeresius, see Jerome's *Chronicon* (Helm, 1913:242-243).

> *Prohaeresius sofista Atheniensis lege data, ne Christiani liberalium atrium doctores essent, cum sibi specialiter Iulianus concederet, ut Christianus doceret, scholam sponte deseruit.*
>
> Prohaeresius, the Athenian sophist, when a law had been decreed that Christians could not be teachers of the liberal arts, although Julian did permit him especially, that he, as a Christian, might teach, left the school at once.

The second comes from Eunapius' *Lives of the Philosophers*, which does not assert Prohaeresius' Christendom in as straightforward a manner as Jerome (10.8):

> Ἰουλιανοῦ δὲ βασιλεύοντος, νόμῳ τοῦ παιδεύειν ἐξειργόμενος (ἐδόκει γὰρ εἶναι χριστιανός)[100] συνορῶν τὸν ἱεροφάντην ὥσπερ Δελφικόν τινα τρίποδα πρὸς τὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος πρόνοιαν πᾶσι τοῖς δεομένοις ἀνακείμενον, σοφίᾳ τινὶ περιῆλθε ξένῃ τὴν πρόγνωσιν.
>
> When Julian was emperor, and when Prohaeresius was excluded by law from teaching (for he seemed to be Christian); and since he observed that the hierophant, like a Delphic tripod, was open to all who had need of him to foretell future events, deceptively obtained a prediction through an unusual trick.[101]

As Prohaeresius cannot enquire directly about the emperor's death, he asks instead about financial reforms that Julian introduced and if they would last for long. When the hierophant replies no, Prohaeresius knows that Julian does not have long left. Goulet (2000:209-217) makes a compelling case for Prohaeresius' paganism. He discusses the two epitaphs discussed above, and notes that there are no Christian references in both, leading one to the possible conclusion that this is because they were not Christian (p.211). Of course, the absence of any reference to Christianity does not then mean that they were Pagan.[102] It is also true that the little we know about the Julian edict on school teachers would indicate that the edict was aimed not at Christians alone, but rather all those who did not fit to the moral standards of Julian (that is, both Christians and Pagans who did not agree with Julian's stance on Greek literature that it was inseparable from the non-Christian religion it professes). Furthermore, we know from the letters of Julian and his oration against the cynic Heraclitus that not all non-Christians were entirely onboard with his religious reforms, or his particular brand of Paganism.[103]

---

[100] Scholars, such as Ruether (1969:20, fn.2) have often based Prohaeresius' Christianity on this parenthesis – taking no account of its context – which would immediately murky the waters.

[101] The text is that of Goulet (2014), the translation is partly mine with the aid of Goulet's translation (p.82) and Wright's (1922:513).

[102] See E. Rebillard (2012:66) who notes some comments of St. Augustine on Christians (both catechumenates and baptised) who continued to consult astrologers.

[103] On the edict and Julian's support amongst Pagans, see Goulet (2000:211-214) and Stenger (2009:101-110). See also McLynn (2014) who does not engage with the work of Stenger and believes Prohaeresius to be a Christian, as does Watts (2006) who argues against Goulet. Urbano (2013:237-241) goes so far as to say that Eunapius uses Prohaeresius as 'an acceptable Christian model' (p.207). Even if it were true that he was a Christian, to suggest that Eunapius was using him as some sort of Christian model seems very unlikely indeed – given that every other philosopher in his work is a "pagan", Neo-Platonist. Nevertheless, I agree with McLynn that the language of the edict is much more ambiguous than many scholars have allowed, essentially leaving the Christian teachers - and the governors who could enforce this edict - with a choice to obey or not. I also agree that local sentiment for and approval of the implementation of the edict for certain persons – like Victorinus and Prohaeresius – was essential in its implementation to remove or sideline such figures. Nevertheless, it is clear that the edict had more than Christians in mind, and it is unlikely, I believe, that Prohaeresius was Christian in any meaningful sense of the word – that is, a devout, practicing Christian like Gregory. On this, see also Cribiore (2013:229-237).

Given that Eunapius, who knew Prohaeresius personally, seems to cast doubt on Prohaeresius' Christianity, and Jerome's account gives no evidence at all of his Christianity, or of the much more complex aim and nature of the school edict, one is inclined to side with Eunapius over Jerome on this issue. However, does one really have to take a side? Or rather, is there really a dichotomy between Christian and Pagan here? It is unlikely that Eunapius would recount his (somewhat fabricated) account of Prohaeresius consulting the hierophant, if there was no doubt concerning his Christian identity; and so, the most that we can assert is Prohaeresius' religious affiliations are unclear. Eunapius clearly wants him to join the neo-Platonic philosophers of his *Lives*, and perhaps he was such a philosopher. But then again, perhaps Prohaeresius was neither a fervent Pagan nor a good Christian, but one of the *incerti* – to use a phrase coined by Kahlos (2007, *passim*).[104] Perhaps his main devotion was not to Christ or the gods, but to *paideia* and sophistry. Given the lack of any clear religious affiliation in the epitaphs collected by Puech and discussed above, it is not too difficult to conclude that religion did not (have to) feature prominently in the identity of the *pepaideumenoi.* One's *paideia*, as it were, could exist alongside or separated from one's Christianity or Pagan beliefs. A closer look at Gregory's epitaph may prove enlightening.

Athens tells us that the whole race of loftily spoken sophists should yield to Prohaeresius (σοφιστῶν Πᾶν γένος ὑψιλόγων εἶκε Προαιρεσίῳ), and we know from other sources that this is no mere aggrandisement of the deceased. Prohaeresius was a favoured sophist in the court of Constans and was honoured with a statue both at Rome and Athens. Eunapius even tells us that the statue at Rome was inscribed "Rome the Queen of cities to the king of eloquence."[105] This time at the Imperial court did not only lead to renown in oratory, but secured for Athens, through his request, the supply of grain from certain islands and his appointment as "stratopedarch", an office even held by the emperor Constantine (Julian, *Or*. 1.8). This stint abroad came, in fact, from his exile from Athens on account of a rivalry between himself and the other teachers of Athens. This enmity arose through his successful monopoly of obtaining (often through coercive and violent means) students for his own school at the expense of other teachers.[106] On his return to Athens, the other teachers were no more in favour of him, and he continued his dominance of the student-market. This rivalry is certainly part of the reason why Julian was so hostile to Prohaeresius, for he seems to have favoured his enemies, such as Himerius, who would no doubt have encouraged Julian's attempt to oust teachers (Prohaeresius amongst them). Speaker par excellence, darling of the emperor, and astute politician, Prohaeresius was likely a sophist in more than one sense of the word. [107] This, no doubt, is what Gregory is praising in both Thespesius (who is clearly over shadowed by his Athenian counterpart) and Prohaeresius' epitaphs: their prowess in the fields of

[104] By *incerti* I mean "those unclassifiable and indefinable individuals who appear in the grey area between hard-line polytheism and hard-line Christianity in Late Antiquity and who elude the rigid pagan-Christian dichotomy" (Kahlos, 2007:31). Such a work marks a welcome change from the dichotomy between "Pagans" and Christians that can be seen in works such as Jones (1963) who talks of a Christian 'battle with Paganism' (p.17) – which is found in a collected volume entitled *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity*. See also the more recent Von Ehrenkrook (2017)
[105] Libanius, *Ep.* 278, mentions both of these statues but does not tell us the inscription.
[106] On the violent student culture of Athens, see DeForest (2011).
[107] The work of Puech (2002:10-15) summarises the many nuances that the title "sophist" had.

rhetoric and their ability to use their *paideia* to accomplish what all aristocratic men of their time wished to accomplish through their education – personal and political renown, the prosperity of their own kin and city, and *fama parennis*. Therefore, Prohaeresius is not (contra McGuckin) being praised by Gregory for being a sort of Christian martyr, forced out of his position as a rhetor at Athens - despite Julian's supposed special exception. Rather, he is being praised for exactly what other sophist and orators were praised for in their epitaphs: his embodiment of *paideia*. And so, when Gregory tells the young to flee Athens, it is not because Prohaeresius – the Christian orator par excellence – is no longer there, but because Prohaeresius – the most eloquent of the sophists – has left it, and so they too must flee.[108]

If Gregory and Prohaeresius do not hold religion in common, they do share a similar conception of *paideia*; or, rather, agree that Julian's conception of *paideia* is unacceptable. These epitaphs in honour of Thespesius and Prohaeresius are not a celebration of Christian sophists, but of sophists of uncertain (*incerti*) religious affiliation (though unlikely in any sense Christian) who embody excellently the Greek culture and education that was clearly very dear to Gregory.[109] We see then that Gregory has developed a conception of *paideia* that need not be explicitly Christian (even if Christ for Gregory is the source and summit of *paideia*), just as Julian's conception demanded, on the other hand, a firm allegiance to the Greco-Roman pantheon. In our discussion of Prohaeresius, we have seen that he was not a mere spinner of words, or composer of fine speeches that were, however, totally devoid of any relevance or importance to contemporary life (a sophist in the most negative sense of the word), but a well-decorated and active public servant to the people of Athens, securing for her not only renown but also grain through his office as stratopedarch. Although this civil service is not made clear in these epitaphs of Gregory, we will see below that patriotism (outstanding service to one's country) is often a major characteristic of Gregory's *pepaideumenoi* – and of epigrams generally speaking.[110] Furthermore, it must be emphasised that despite the negative view of sophists noted in our introductory discussion of *Or.* 4, Gregory clearly had respect for this prominent sophist and teacher of his; but what is more, is that this much more positive view of a sophist – and sophistic values – only comes across in poetry, as we shall see in other epitaphs for deceased *pepaideumenoi*. In his funeral oration for Basil (*Or.* 43.15), Gregory notes that:

> Σοφιστομανοῦσιν[111] Ἀθήνησι τῶν νέων οἱ πλεῖστοι καὶ ἀφρονέστεροι, οὐ τῶν ἀγεννῶν μόνον καὶ τῶν ἀνωνύμον, ἀλλ' ἤδη καὶ τῶν εὖ γεγονότων καὶ περιφανεστέρων …
>
> In Athens, the foolish majority of the young men have a passion for sophists, not only the ignoble and un-noteworthy, but also the noble and illustrious …

[108] See Wenzel (2010) for an outline of Gregory's more positive view of Athens. However, Wenzel does not at all consider this epigram in his article. Nevertheless, I don't believe Gregory is being negative of *paideia* or Athens here, although a place like Athens had its dangers for the committed Christian.
[109] It should be noted, however, that Gregory has not only praise for sophists, but scorn too – such as in their inordinate desire for applause (as noted by Ruether [1969:28] quoting *Carm.* 2.1.11.265-274). Yet Gregory could also be guilty of such desire, as Jerome suggests in one of his epistles (52.8) – see also Adkin (1999).
[110] On which see Coleman (2019).
[111] A word first attested in Gregory, see *Lampe* s.v. σοφιστομανέω.

Given that Gregory wholeheartedly joined in the sophistic life at Athens, as evidenced by his in-depth knowledge of its rituals (DeForest, 2011), we must keep in mind that Gregory perhaps saw himself as one of those young men (of the more noble kind, of course) who took a great interest in sophists, and perhaps once wanted to emulate them. It is this desire, which, as we shall see, was so lacking in his friend Basil, that ultimately shapes Gregory's unique conception and use of *paideia*.

Martinianus

Another example of a *pepaideumenos* is found in the epitaphs for Martinianus. No explicit mention is made of his religion, but much is made of his *paideia*. Chastagnol (1960:292-293) summarises the little that we know of this prefect. He held prominent positions in North Africa, Sicily, and Italy as prefect of the City; and was likely involved in the quelling of Magnentius' rebellion (hence the reference to his prowess in battle by land and sea in Gregory's epitaph for him [*AP* 8.108]).[112] That Martinianus was Christian can be (somewhat) safely asserted.[113] But it is also clear that, if he were a Christian, this was not something which Gregory highlights or touches upon in lamenting and praising the deceased Cappadocian. Before we even look at these epitaphs, we can see in the letter of Basil to Martinianus (*Ep*. 74) that the Bishop of Caesarea does not rely on a common religion (which they may or may not have shared even if Martinianus were – broadly speaking – Christian) but on a shared *paideia*.[114] Basil wrote the letter to plead with Martinianus to try what he can to stop the splitting of Cappadocia into two provinces, thus weakening his episcopal power. The letter is replete with references to writers such as Homer and Simonides, and appeals not at all to God, but rather to a sense of patriotism for one's homeland, Cappadocia in this case. Basil even tries to rouse Martinianus' pity by recounting how the learned men and the refinement and fame that they bring to the city through their eloquence has been replaced by Scythians and Massagete tribes being bought and sold in the market place, whilst the members of the upper-echelons of Caesarean society head to Podandus, which is compared to the Laconian Ceades, a pit in Sparta into which condemned criminals were thrown. This, of course, is not the only letter of Basil that makes use of his education and shared *paideia*.[115] But if we compare this letter to the following two (*Ep*.75-76), written to Aburgius and Sophronius respectively on the same matter, we see that Basil does make mention of God and the strength that He can give Basil's two correspondents to intercede for him in the matter at hand. That Basil would choose to make full use of their shared *paideia*, as opposed to a shared religion, might suggest that this was very important to Martinianus, more so than his religious identity. However, this is difficult to infer from the (lack of) evidence. At the least, we can say that Basil preferred to use with Martinianus

[112] See *PLRE* 1:564, s.v. Martinianus 5. Van Dam (2002:58-59) who believes his prominence in the administration of the western Empire is due to his support of Constantius against Magnentius. Van Dam also points out that his prominence in the West would suggest that he knew Latin and was perhaps even trained in Roman law as well (p.120). See also Hauser-Meury (1960:117-118) which gives more details about his political/military career.

[113] *PLRE* 1:564 suggests that he was a Pagan who became a Christian in later life,but the invocation of Christ in some of these epitaphs would lead one to believe that he was a Christian.

[114] This is also noted by Van Dam (2002:120-121).

[115] See Beagon (1997) for another possible cultural contact of Basil, Strategius Musonianus, who was praetorian prefect in the east between 354 and 358 – thus holding a similarly prominent position to Martinianus in the Empire.

the established code of communication with elite figures without feeling the need to invoke Christian themes or forms of reasoning as he does with Aburgius and Sophronius.[116]

The same can be said for Gregory's epitaphs for him. We find in these epitaphs two pagan exempla, found in *AP* 8.104 which opens the series on Martinianus and centres around the myth of Tantalus and the torments he endured:

> Εἴ τις Τάνταλός ἐστιν ἐν ὕδασιν αὖος ἀπίστοις,
> εἴ τις ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς πέτρος ἀεὶ φοβέων
> δαπτόμενόν τ' ὄρνισιν ἀγήραον ἦπαρ ἀλιτροῦ
> καὶ πυρόεις ποταμὸς καὶ ζόφος ἀθάνατος
> ταρτάρεοί τε μυχοὶ καὶ δαίμονες ἀγριόθυμοι
> ἄλλαι τε φθιμένων τίσιες εἰν ἀίδι,
> ὅστις Μαρτινιανὸν ἀγακλέα δηλήσαιτο
> τύμβον ἀνοχλίζων, δείματα πάντα φέροι.
>
> If there is a Tantalus thirsting in the deceitful waters, if there is a rock above one's head forever causing fear, and a sinner's undecaying liver feasted upon by birds, and a fiery river and immortal darkness, Tartaran depths and wild-tempered *daimones*, and other punishments of the dead, may whosoever does mischief to illustrious Martinianus by digging up his tomb endure all these terrible things.

This epigram has many similarities to other *arai* found in Greek literature, such as the one found in Puech and mentioned above. Firstly, it should be noted that this poem (and the other poems in the Martinianus cycle, as we shall see below) is concerned with the theme of justice (*Themis*) (Watson [1991:38-42]).[117] The curse wishes that any who should despoil the tomb against established law and custom, should be punished with the torments of Hades. There is also a certain learned obscurity which is characteristic of Hellenistic *arai* (Watson, p.168-175). Reference is made here to the punishments of Sisyphus (mentioned also in 8.110) and Prometheus without mentioning them explicitly, but simply referring to their eternal punishments. The word ζόφος is often used in Homer to describe the nether-world but is normally combined with the adjective ἠερόεις (murky), and so the description of darkness as 'immortal' (ἀθάνατος) here is peculiar, and somewhat reminiscent of Orphic poetry. Where ζόφος ἀθάνατος has an Orphic ring to it, ἀγριόθυμοι is most definitely Orphic, and only found outside this poem in an Orphic Hymn to Heracles.[118] All of Martinianus' epitaphs show concern for the welfare of his tomb, and much has already been written on this subject.[119] What is worth noting here is the narrative that gradually unfolds through the variation on the theme of Martinianus' prowess in life and care after his death for his tomb.

---

[116] On *paideia* as a means of communication between elites, see Brown (1992:35-70). The epistolary exchange between Basil and Libanius sees Basil much more in tune with his secular education. However, these letters between the two figures are likely a forgery; on which, see Van Hoof (2016). See also Brown (2002:35-42) who notes that Basil's relief of the poor during famine stems not (only) from his monastic/ascetic proclivities, but from his civic duty (as an elite man imbued with *paideia*) to the poor – and to protect tax cuts for the Church and clergy.

[117] For the role of Themis in cult and archaic literature (i.e. Homer) and society, see Harrison (1912) and Stafford (2000:45-73), who highlights the role that Themis plays in maintaining the social and natural cohesion of the world.

[118] See *LSJ*, s.v. ἀγριόθῡμος, *Orph. Hym.* 12.4. We will discuss such Orphic elements in more detail in Ch.4.

[119] See Consolino (1987), Corsano (1991), and Floridi (2013). Corsano and Floridi provide the most in-depth examination of the *tymborychia* poems with Floridi providing a good inter-textual analysis of the Martinanus

AP 8.106 tells us that when Martinianus was buried, all the cities of Italy groaned, as does Sicily and the broad earth, because Themis (Justice) has left men. The mention of Italy and Sicily is clear references to his time as prefect in the West. Martinianus becomes the embodiment of Justice and with his death, Justice has also left. The speaker of this poem promises to look after his tomb and keep it as something to be venerated for future generations (αἰὲν ἐπερχομένοις δώσομεν ὥς τι σέβας). One would expect Gregory, the bishop, to hold the tomb of martyrs to be first and foremost an object worthy of veneration (which is what σέβας basically means).[120] Yet Martinianus is not at all portrayed here as an excellent Christian – never mind a martyr – rather he is a fine example of the embodiment of *paideia*, and Themis (justice) in particular. The epitaphs discussed thus far might even lead one to the conclusion that Martinianus is Pagan (but this would be a case of falling into the same trap that many earlier scholars have done by presuming one's religion on flimsy grounds). For we hear of Tantalus, Tartarus, and Themis, but nothing of Christ. Even the earth in which Martinianus is buried is mother of all (μητέρα πάντων) (8.106.1).[121] Therefore, we see in Martinianus yet another example of Gregory's praise of *paideia* made without regard to the deceased's religious affiliation. The focus, rather, is Martinianus' *paideia* and the *philotimia* (love of honour) which stems from it, things which are clearly worthy of veneration for Gregory.

Given what is to come in this series of epitaphs (the threat of violence to Martinianus and his tomb), the choice of ἐπερχομένοις (8.106.6, quoted above) is apt, for it can mean those who come after in time but also can refer to those who come to attack (that is, the grave robbers). It is clear that Martinianus had great power and influence in his life, but Gregory has Martinianus himself address the use of this power in death (8.107):

> Οἱ Χριστὸν φορέοντες ἀκούσατε οἵ τε θέμιστας
> εἰδότες ἡμερίων καὶ φθιμένων ὁσίην·
> πάντα λιπών, βασιλῆα, πάτρην, γένος, εὖχος ὑπάρχων,
> αἰαῖ, πᾶσιν ὁμῶς νῦν κόνις εἴμ' ὀλίγη
> Μαρτινιανὸς πᾶσι τετιμένος· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τύμβῳ
> βάλλειν ἡμετέρῳ δάκρυα, μὴ παλάμας.
>
> Listen you who bear Christ and who know the laws of today's men and the honours due to the dead. Leaving everything, the Emperor, my country, family, the glory of prefects, alas! I am now, like all the others, a little bit of dust, I Martinianus who was honoured by all. But on our tomb cast tears and not hands.[122]

There is a clear contrast here between the time during which Martinianus was alive and had everything, to Martinianus now who is but dust. From having all the power in the world to having nothing, Martinianus must plead with his listeners on the ground of (Christian) religion, written law (θέμιστας) and established custom around the burial of the dead (ὁσίην).

---

epitaphs, highlighting the references to Homer and other Greek writers, as well as the New Testament. See also Parrot (1939) on *arai* in general.

[120] See *Lampe* s.v. σέβας, 2.

[121] See Waltz (1944:114) for the various places this is found in (Pagan) Greek literature.

[122] On the use of the first person in sepulchral epigrams, see Vestrheim (2010:71-75).

The next epigram goes on to enumerate Martinianus' achievements in no uncertain terms (8.108):

> Μουσοπόλον, ῥητῆρα, δικασπόλον, ἄκρον ἅπαντα,
> τύμβος ὅδ' εὐγενέτην Μαρτινιανὸν ἔχω,
> ναυμάχον ἐν πελάγεσσιν, ἀρήιον ἐν πεδίοισιν·
> ἀλλ' ἀποτῆλε τάφου πρίν τι κακὸν παθέειν.
>
> Poet, rhetor, judge, excelling in everything, noble Martinianus I, his tomb, hold; a marine at sea, valiant on land. But stay away from this sepulchre, lest something evil befall you.

One gets a sense here of how broad Martinianus' education was. Not only is he an accomplished poet and speaker, but in the duties of state he excels in both law and warfare. Although Martinianus has left behind the glory of his accomplishments, as well as the state and people he once patriotically served, he is still in death, nevertheless, a *pepaideumenos*. A man who was both just judge and warrior should surely strike fear into the heart of those intending to rob his grave. But this is not the case (8.109):

> Μὴ πόλεμον φθιμένοισιν· ἅλις ζώοντες, ἀλιτροί·
> μὴ πόλεμον φθιμένοις. Μαρτινιανὸς ἐγὼ
> ταῦτα πάσιν ζῴοις ἐπιτέλλομαι. οὐ θέμις ἐστὶν
> τῶν ὀλίγων φθονέειν τοῖς φθιμένοισι λίθων.
>
> Do not wage war on the dead, the living are plentiful you sinners. Do not wage war on the dead. I Martinianus enjoin this on all the living. It is not just to envy the little stones of the dead.

Despite the martial prowess and oratorical eloquence of Martinianus in life, this is not enough to keep away the grave diggers from his tomb. He can plead and command and tell the reader what is *themis* (just), but he cannot enforce it; and we go on to see just how much power Martinianus has from the grave (8.112):

> Χάζεο, χάζεο τῆλε· κακὸν τὸν ἄεθλον ἐγείρεις
> λᾶας ἀνοχλίζων καὶ τάφον ἡμέτερον·
> χάζεο· Μαρτινιανὸς ἐγώ, καὶ ζῶσιν ὄνειαρ,
> καὶ νέκυς οὐκ ὀλίγον ἐνθάδε κάρτος ἔχω.
>
> Draw back! Draw back far off! You are rousing up a wicked contest by digging up the stones of our tomb. I am Martinianus, a profit to the living and dead I have not a little power here.

Floridi (2013:67) sees this epitaph as an indication of Martinianus' power even in death, and so interprets the last line as 'and here dead I have no little power.' Therefore, Martinianus, even in death could inflict punishment on his assailants, but that is clearly not the case. As the poem unfolds the robbers are at that very moment despoiling his grave. He is, in a sense, still a *pepaideumenos* – for he speaks to the reader in elegiac couplets - but at the same time he is but dust, and has become a prize (ὄνειαρ, literally a thing that brings profit) in a wicked contest (κακὸν τὸν ἄεθλον). The translation of ὄνειαρ as "prize" or "benefit" is the one preferred by recent

translations.[123] However, perhaps Gregory (also) means to suggest that Martinianus is now a mere fleeting thing.[124] In which case, he is but a shadow of himself to the living, stripped of the power and prestige he once held. I wonder if the ambiguity is meant by Gregory, for it is true that he was of benefit to the living in life, but it is also true that his death has left him as a shadow of his former self, a pile of dust. For all the benefits that his *paideia* brought to him and others in life, it serves him nothing in death.

In the narrative that unfolds in the Martinianus cycle, we see that Gregory holds justice to be something inherent within Martinianus. When he departs, *Themis*, the embodiment of justice, departs with him; and with the departure of justice from the world, there is nothing to stop the grave robbers from despoiling Martinianus' grave and desecrating his remains. The cycle begins with a learned display of his *paideia* through the curse poem of 8.104; then, his various achievements and status in life are enumerated. His prowess as a general seems to act as a warning against robbers at 8.108, but despite his curses and boasting of his status in life, it cannot stop the grave robbers from disturbing his grave. Neither the power he held as a magistrate and general nor his *paideia* which exceeded his contemporaries can save his tomb. The *paideia* that was so dear to him in life and in which he excelled profits him nothing in death. That justice, for Gregory, is not found in laws and customs – can be seen in one of the iambic epigrams on *tymborychia* (*PG* 38.106):[125]

> Δίκη, δικασταὶ, καὶ νόμοι, καὶ Βήματα,
> Κακοῖς ἀρήγετ'. Οὐ γὰρ ἄν κάλλος τόδε
> Τάφου διώλετ' ἐξ αθεμίτου χερός,
> Ἣ καὶ πάλαι θανόντας αἰτεῖ χρυσίον.
>
> You, Justice, judges and laws and tribunals bring aid to the wicked. For, otherwise, the beauty of this sepulchre would not have been destroyed by the unjust hand, a hand that asks for gold even from those who died long ago.

As Corsano makes clear, laws and the processes of justice played out in courtrooms before judges and magistrates do not help the prevention of tomb robberies – in fact, they give aid to the wicked. What we must add, however, is that, if justice is not found in laws and courtrooms, it is for Gregory found in the *pepaideumenoi* on account of their education. Furthermore, this is in no way attached to one's religion for even Candidianus (a Pagan correspondent of Gregory) is praised for his just judgements in court (as pointed out by Corsano, p.173) in a letter which clearly displays Gregory and Candidianus' shared *paideia* (*Ep.* 10).[126]

To conclude this section on the Martinianus cycle, we see the rise of a Cappadocian statesman from the obscure, eastern province of his homeland to the very seat of power in the

---

[123] See Waltz (1944:66): "Je faisais du bien aux vivants …"; and Paton (1917:449): "The living I benefited …".
[124] See *LSJ* s.v. ὄνειαρ, II, for this alternative spelling of ὄναρ – which appears elsewhere in the *AP* (7.42); and see *LSJ* s.v. ὄναρ, 2 for its meaning here. We could then also see an echo of Pindar's *Pyth*. 8.95.
[125] See Corsano (pp.177-179) which also discusses in more detail Gregory's view of the inability of law to enact justice. He also provides an analysis of the manuscript tradition on this particular poem and I incorporate his changes from the version printed in the *PG* (38.106) into my discussion.
[126] On Candidianus, see *PLRE* s.v. Candidianus 2 and Hauser-Meury (1960:51-52).

Mediterranean world. This rise was not only achieved through his political and military acumen, but also his excellence in the realm of *paideia* – which, as we have seen in characters such as Musonius and Prohaeresius - is not in any way separate from the realms of politics or war. Nevertheless, despite his great learning, Martinianus can do nothing to stop the threat of violence against his tomb and corpse. Despite his sound dispensation of justice during his life, with his death Justice has left the earth, and, even so, laws and lawcourts can do little to nothing to punish the perpetrators.

It must be asked why the epigrams for Martinianus show a particular preoccupation with the welfare of his tomb. We know that the majority of inscriptions against *tymborychia* are found in Asia Minor, and so it is only natural that a prominent Cappadocian who was – most likely – buried in the region would have concern about his tomb being ransacked. But why Martinianus in particular? As we can tell from what we know of Martinianus, he was a prominent magistrate and is praised by Gregory for his sound judgement. Given his career in the West, it is not beyond the realms of possibility that he was not only a Latin speaker but also educated in law, perhaps at Beirut. We see at this period, also, a series of legislation on penalties for disturbing tombs and the bodies within them issued by Julian and Constantius and re-affirmed by emperors after them.[127] Could it be that Martinianus, the native of a land that was all too conscious of the threat of grave robbers, had some hand in this legislation? This is, of course, mere speculation. What is more pertinent to our argument, however, is that there is a contrast between sound judgement and the guarantee of justice that is secured by *paideia* and the laws of the land which, in and of themselves, cannot prevent the wrongdoing or bring it to justice. In other words, justice and peace are not guaranteed by laws and legislation but by the people who are embodiments of *Themis* through their *paideia*. When dead, however, one's education and illustrious career in life can do little to help you. Such *pathos* and pessimism can only be expected in epitaphs, and rarely do the epitaphs found in Gregory or the *AP* generally have a happy ending. Nevertheless, it is clear that Gregory placed great emphasis on the value of *paideia* for creating a community of (ruling) men that could stem the ever-growing tide of violence and war that characterises his times – as noted by Brown (see above).

Furthermore, Gregory may well also want to display to other Imperial governors still alive that he was capable of lavishing on them great praise in the same way that he praised Martinianus. It is difficult to say, however, who exactly Gregory's audience is for his epitaphs, though it is clear that they are written for the *pepaideumenoi* who would share in Gregory's great learning. McLynn (2006b:289-290) has noted that Gregory, in a letter to the governor Olympus in which he sought an exemption from municipal service for his relative Nicoboulus, promises the governor in return to celebrate his administration among all those to whom he was known. Epitaphs like those for Martinianus show in no uncertain terms Gregory's ability to praise and project the success of such administrators for future generations to admire.[128] One could almost say that Gregory is like one of

[127] See E. Rebillard (2009:63-66).
[128] This is noted by Anderson (1993:212-213).

Cameron's 'wandering poets', who were 'equally proficient in the very different arts of poetry and politics' (1965:471). Therefore, what is interesting about these particular epitaphs written by a Christian bishop, is in fact the very traditional and sophistic nature of them.

Livia, Euphemius and Amphilochus

Perhaps an incentive for building a chapel in the ancient world was that your remains could be interred beneath it in relative safety, such as the subjects of the next cycle of epitaphs dedicated to Gregory's relatives – his aunt Livia, her son Euphemius, and her husband Amphilochus. Livia bore three children, Amphilochus junior who left his secular career to pursue an ascetical life and became Bishop of Iconium, and Theosebia who is mentioned in another poem by Gregory to his cousin Olympias as an example of uxorial virtue.[129] Livia seems to have died at a young age, and Euphemius was the next to go at the age of twenty whilst preparing for his wedding.[130] Amphilochus senior is the last to die – as Amphilochus junior and Theosebia must have still been alive when Gregory wrote these epitaphs. Amphilochus senior was the brother of Gregory's mother and one of Gregory's first teachers. He was someone who valued highly his own *paideia* (as can be seen by his advancement in the realm of politics) and took great measures that his sons and kinsmen follow in his footsteps, not only in cultivating their *paideia*, but also in following him into a career as rhetorician and politician (as will become clear).

The first epitaph in this cycle makes reference to the church which was built by the family at Euphemias (*AP* 8.118). This epigram leaves no doubt as to the religion of the deceased and their family and provides an example of particularly Christian euergetism. But the epitaphs that follow have no other reference to their religion (119-120):

> Ὤφελες, ὦ Λιβία, ζώειν τεκέεσσι φίλοισιν·
> ὤφελες ἄχρι πύλης γήραος ἐμπελάσαι.
> νῦν δέ σε μοῖρ' ἐδάμασσεν ἀώριον, εἰσέτι καλήν,
> εἰσέτι κουριδίοις ἄνθεσι λαμπομένην.
> αἰαῖ, Ἀμφίλοχος δὲ τεὸς πόσις ἀντὶ δάμαρτος
> ἐσθλῆς καὶ πινυτῆς τλήμονα τύμβον ἔχει.
>
> You ought to be alive with your dear children, Livia. You ought to draw near to the gate of old age. But now an untimely fate has assailed you, still beautiful, still resplendent with the bloom of married youth. Alas! Amphilochus your spouse has instead of a noble and wise wife a wretched tomb.
>
> Αἰαῖ, καὶ Λιβίαν κατέχει κόνις. οὔποτ' ἔγωγε
> ὠισάμην θνητὴν ἔμμεναι εἰσορόων
> εἶδος μειλιχίην τε σαοφροσύνην τε γυναικός,
> τοῖς φῦλον πασέων καίνυτο θηλυτέρων.
> τοὔνεκα καὶ τοίῳ σε τάφῳ κύδηνε θανοῦσαν
> σῶν τε τριὰς τεκέων καὶ πόσις Ἀμφίλοχος.

[129] For Amphilochius senior, see *PLRE* 1:57-58, s.v. Amphilochius 2. It is noted by Hauser-Meury (1960:29) that he was fellow student with Libanius and known to Themistius. For Livia, *PLRE* 1:511 and Hauser-Meury (1960:113); for Ulpianus see *PLRE* 1:973-974, s.v. Ulpianus 3; for Amphilochius' son of the same name see *PLRE* 1:58 s.v. Amphilochius 4, and Hauser-Meury (1960:30-32); for Euphemius, see *PLRE* 1:298 and Hauser-Meury (1960:71) where it is noted that he was also a pupil of Libanius; for Theodosia, see *PLRE* 1:902 and Hauser-Meury (1960:167).

[130] Gregory's *Ep.* 230 tells us that the marriage was imminent.

> Alas! The dust has taken Livia too. I never thought that she was mortal when I saw her beauty, her sweetness, her uxorial chastity, for which she has surpassed all women. Therefore, your husband, Amphilochus and her three children honour you in death with such a great tomb.

Much of the traditional tropes and themes of Greek epitaphs are present here. The celebration of her virtues and beauty is certainly commonplace as well as the use of archaic/Homeric vocabulary to describe her - such as δάμαρ for 'wife' or describing her as πινυτή (wise).[131] Her seemingly superhuman virtue also gives her a mythic air, as if she does belong to the Homeric past which colours her description. Waltz (1944:68) notices that there is a *réminiscence homérique* in the phrase σε μοῖρ' ἐδάμασσεν (119.3), which, for him, justifies the invocation of the Pagan *Moira*. Furthermore, the opening Ὤφελες is reminiscent of Euripides' *Medea* (Εἴθ' ὤφελ') as well as *AP* 7.271 by Callimachus and *AP* 15.50, which bears the closest resemblance to the above.[132] We also have certain literary *topoi* that appear elsewhere in the *AP* such as the sentiment that the husband has a tomb instead of a spouse (*AP* 7.569), and that the tomb is given as a gift for the deceased (*AP* 7.331).[133]

These epitaphs, however, are not so much for Livia, as for her husband Amphilochus who becomes the (grammatical) subject of the close of each epitaph. Although the epitaphs are for Livia and celebrate her womanly virtue, they are also clearly for her husband (who is explicitly named) and her three children (who are not explicitly named in 120 – and do not appear in 119). What we are seeing here (as will become more apparent below) is that *paideia* forms the basis of the bond between Gregory and Amphilochus in these epitaphs, and we shall see throughout this chapter that the *Epitaphia* provide a literary space for Gregory to display his *paideia* for those who also cherished it or embodied it in their own lives.

In turning to the epitaphs for Euphemius, we will see that *paideia* plays a more prominent role in the description of the deceased (*AP* 8.122):

> Ῥήτωρ ἐν ῥητῆρσιν, ἀοιδοπόλος δ' ἐν ἀοιδοῖς,
> κῦδος ἑῆς πάτρης, κῦδος ἑῶν τοκέων,
> ἄρτι γενειάσκων Εὐφήμιος, ἄρτι δ' Ἔρωτας
> ἐς θαλάμους καλέων ὤλετο, φεῦ παθέων·
> ἀντὶ δὲ παρθενικῆς τύμβον λάχεν, ἠδ' ὑμεναίων
> ἤματα νυμφιδίων ἦμαρ ἐπῆλθε γόων.
>
> Rhetor among rhetors, devoted poet among poets, the glory of your country, the glory of your parents, Euphemius, just growing his first beard, just calling the Loves to his chambers is dead. Woe these misfortunes! He has a tomb instead of a virgin bride, and the day of mourning has overtaken the days of bridal wedding songs.

---

[131] The adjective is used to describe Penelope at *Od*. 11.445.
[132] *AP* 7.271.1: Ὤφελε μηδ' ἐγένοντο θοαὶ νέες; *AP* 15.50.1: Ὤφελες ὅπλα φέρειν. On the opening line of the *Medea*, see Mastronarde (2002:161). On Callimachus's influence on Gregory see Simelidis (2009 and 2011). On Hellenistic epigram more generally, see Bing's monograph (2009), though I do not concern myself here with many of the questions which he discusses – such as the presence of *Ergänzungsspiel* in Callimachus' epigrams or the relations between literary and inscribed epigrams. See, however, De Stefani and Magnelli (2011) on Callimachus and later Greek poetry, and the recently completed PhD dissertation of Poulos (2019) on Callimachus in Gregory's poetry.
[133] See also *EG* 243b as cited by Lattimore (1942:276).

Firstly, we see that clear signal of one's status as a sophist, ῥήτωρ, and the link between one's *paideia* and patriotism since his *paideia* brings κῦδος to his country. The word ἀοιδοπόλος is found only in the *AP* (7.594-595) used by Julian the Egyptian (writing in the 6th Century AD),[134] and the *Palnudean Anthology* (*APl* 4.75) by Antipater of Thessalonica (writing at the end of the 1st century AD). This shows a certain familiarity with the epigrammatic tradition on Gregory's part, but more interestingly the use of ἀοιδοπόλος in these other authors is to describe the poets of old or poets of renown in particular.[135] We can certainly see that there is a similar sense in ἀοιδοπόλος here. Euphemius may have died young, but his grasp of *paideia* was like that of the ancients. Again, as we have noted in the epitaphs above, we see that Gregory's epitaphs are very much influenced by sophistic culture; in this case, it is the tendency of sophistic writers to glorify the past, to bring it to life in the present, and to indulge in a certain nostalgia for the literature and times of ancient writers.[136]

Secondly, and more interestingly, we see here a theme that is much more common in epitaphs for women than it is for men, the death of a spouse-to-be on the eve of (or soon after) their wedding.[137] It appears again at 8.126.3-4: οἱ δ' ὑμέναιοι / ἀμφὶ θύρας· ἦλθεν δ' ὁ Φθόνος ὠκύτερος (The bridal hymners were at your door. But Envy came all the more swiftly).[138] Another common trope is found at 8.127.3-4: οὐδέ τ' ἀνέσχεν, / αἰαῖ, σοῖς θαλάμοις πυρσός, ὃν ἦψεν Ἔρως (Alas, the torch that love had lit was not held up in your chambers). It is implied that instead they are present at his funeral – as in 7.182,188. The epitaphic tradition as preserved in *AP* 7 provides for Gregory enough material for Euphemius' particularly tragic end, dying soon before his wedding day.[139] Furthermore, the use of a trope used normally for a deceased female raises (as we have indicated) certain questions about Gregory's concept of gender, but it also shows a certain playfulness, On Gregory's part, with *paideia,* and particularly the literary tradition in which he was writing. The relationship between the literary tradition and Gregory's innovations upon it will be discussed further in later chapters.

Furthermore, we find in these poems addressed to the bridegroom many references to the Graces, Muses, and Erotes. Euphemius was calling the loves to his chamber when he was struck

---

[134] On whom, see Hartigan (1975).
[135] See *GA* 7.594-595, where Theodorus has devoted his life's work to preserving the works of ancient poets – and his death heralds the final death of the ancient poets (ἀοιδοπόλων παλαιῶν).
[136] On this, see especially Anderson (1993:96-85,101-132).
[137] See *AP* 7.182,183,186,188. Also, see Elm's (2006) thought-provoking article, which discusses his concept of family, its implications for gendered roles in antiquity, and Gregory's own self-portrayal as both a father and mother of sorts. A consideration of these poems might further develop the conclusions of Elm, but we have not the space to discuss this here.
[138] See Gregg (1975:149-152) for the role of Envy in the writings of the Cappadocian fathers. He notes that this mention of envy is more than just a nod to their Greek education and the literary tropes that would normally accompany the lamentations of their consolatory works, but that Envy (especially that of Satan) is worked into the theology of Basil, Nazianzen, and Nyssen. It is also the case that envy can play a role in the description of sophists, and that the envy of other such men often leads to adversity. Take for, example Prohaeresius, whose rivals are 'wracked with envy' at his marvellous extempore displays (see Ruether [1969:22]). See, also, Stevens (1948), Papala (1979) and Spatharas (2011).
[139] This *topos* can also be found throughout tragedy, see Seaford (1987), Rehm (1994), and Ferrari (2003:35-38).

down (122.3-4); he has beauty like the Graces (124.3); he is whom the Graces give to the Muses (126.3). The Muses and Graces appear again at 127, but in 128 they have a conversation, during which they decide never to raise an ἄγαλμα (statue) like Euphemius ever again.[140] It should be noted that the gods invoked here (Eros, the Graces and the Muses) are often found in epithalamic poems and orations. Penella (2005:141) notes how Gregory in two letters (Eps. 231-232) says he would leave it to others to summon the Erotes (231.3), but clearly, he has no qualms to do so here – even if the context is more tragic. Not taking account of these epitaphs, Penella puts Gregory among the more austere Christians, but in fact it would seem that Gregory, like other educated Christians detached the pagan gods from their religious origins and used them as 'an encoded model of human relations' (Roberts 1989:335), as is the case with the invocation of myth in the epitaphs for Martinianus. This practice of detaching the pagan gods from their original religious bearings further joins Gregory to the emerging culture of the Christian elite of both the West and East, and so Gregory appears more like his Latin contemporary Ausonius than Paulinus, who would go on to reject such a view of Pagan divinities.[141] Clearly Gregory, unlike Nyssen and Basil, was less tentative about using the education and literature he had inherited from the Hellenic past. Gregory might echo Basil in saying that one should "pluck the roses and avoid the thorns" in culling what is good and beautiful from Greek literature.[142] But if we interpret this phrase as simply culling out all that could be considered "Pagan", then Gregory seems to have plucked a few thorns with his roses. We should be aware, therefore, that such vague slogans can do little to tell us how Gregory (and other church fathers) really viewed the Greek literature in which they were formed, and often their relation to *paideia* and how they used and viewed it could change and be re-negotiated depending upon their present needs and aims – such as Basil's letter to Martinianus discussed above, or the fact that Gregory says in his epistles that he will leave it to others to summon the Erotes, but happily does it in his epitaph for Euphemius. These complexities will become much clearer below in our discussion of Caesarius' epitaphs.

Gregory, in three epitaphs, elaborates as to why he died so young - at the age of just twenty (123.1). It is worth quoting these epitaphs in full (8.123-125):[143]

---

[140] See, also, Bowie's brief discussion of the poet and sophist Falernus, who, in one of his own epigrams, says his lines are 'worthy of the Muses, worthy of the Graces' (1989:230), emphasising the importance of these figures to the identity of the sophist.

[141] The use of these divinities in Gregory's poetry should put to bed any scholarly belief that such classicising tendencies in an author is a sign of 'crypto-paganism' – on which, see Gullo (forthcoming, b:54-55). On Ausonius and Paulinus, see Shorrock (2011:15-20). He suggests later that Gregory is a 'poet of Christ' as opposed to 'of the Muses' (p. 32), but the above epitaphs show just how complex the issue is with Gregory, for, as we shall see, Gregory's poetry could be seen as a mixture of poetic dissent (the poet of Christ) and poetic descent (of the Muses), to use Shorrock's terminology (p.45). Furthermore, see Waltz's (1931) discussion of Byzantine epigrams of the sixth century. More specifically, Julian the Egyptian (mentioned here passim) – on whom see Gullo (forthcoming, b) and Dioscourus of Aphrodito (from 6th Century AD Egypt) comes to mind, whom MacCoull (1988:58) notes did not separate the classical and Christian in his poetry – even if he does not write in the high style of Gregory. See also Av. Cameron (1970:16-17) on the 6th Century cycle of Agathias who notes that the genre of epigram was inherently conservative and traditional, and so hints of "Paganism" were 'excused – indeed required – by the demands of the genre.'

[142] See *Carm.* 2.2.8.61 and Basil *Ad Adulescentes* (4.9).

[143] See also Meyer (2019:190) who briefly mention another epitaph for Euphemius (*AP* 8.129) that has a resemblance to Theocritus' *Idyll* 1 and discusses emotions in epitaphs in general.

Εἰκοσέτης πᾶσαν Εὐφήμιος, ὡς μίαν οὔτις,
Ἑλλάδα καὐσονίην μοῦσαν ἐφιπτάμενος,
στράπτων ἀγλαΐῃ τε καὶ ἤθεσιν ἦλθ' ὑπὸ γαῖαν.
αἰαῖ, τῶν ἀγαθῶν ὡς μόρος ὠκύτερος.

Euphemius, just twenty years old, running eagerly after the Greek and Latin Muses, (like no one [just pursuing] one), gleaming with Aglaia and virtue, has gone under the earth. Alas! How swift is the death of the good!

Χρυσείης γενεῆς Εὐφήμιος ἦν ἔτι τυτθὸν
λείψανον, εὐγενέτης ἤθεα καὶ πραπίδας,
μείλιχος, ἡδυεπής, εἶδος Χαρίτεσσιν ὁμοῖος·
τοὔνεκα καὶ θνητοῖς οὐκ ἐπὶ δὴν ἐμίγη.

Euphemius was a little remnant of the golden age; noble in his virtues and intelligence; gentle, sweet-speaking, with beauty like the Graces. That is why he has not been brought into contact with mortals for any length of time.

Στράψε μέγ' ἀνθρώποις Εὐφήμιος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τυτθόν·
καὶ γὰρ καὶ στεροπῆς οὐ μακρόν ἐστι σέλας·
στράψεν ὁμοῦ σοφίῃ τε καὶ εἴδεϊ καὶ πραπίδεσσιν·
τὰ πρὶν Καππαδόκαις ἦν κλέα, νῦν δὲ γόος.

Euphemius shone greatly among men, but for a little while. For, indeed, even a flash of lightning does not last long. In the same way he shone in wisdom, beauty, and intelligence. Things that were once the glory of Cappadocia, but now its lament.

In all of these epitaphs, Gregory highlights just how eagerly and how well Euphemius pursued *paideia* in his short life, exhibiting moral, physical, and intellectual excellence, worthy of (provincial-) wide renown. What is more, Gregory makes Euphemius to be a product of these Pagan divinities, something – as Kaldellis (2007:151) points out – that Aristides 'labored [sic] to prove' as regards poets and orators. Kaldellis, furthermore, says that '[i]t was a commonplace to believe that one's progress in *paideia* was due to divine assistance …'. Indeed, the greater the renown, the greater the lament. In writing to Euphemius' fiancée's father, Gregory even goes as far as to call Euphemius his son (*Ep.* 80), and so Gregory was clearly very fond of his cousin. Yet Gregory expresses his deep emotions in incredibly literate, but not explicitly Christian, terms. There is also a clear disconnect between the Gregory of the epistles, who feigns not to invoke the Erotes, and the Gregory of the poems who does it freely. Finally, it is worth noting the emphasis which Gregory puts on Euphemius' beauty. In my translation of 8.123 I have said that Euphemius was 'gleaming with Aglaia', which is the Greek word not only for 'beauty' but the name of one of the Graces – who appear often in the poems for Euphemius. Such an emphasis on physical beauty is quite far removed for the lack of concern which Christian (ascetic) writers showed for external looks – which was often grotesque compared to the ascetic's internal beauty.[144] It was, however, important to those who moved in sophistic circles, and one's physiognomical deportment was just as important as one's speech or educational credentials.[145] This emphasis of Euphemius' beauty, therefore, shows again the emphasis which Gregory places on sophistic values at the expense of

[144] Gregory (as we shall see in Ch. 3) is one of these Christian writers.
[145] See especially Gleason (1995:55-81).

more Christian ones – such as the admiration for ascetic dishevelledness.[146] Nevertheless, as will become clearer below, it may make more sense to talk about Gregory's *conceptions* of *paideia* – as opposed to his *conception* (and we shall see more clearly in Ch. 3 how Gregory can also praise the lack of beauty found in virgins).

Amphilochus senior was a fellow student of Libanius, teacher of rhetoric, an advocate in the law courts, and a colleague of the governor of Cappadocia, Ulpianus. The cycle of epitaphs dedicated to him opens with the following (*AP* 8.131):

> Ἤλυθε κ' Ἀμφιλόχοιο φίλον δέμας ἐς μέγα σῆμα,
> ψυχὴ δ' ἐς μακάρων ᾤχετ' ἀποπταμένη.
> πηοῖς πάντα πέπασο, μακάρτατε· βίβλον ἔῳξας
> πᾶσαν, ὅση θνητῶν κεἴ τις ἐπουρανίη·
> γηραλέος φιλίην ὑπέδυς χθόνα· τέκνα λέλοιπας
> κρείσσονα καὶ τοκέων· τὸ πλέον οὐ μερόπων.
>
> The dear body of Amphilochus has come into a great tomb, but his soul, flying off, has gone to the place of the blessed. For your relatives you have acquired all your possessions, most blessed man. You have opened every book, as many heavenly ones as those of mortals. In old age you went down into the beloved earth. You have left behind children and better than their parents. More is not for mortals.

Again, we have Homeric resonances, such as the references to Amphilochus as μακάρτατε.[147] Just as Amphilochus has went ἐς μακάρων (to the land of the blessed) so too do we see such vocabulary in the epitaph for a Menander of Athens who is ἐν Διὸς ἢ μακάρων (in the abode of Zeus or the blessed [*AP* 7.370]). We also see a duality of soul and body typical of Greek epitaphs, as well as the location of the soul ἐς μακάρων; the tomb had Amphilochus' body, but the heavens his soul.[148] Unlike the epitaphs we have discussed above, Amphilochus' learning is not just human but divine, and so the clear reference to his Christianity and divine learning earns him a place among the divine ones. Of all the epitaphs we have discussed thus far, this is the first one to have a clear reference to the (happy) afterlife of the deceased. Certainly, his *paideia* is just as important in this epitaph as his salvation, as Amphilochus has opened every book pertaining to sacred and profane wisdom. Although we cannot make too much of this, it is interesting to note that Gregory makes little effort to distinguish between mortal and heavenly books; one does not seem to be superior to the other. Does that mean that they are equal? Unlikely. But it is clear, nevertheless, that Gregory does not see the need to present these two forms of wisdom in a hierarchical relationship, in which sacred/scriptural learning trumps profane/Pagan learning. Given the explicit mention of an afterlife in this epitaph, and to heavenly books (wisdom), can we say that Gregory is establishing here a Christian concept of *paideia*? That Amphilochus was Christian cannot be doubted. However, that does not mean that Gregory is trying to establish a Christian *paideia* in this particular epitaph. We

[146] See also the monograph of Wypustek (2013:125-130) were he notes how those who died young were often seen as favoured by a certain god (on account of their beauty) who wished to take the deceased to themselves. His arguments only go to strengthening my argument here that these poems are incredibly indebted to the epigraphic tradition with little to no sign of Christianisation present in them.
[147] See *Od.* 6.158 and 11.483. Waltz (1944:72) also notes that φίλον δέμας *semble être une expression imitée du style homérique*.
[148] See Lattimore (1942:28-36).

have noted above the similarity of this epitaph to one found at *AP* 7.370, in which Menander (a friend of Bacchus and the Muses) goes to the abode of Zeus or the blessed (ἐν Διὸς ἢ μακάρων). A similar sentiment can be found at 7.362.4 for Aetius who is – like Amphilochus – a distinguished orator. So, to say that Gregory is here attempting to establish a *paideia* that is particularly Christian is farfetched; for there is nothing explicitly Christian about Amphilochus being blessed (μάκαρ) or dwelling with the blessed (ἐς μακάρων).

Furthermore, his epitaphs say little else about his divine learning but emphasises his *paideia* (*AP* 8.133):

> Ὦ μάκαρ, ὦ ξυνὸν πενίης ἄκος, ὦ πτερόεντες
> μῦθοι καὶ πηγὴ πᾶσιν ἀρυομένη,
> ἄσθματι πάντα λίπες πυμάτῳ· τὸ δ' ἅμ' ἕσπετο μοῦνον
> ἔνθεν ἀειρομένῳ κῦδος ἀεὶ θαλέθον.
> Γρηγόριος τάδ' ἔγραψα, λόγῳ λόγον ὃν παρὰ σεῖο,
> Ἀμφίλοχ', ἐξεδάην ἀντιχαριζόμενος.
>
> O blessed man, o common cure of poverty, o winged words and spring drawn from by all, with your last breath you have left everything. Only your ever-blooming glory follows you hence. I, Gregory wrote these things to show kindness in return with eloquence for the eloquence I learned from you, Amphilochus.

Here Amphilochus is praised for his euergetism and his winged words (πτερόεντες μῦθοι). Such almsgiving might not be particularly Christian, as it was common for prominent, urban men to financially support members of their community.[149] The poem itself is an affectionate and eloquent display by Gregory. What is interesting to note here is that Gregory gives us a clear reason for writing this poem, to repay the debt owed to his uncle for his education. Amphilochus must have been one of Gregory's first teachers before he went on his travels to Palestine, Alexandria, and Athens. Perhaps his uncle is the very person that instilled in Gregory his great love of letters. In these epitaphs it certainly comes across that *paideia* bound Gregory to his uncle and cousin, *paideia* with which Amphilochus imbued his sons and nephews and by means of which Gregory and his contemporaries could communicate, thrive and succeed in their society. No wonder, then, that Gregory sees these epitaphs as a fitting commemoration of his uncle and a means of repaying his uncle for the (love of) education that he gave his nephew. One wonders if this provides a reason not only for the writing of the epitaphs for Amphilochus, but of Livia and Euphemius as well. There is evidence to suggest that, for Gregory, *paideia* could provide some comfort for the trials and tribulations of this life. Certainly, by embodying *paideia* and practicing the virtues that flow from it, Amphilochus brought comfort (and renown) to his community – the small town of Diocaesarea (Nazianzus) - and friends.[150]

[149] On this see Vuolanto (2002) – although emphasising female euergetism - Brown (2013), and Salzman (2017).
[150] On the equation of Diocaesarea with Nazianzus, see Demoen (1997b).

Caesarius[151]

Before we begin to discuss the epitaphs of Caesarius, we will examine Gregory's correspondence with Caesarius during his life, and the oration given at some point after his death.[152] *Ep.* 7 shows Gregory's concern for Caesarius' spiritual welfare, after he has heard rumours that he is putting earthly advancements and riches before his Christian faith. The (Christian) people of Diocaesarea were gossiping: the bishop's son thinks earthly honours and positions, wealth and prestige, worthier of pursuit than the everlasting wealth, glory, and salvation found in Christ.[153] Such was the scandal that every effort was made to keep his pious mother, who would not even dine with a non-Christian, in the dark. It is clear that there were some Christians who thought that there was a dichotomy between the pursuit of earthly honours and the practice of the Christian faith – or at least this was so under the emperor Julian, who tried to marginalise the Christian faithful. But, as we have seen, Gregory does not share such a view when it comes to *paideia* and the earthly renown that comes with it. Gregory's cautions, as we shall see, comes rather from the particular emperor whom Caesarius was serving at the time, than the fact that he was serving the emperor at all.

Eps. 14 and 23 are letters in which Gregory asks his brother to use his wealth and position to look after the poor, but also their friends and close relations; 23 pleads, in particular, that Caesarius takes Amphilochus (son of Amphilochus and Livia, and future bishop of Iconium) under his protection and guidance.[154] *Ep.* 20 would have been the last letter that Gregory wrote to his brother, in which he asks his brother to return home quickly after he survived the earthquake of Nicaea. Caesarius did not return alive. The correspondence of Gregory to his younger brother Caesarius shows a certain fraternal concern.[155] Gregory is anxious to make sure that Caesarius does not stray from the path of Christian virtue and perfection. He must not be dragged down by earthly desires for power and glory, but rather strive to lead a Christian life, in a court that was not (especially under Julian) conducive to (Gregory's conception of) Christian life. After all, some of the emperors under which Caesarius served – such as Valens and, most explicitly, Julian – did not share the religious affiliations of his brother Gregory.

Such concern is all but gone in the funeral oration Gregory delivered for his brother (*Or.* 7). Gregory makes Caesarius' desire to serve in the court at Constantinople patriotic (which, as we have seen, is important in Gregory's conception of *paideia*), but admits that he had a lust for glory

[151] On Caesarius, see *PLRE* s.v.Caesarius 2, and Hauser-Meury (1960:48-50).
[152] It is not quite clear when exactly Gregory delivered this oration.
[153] See Brown (1971b:40) who notes that by Caesarius' time 'services and titles from the emperor' more than the building of public amenities and commemorative statues was how the elite man marked out his high status.
[154] Many letters from Gregory to Amphilochius are extant (*Eps.* 9, 25-28, 62, 171, and 184) and one to his father (*Ep.* 63).
[155] On the relationship of Caesarius and Gregory, see McGuckin (2001:30-34), and Van Dam (1995 and 2003b:60-65).

(δόξης ἐπιθυμία), as well as a desire to be guardian (perhaps Prefect) of the city (τοῦ προστατεῖν τῆς πόλεως [7.9.5]). Gregory admits he was not pleased by this; but, nevertheless (7.9.7):

> οὐ μικρὸν δὲ εἴ τις, τὸν δεύτερον προστησάμενος βίον, καλοκαγαθίας μεταποιοῖτο, καὶ πλείω λόγον ἔχοι Θεοῦ καὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σωτηρίας ἢ τῆς κάτω λαμπρότητος·
>
> It is no small thing, if one, who has embraced the second life [in court and not devoted to philosophy – the first life], should lay claim to nobility of character, and should understand the word of God and his own salvation more than the splendidness of this place below.

This, Gregory knows, is Caesarius' purpose. That Caesarius wanted to rise high in his career was no secret (given the letters discussed above), but what Gregory is at pains to emphasise here is that Caesarius was also just as committed to his Christian faith.

It did not take Caesarius long to rise to the top in Constantinople. Merely displaying a fraction of his learning was enough for him to be counted among the friends of the Emperor Constantius (10.1). Despite his career taking off so quickly, Caesarius did not let fame and honours corrupt his soul. Not even the simplicity of Crates' life could compare to Caesarius' and (10.4):

> πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ, πρῶτον ἦν εἰς ἀξίωμα Χριστιανὸν καὶ εἶναι καὶ ὀνομάζεσθαι, καὶ πάντα ὁμοῦ παιδιά τις ἐκείνῳ.
>
> Although there were many great things there for him, the most important was the dignity of being known as and called Christian; and everything else to him was but child's play.

Gregory is referring here to the philosopher Crates who gave away all his wealth and lived his life as a cynic. No doubt there is some hyperbole here, but the comparison is useful in that Gregory wants to emphasise the philanthropy of Caesarius, by comparing him to a cynic who supposedly gave all his wealth away (Diog. Laer. *Vitae* 6.87) – in the same way that Christ commanded. Furthermore, comparing him to a cynic further distances his brother from Julian, who expressed his dislike of the contemporary practice of the cynic lifestyle in two orations (*Or.* 6-7).[156] Caesarius need only display a portion of his παίδευσις to rise to the top, and yet the honours he gains from this are mere παιδιά to him. The link between παίδευσις and παιδιά is, indeed, tenuous here, but it does become stronger as the oration goes on. Again, we sense here a certain tension between Caesarius' career and his faith. Yes, Caesarius was a *pepaideumenos;* in fact, he is one of the best. But Gregory makes clear that it is his identity as a Christian (not a *pepaideumenos*) that is of most value to Caesarius.

In chs. 12-13 of the oration, we have an *agon* between Caesarius and Julian the Apostate.[157] Julian is eager to have Caesarius renounce his Christian faith. Gregory sets the scene; spectators are present in support of both sides, Christ arms Caesarius with His sufferings, whilst

[156] On the cynic ideal of poverty, see Desmond (2006), on Cynicism in general see Branham and Goulet-Cazé (1996), on Cynicism in the fourth Century fathers, see Krueger (1993). On Julian's view of cynicism, see Marcone (2012). On Gregory's use of Cynicism, see Asmus (1991).
[157] See chapter 3 for further discussion (and scholarship) on the *agon* in Greco-Roman society, especially contests of rhetoric and poetry.

Julian is τῇ τῶν λόγων οἰκειότητι προσσαίνων καὶ τῷ τῆς ἐξουσίας ὄγκῳ δεδιττόμενος (coaxing with their familiarity with eloquence and terrifying with the arrow point of his authority) (12.3). Previously, Gregory had made clear that Caesarius was an exemplary Christian despite/regardless of his honours and παίδευσις. But the *paideia* (and authority that comes with it) that was so prized by Gregory's peers is here used as a weapon against a faithful Christian. Gregory goes on (13.2):

> Ὡς δὲ πάσας αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις πλοκὰς διαλύσας, καὶ πεῖραν ἅπασαν ἀφανῆ τε καὶ φανερὰν ὥσπερ τινὰ παιδιὰν παρωσάμενος, μεγάλῃ καὶ λαμπρᾷ τῇ φωνῇ τὸ Χριστιανὸς εἶναί τε καὶ μένειν ἀνεκήρυξεν, οὐδὲ οὕτω μὲν παντελῶς ἀποπέμπεται· (3) καὶ γὰρ δεινὸς ἔρως εἶχε τὸν βασιλέα τῇ Καισαρίου παιδεύσει συνεῖναι καὶ καλλωπίζεσθαι·
>
> When Caesarius had loosened all the coils of his words and set aside every attempt both hidden and clear as mere child's play, he proclaimed in a great and clear voice that he was and would remain a Christian. And yet he was not dismissed altogether, for a dreadful desire held the emperor of being associated and adorned with Caesarius' learning.

Here the link between παίδευσις and παιδιά is made much more clearly. Caesarius manages to untangle the coils of words the Julian uses to ensnare him and put aside the speech of this powerful orator with ease, yet Julian does not dismiss him from his court out of an unhealthy (perhaps even irrational) desire to garner to himself the great learning of Caesarius. But Gregory does not portray Julian's lack of action against Caesarius here as clemency, but rather as Julian's terrible desire to be adorned with the learning of another. It must also be noted here that Caesarius' loud and clear declaration of his Christian faith is reminiscent of the various *Acta* of martyrs that were growing in popularity in the fourth century.[158] Again, it is made clear here that Gregory in his oration for his brother is emphasising his Christian credentials - more so than his outstanding education and the career which this obtained for him.

Later in the speech, Gregory will again denounce the pagan practices that would normally accompany a young man's funeral: the costly robes and perfumes that the tomb would enclose, or the "pagan" games (ἀγῶνες Ἑλληνικοὶ), contests, and flowers that would follow burial (16). Then Gregory outlines the futility of all the honours and activities that the learned appreciate in life, such as making oratorical displays (Οὐκ ἐπιδείξεται λόγους;) or expounding the doctrines of philosophers (Οὐ καλλωπιεῖται τοῖς Πλάτωνος …;) (20.4-5). It would seem that Gregory's view of Greek culture and learning is all but negative. Yet, although Caesarius' Christian faith is set in contrast with Julian's obsession with *paideia*, we must not draw the conclusion that Gregory holds learning entirely in contempt. After all, after the *agon* between Caesarius and Julian, the emperor supposedly utters a well-known (περιβόητον) saying heard by all present (13.3):

> Ὢ πατρὸς εὐτυχοῦς, ὢ παίδων δυστυχῶν· ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἠξίωσε τιμῆσαι τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῆς ἀτιμίας, ὧν καὶ τὴν παίδευσιν Ἀθήνῃσιν ἔγνω καὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν

[158] See Grigg (2004:21), Limberis (2011:142-144) who notes all the various martyr tropes in the oration for Caesarius (and throughout Gregory's works), and Rebillard (2017, *passim*) for various texts for various martyrs where the martyr states clearly before a judge that they are Christian.

> "O fortunate father, O unlucky children". Since he deemed me, whose learning and piety he learned of at Athens, worthy to be honoured in association with dishonour.

Gregory is keen, therefore, to be associated with not only the piety of his brother but the *paideia* of Caesarius. Furthermore, Gregory's disdain for the funeral customs stated above should be tempered against the fact that he engaged in one of the most widely practiced funerary customs in Greco-Roman culture, the writing of epitaphs. It is clear, then, that what shapes Gregory's portrayal of *paideia* is his audience. Those gathered to listen to the funeral oration for Caesarius were quite a mixed bunch. Not only orators who had come to listen to Gregory's oratorical display (7.1) but also, no doubt, the Christians who had previously wagged their fingers at the bishop's son for pursuing a career at the Imperial court that they saw as being in opposition to the practice of his Christian faith. In these poems, dedicated to Caearius, and other friends and relations, we can gain a deeper understanding of Gregory's complicated and nuanced relationship to Greek learning and culture.[159]

The epitaphs dedicated to Caesarius appear in the *PG* and *AP* 8 in exactly the same order, but later in the series of the *AP* (85-100). It begins with two epigrams, two elegiac couplets followed by three lines of iambic trimeter (*PG* 14; *AP* 8.85-85b):

> Σχέτλιός ἐστιν ὁ τύμβος. ἔγωγε μὲν οὔποτ' ἐώλπειν,
> ὥς ῥα κατακρύψει τοὺς πυμάτους προτέρους·
> αὐτὰρ ὃ Καισάριον, ἐρικυδέα υἷα, τοκήων
> τῶν προτέρων πρότερον δέξατο. ποῖα δίκη;
> Οὐκ ἔσθ' ὁ τύμβος αἴτιος· μὴ λοιδόρει.
> Φθόνου τόδ' ἐστὶν ἔργον. πῶς δ' ἤνεγκεν ἂν
> νέον γερόντων εἰσορῶν σοφώτερον;
>
> Wretched is your tomb. I had never had cause to expect that it would cover the last-born first.[160] But this tomb has received Caesarius, a renowned son, before his elders. What justice is this!?
>
> It is not the tomb's fault. Do not rail against it. This is the work of Envy. How could it incline to admire a young man who was wiser than the old?[161]

It seems that there are two speakers here, the change being indicated by the change in metre; or perhaps this is an example similar to those discussed by Walsh (1990), such as Callimachus' poem on the death of his friend Heraclitus (*AP* 7.80) where the poem acts as the vocalisation of an internal coming-to-terms with one's situation – in this case, the death of Caesarius. The tomb is wretched (Σχέτλιός) - a word often used of Homeric heroes - and the phrase ἐρικυδέα υἷα puts Caesarius on par with the heroic offspring of the gods.[162] Nevertheless, this high praise is tempered by three, sobering lines of iambic, that - unusually, given iambics' traditional subject matter – tell the speaker of this poem *not* to rail against something, and indicate what, rather, should be the

[159] See also Ypsilanti (2018) for a comparison of Gregory's epigrams for Caesarius (and Basil) with his (their) funeral oration(s).
[160] Cp. *AP* 7.228, where the tomb prays that it covers the earlier born before the later.
[161] A similar sentiment is found in an epigram of Julian the Egyptian, *AP*. 7.603, where the deceased's mind is equal to the elderly's.
[162] *Il*.14.327 where it is used of Leto; *Od*.11.576 used of Gaia, and 11.631 to describe Theseus and Peirithous.

subject of the speaker's ire: not the tomb, but Envy, who has a continuous presence in the epitaphs. Waltz (1944:110) notes that the sentiment, ποῖα δίκη, is *une exclamation qui émane d'un sentiment assez peu chrétien*.[163] It appears again at 89.3, another epitaph for Caesarius. Waltz is not the only scholar to comment on the less than Christian sentiments that appear in these epitaphs (see below). But rather than seeing these comments as a sort of strange lapse in the faith of Gregory (one of the staunchest Nicene bishops), we should note that they are in fact in line with the sentiment found in epitaphs throughout *AP* book 7.[164] One epigram in particular that we should note is *AP* 7.361, in which a father buries his son. The poet notes that the reverse (the son burying the father) would have been just, but that Envy was quicker than justice. When we compare this with the similar sentiment found at 8.89, where Gregory Sr. laments the loss of his son with a similar phrase to the above (οἵα δίκη [89.3]), we see that Gregory is clearly writing these epitaphs with an eye to the literary tradition that has come before him. This is perhaps why we see such an intensity of emotion that is altogether lacking in his orations for Caesarius. It is clear, furthermore, that Gregory's audience has changed. Gregory does not need to be as careful as he was in delivering Caesarius' funeral oration, where the Christians who were less than enthused by Caesarius' career choice were present. Rather, he can indulge more in displaying his own *paideia* in order to show more clearly how exemplary the learning of his brother was too.

The following epigram (*PG* 38.14-15; *AP* 8.86) – addressed to Caesarius' father - further builds the praise of Caesarius' wisdom, adding to his praise his physical beauty and his close relationship to the Emperor (lines 1-2):

> Γρηγόριε, θνητῶν μὲν ὑπείροχον ἔλλαχες υἷα
> κάλλεϊ καὶ σοφίῃ καὶ βασιλῆι φίλον,
> κρείσσονα δ' οὐκέτι πάμπαν ἀπηλεγέος θανάτοιο.
> ἦ μὴν ὠιόμην. ἀλλὰ τί φησὶ τάφος;
> Τέτλαθι· Καισάριος μὲν ἀπέφθιτο, ἀλλὰ μέγιστον
> υἱέος εὖχος ἔχεις υἱέος ἀντὶ φίλου.
>
> "Gregory, you had a son most excellent of men in beauty and wisdom, and a friend to the emperor, but not at all better than ruthless death." I thought as much, but what does the tomb say." "Endure it. Caesarius is dead, but you have the greatest glory of your son in place of a beloved son."

A dialogue is imagined here between Gregory senior and the tomb. Speaker A begins by emphasising that which would traditionally be praised in a deceased young man (status, looks, education), and ends by reciting what the tomb says. Read within the context of the poem as a whole the μέγιστον υἱέος εὖχος is the glory that Caesarius attained through his learning and the display of his learning and culture that gained for him fame, wealth, and power. Another sentiment that may seem shocking to the sensitive, Christian reader is the supposed friendship which Caesarius had with the emperors under which he served – none of whom were Nicene Christians (one an apostate!). Yet Gregory is not portraying Caesarius the martyr here, but Caesarius the *pepaideumenos*, who would, no doubt, be elated at being considered a friend of the emperor of the

[163] See *AP*. 7.187 for the expression of a similar sentiment.
[164] This is noted by Waltz (p.110), in particular *GA* 7.187,334,361, and 638.

Roman Empire. Furthermore, it must be noted that the consolation which the tomb gives to Gregory senior, a Christian Bishop, is not the hope of salvation in Christ, but the glory that Caesarius won through his embodiment of the values of *paideia*.[165] Again, we see that Gregory is giving pride of place to *paideia* and its fruits; no longer are these things mere παιδιά (playthings) but the crowning glory of Caesarius, the thing that remains for his father once he has passed from this life.

There follow four epitaphs that emphasise the grief of Gregory senior for his youngest son and lament the fact that the tomb meant for him and his wife is now occupied by Caesarius (*PG* 38.15-16; *AP* 8.87-90). The following epigrams cast light upon Gregory's portrayal of *paideia* in his epigrams (*PG* 38.17 (1), *AP* 8.91):

> Πᾶσαν ὅση σοφίη λεπτῆς φρενὸς ἐν μερόπεσσιν
> ἀμφὶ γεωμετρίην καὶ θέσιν οὐρανίων
> καὶ λογικῆς τέχνης τὰ παλαίσματα γραμματικήν τε
> ἠδ' ἰητορίην ῥητορικῆς τε μένος
> Καισάριος πτερόεντι νόῳ μοῦνος καταμάρψας,
> αἰαῖ, πᾶσιν ὁμῶς νῦν κόνις ἐστ' ὀλίγη.[166]
>
> Caesarius, who alone by his winged mind pursued the whole wisdom of man's subtle thought concerning geometry and the position of the heavenly bodies, and also the falls of the art of logic, and grammar too and medicine and powerful rhetoric, is now, alas! Like all the rest, a handful of dust (Trans. Paton1927B:441).

Caesarius here is described as a man competent in all the facets of Greek wisdom.[167] Furthermore, the words which Gregory uses have an athletic connotation. τὰ παλαίσματα is certainly used in relation to the art of Rhetoric, but it has strong connotations with wrestling and the "falls" or "tricks" involved in a wrestling match.[168] The word "grasped" here (καταμάρψας) is often used of one catching/pursuing someone. Given its use in Homeric epic,[169] Gregory again portrays his brother in the light of the epic heroes; and such a grasp of all the facets of knowledge that were revered by Greek thinkers may be seen as a heroic task by his contemporaries. But by using words associated with physical and corporeal pursuits, Gregory draws attention to the temporal nature of such an education.

The following three epigrams echo the sentiments of the above. *AP* 8.93 emphasises Caesarius' physical beauty and his prominent position in the court of the Emperor, but he returns

---

[165] Compare this with an epigram by Julian the Egyptian (*AP*.7.590), where the deceased's mortality is emphasised, but his virtue (*aretai*) is stronger than death.
[166] Gregory is quite possibly echoing a sentiment of Callimachus *AP*. 7.728.3, an epitaph for a priestess where the phrase νῦν κόνις is also found. The exact same line is also found in an epitaph for Martinianus (107.4) discussed above.
[167] Although Gegory does not emphasise in particular his brother's medical acumen. We could see Caesarius as one of the 'iatrosophists' that appear frequently in the epigraphic epigrams of late antiquity. See Agosti (2008:14-15) for his discussion on particular examples of the (Alexandrian-trained) iatrosophist in the epigraphic record, and their portrayal as equally skilled rhetoricians and poets, alongside their medical practice.
[168] For the meaning 'wrestling', see *LSJ* s.v παλαίσμα, 1; and for its meaning as wrestling or rhetorical 'trick', s.v 3.
[169] See *Il.* 5.65, 6.364, and 16.598.

from Bithynia as ash (κόνιν).[170] 8.94, in which Gregory recounts his escape from the earthquake at Nicaea, only to succumb to illness, again makes clear the uselessness of his education (especially as a physician) in the face of death. Finally, 95 describes Caesarius' brief but illustrious life as a flash of lightning. Gregory sheds further light on this pessimistic view of the benefits of education in 8.96:

> Καισαρίου φθιμένοιο κατήφησαν βασιλῆος
> αὐλαί, Καππαδόκαι δ' ἤμυσαν ἐξαπίνης·
> καὶ καλὸν εἴ τι λέλειπτο μετ' ἀνθρώποισιν, ὄλωλεν,
> οἱ δὲ λόγοι σιγῆς ἀμφεβάλοντο νέφος.
>
> When Caesarius died, the Emperor's court was dejected, and the Cappadocians were suddenly downcast. Even if any beauty had remained among men, it has been destroyed. Learning is shrouded in a cloud of silence.

There is a verbal echo here with an epigram of Simonides (*AP* 7.251) in which the Spartans (presumably, given the epigrams that precede this one) are shrouded in the dark cloud of death (κυάνεον θανάτου ἀμφεβάλοντο νέφος). But where the Spartans' ἀρετὴ keeps them in death from dying, there is no such hint that Caesarius' *paideia* will do such a thing. Rather, (his) learning is shrouded in silence.[171]

The next epigram provides another example of a pagan *exemplum* in the epigrams (*PG* 38.19-20; *AP* 8.97):

> Εἴ τινα δένδρον ἔθηκε γόος καὶ εἴ τινα πέτρην,
> εἴ τις καὶ πηγὴ ῥεῦσεν ὀδυρομένη,
> πέτραι καὶ ποταμοὶ καὶ δένδρεα λυπρὰ πέλοισθε,
> πάντες Καισαρίῳ γείτονες ἠδὲ φίλοι·
> Καισάριος πάντεσσι τετιμένος, εὖχος ἀνάκτων,
> αἰαῖ τῶν ἀχέων, ἤλυθεν εἰς Ἀίδην.
>
> If grief has made anyone into a tree, and even a stone; and if a stream flows because of mourning, then stones, rivers, and wretched trees would be made of those near and dear to Caesarius. Caesarius, honoured by all, the glory of kings.[172] Alas! Alas! Such grief! He has gone to Hades.

There is a similar structure here to the epitaph for Martinianus (8.108): "If [these Greek myths are true], then …". Reference is made here to three Greek myths: Niobe, whose children are slaughtered by Artemis and Apollo for boasting that she had more children than Leto; the daughters of Phaethon, who lament him and are turned into trees once he falls from the chariot of Apollo; and Byblis, who is turned into a stream through mourning for her brother whom she loved unnaturally. What links these myths together is the mourning of the loss of family in tragic circumstances. Again, we have a statement which the *PG* notes is *parum digna Gregorio sententia* – that Caesarius went down to Hades. Whenever Hades is mentioned in the New Testament, it is used either to

[170] See also O'Connell (2019:13-17) who comments on Gregory's account of Caesarius' death in the poem *On His Own Affairs* (*Carm*. 2.1.1.177-184).
[171] One could compare this with *AP*. 7.562 by Julian the Egyptian, where the death of the rhetor Craterus causes silence and the end of the art of speaking. See Gullo (forthcoming) for more on this epigram.
[172] This would be a reference to the four emperors under whom Caesarius served: Constans, Julian, Jovian, and Valens (Waltz 1944:62).

denote the punishment of sinners, or simply death – as opposed to the eternal life of Christ.[173] Did Gregory think that his brother was in fact in hell, or at least not enjoying the rewards of eternal life in Christ? Certainly not. What we have here – as already noted above - is a common literary motif in Greek literature, a lamentation for the dearly departed.[174] Nevertheless, we must remember that Gregory had rejected such an outpouring of grief in his oration for Caesarius. As Hägg notes (2006:138) 'Lamentation is … topicalized many times over [in the oration for Caesarius], but never indulged in.' What Gregory had clearly avoided in his oration, he openly indulges in with his epitaphs for Caesarius. This is yet another example of the differences in how Gregory portrays and uses his *paideia*, most likely due to the change of audience between the Oration for Caesarius and the epitaphs (as noted above).

The following poem provides us with Gregory's own lament over his brother (8.98):

> Χειὶρ τάδε Γρηγορίοιο· κάσιν ποθέων τὸν ἄριστον
> κηρύσσω θνητοῖς τόνδε βίον στυγέειν.
> Καισαρίῳ τίς κάλλος ὁμοίιος; ἢ τίς ἁπάντων
> τόσσος ἐὼν τόσσης εἶλε κλέος σοφίης;
> οὔτις ἐπιχθονίων· ἀλλ' ἔπτατο ἐκ βιότοιο
> ὡς ῥόδον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν, ὡς δρόσος ἐκ πετάλων.
>
> The hand of Gregory [writes] this: longing for my most noble brother, I declare to mortals to hate this life. Who is beautiful like Caesarius? Who of all men was so great as to take the glory of such great wisdom? No one on this earth. But he has taken wing from this life as a rose [plucked] from the thorns, like dew [falling] from the petals.

Caesarius has not gone from this life alone but has taken his beauty and the glory of his wisdom with him. As a result, this life has become hateful to Gregory (*AP* 8.98). Who is as beautiful as Caesarius? Who has the glory of such great wisdom? οὔτις ἐπιχθονίων is the answer that Gregory gives, 'no one on this earth' (98.5). The choice of ἐπιχθονίων further emphasises that the likes of Caesarius are now gone from this earth, and with it, also, the *paideia* which Caesarius, and the likes of him, embodied. The despair of the previous epigram is tempered in this and the following epigram. For here, Caesarius takes wing from this life (ἔπτατο ἐκ βιότοιο) – suggesting a more positive end to one's life than a descent to Hades would - and in 8.99, Gregory asks the Martyrs to be gracious to the family of Gregory and Nonna buried in the tomb. Epitaphs 97-99 when read together create a narrative that sees Caesarius death as not just a descent into Hades, which seems permanent and which ends in mourning – much like the pagan *exempla* that open that epigram. For this descent is then followed by an ascent from this life and ends - albeit in the tomb - with Caesarius surrounded by the martyrs.

Taking stock of what we have discussed thus far, we can say the following. Gregory had great concern for Caesarius while he was a physician at court. His letters show that he was anxious

[173] See Mt. 11:23, 16:18; Lk. 10:15; 16:23; Acts 2:27, 31; 1 Cor. 15:551; Rev. 1:18; 6:8; 20:13, 14. Matthew and Luke particularly emphasise Hades role as a place of eternal punishment, where Acts emphasises its role in early Christian thought as a place of death in which Christ did not stay but rose again to new life.
[174] The phrase ἤλυθεν εἰς Ἀίδην is found again in Gregory and refers to Orpheus descent to Hades (*AP*. 8.218.1), and εἰς Ἀίδην plus a verb of motion is found *passim* in *AP*. 7.

to make sure that his brother lead a Christian life, and that he looked after not only their relatives'/friends' temporal and educational needs, but also the needs of the poor. Gregory's oration at his funeral – though likely exaggerated – shows that Caesarius did indeed lead a frugal, Christian life whilst serving the emperor and empire. What is more, he excelled in the secular as well as the Christian life; and by displaying only a fraction of his learning (παίδευσις) he rose quickly up the ranks at court. His encounter (or *agon*) with Julian demonstrates that *paideia* is not in and of itself wicked or contrary to the Christian life; but, rather, an unhealthy desire for it was - far from making one an example of virtue through embodying *paideia* – a manifestation of vice. Gregory's speech (itself a traditional display of *paideia*) is a suitable offering for the departed Caesarius; and this offering is set in opposition to the Hellenic, Greek contests and customs that preceded Christ. Nevertheless, we can see that Gregory too wanted to be associated with the *paideia* of his brother, just as the emperor desperately desired to be adorned in Caesarius' learning.

However, there is a clear contrast in message between the oration and the epitaphs for Caesarius. Caesarius, in Gregory's oration, is an outstanding example of the virtues which *paideia* imbued within educated men. Nevertheless, his Christianity prevents his *paideia* from leading him to an excessive desire for power, wealth, and worldly glory. In a sense, his Christian faith trumps his *paideia*. In the epitaphs, however, one does not get a (clear) glimpse of Caesarius' Christianity. Instead, we are told of his great learning, all of the honours, glory, and titles which it earned him – a friend of the emperor, a master of every facet of human learning – and the uselessness of such *paideia* in the face of death. This, as we have noted is likely due to the difference in audience between the literary epitaphs and the speech delivered in front of Christians who were more than suspicious of the bishop's son going off to pursue fame and fortune in the imperial court.[175] Without such Christians in mind, Gregory perhaps felt freer to indulge in a display of Caesarius' (and his) *paideia* and to emphasise the learning and glory of his brother. Gregory is certainly familiar with the epitaphic tradition, and its use of Homeric language. This epic vocabulary raises the deceased out of their contemporary landscape and into a realm which is closely associated with immortal gods and heroes, along with their eternal renown (κλέος ἄφθιτον). Nevertheless, it is also clear that one's learning and the temporary gains and privileges that it brings in this life, benefit one little in death or in the hereafter. This, of course is not a controversial thing, even for Pagans.[176] But it is worth nothing that Gregory's conception of *paideia* – as we have seen from the above discussion – is anything but straight forward. One's audience and context seem to play a major role in how Gregory portrays the importance of Greek education and culture.[177]

[175] This awareness of audience, circumstances, and subject is noted by Demoen (2009:54).
[176] Note, in particular, *GA* 7.362.6, in which the poet states neither *logos* nor *theos* can make a man immortal.
[177] Van Hoof (2010:222-223) notices a similar sort of nuance in Libanius' view of the study of Latin law. Rather than always being negative of the study of law and its preference over Greek rhetoric. Libanius can sometimes portray the study of law negatively, at others positively, depending on the context and audience of these statements. Gregory should be seen no differently than Libanius in this respect.

Bishops, Ascetics, and *Paideia*

Thus far, we have looked at epitaphs in which Christian themes are largely absent or lay beneath the surface, and the *paideia* of the deceased – as well as Gregory's display of his knowledge of the epitaphic, literary tradition – is on full display. Now we shall look at epitaphs for those whose Christian credentials play a much more prominent role in Gregory's portrayal of them.

Carterius was a figure who was close to Gregory, and who practiced a form of asceticism much more in line with Gregory's own preferences.[178] He is commemorated in three epitaphs (*AP* 8.142-144):

> Πῇ με λιπὼν πολύμοχθον ἐπὶ χθονί, φίλταθ' ἑταίρων,
> ἤλυθες ἁρπαλέως, κύδιμε Καρτέριε;
> πῇ ποτ' ἔβης νεότητος ἐμῆς οἰήια νωμῶν,
> ἧμος ἐπ' ἀλλοδαπῆς μῦθον ἐμετρεόμην,
> ὃς βιότῳ μ' ἔζησας ἀσαρκέι; ἦ ῥ' ἐτεόν σοι
> Χριστὸς ἄναξ πάντων φίλτερος, ὅν νυν ἔχεις.
>
> Ἀστεροπὴ Χριστοῖο μεγακλέος, ἔρκος ἄριστον
> ἠιθέων, ζωῆς ἡνίοχ' ἡμετέρης,
> μνώεο Γρηγορίοιο, τὸν ἔπλασας ἤθεσι κεδνοῖς,
> ἦν ὅτε ἦν, ἀρετῆς κοίρανε Καρτέριε.
>
> Ὦ πηγαὶ δακρύων, ὦ γούνατα, ὦ θυέεσσιν
> ἁγνοτάτοις παλάμαι Χριστὸν ἀρεσσάμεναι
> Καρτερίου, πῶς λῆξεν ὁμῶς πάντεσσι βροτοῖσιν;
> ἤθελεν ὑμνοπόλον κεῖθι χοροστασίη.
>
> Where have you suddenly gone, noble Carterius, leaving me on earth much in toil, my dear companion? Where have you gone, once guiding the rudder of my youth, when I composed verse in a strange land, you who quickened me in the spiritual life? Truly Christ the king, whom you now possess, is dearer to you than all else.
>
> Lightning of our most-illustrious Christ, best bulwark of youth, charioteer of our life, remember Gregory, whom you fashioned with diligent conduct, once upon a time, Carterius, a lord of virtue.
>
> O fount of tears, O knees, O hands of Carterius that pleased Christ with most holy offerings. How has he ceased to be like all mortals? The choir of heaven wanted him to be their hymn-writer.

These epitaphs, like many examined thus far, are replete with literary resonances, and it would seem that Carterius was important to Gregory's secular and spiritual education. When Gregory calls him κύδιμε, he is using an epithet of Hermes, whom we have noted above in our discussion of *Carm.* 2.2.4-5, was associated with *paideia* – as well as with the guiding of men in general.[179] The word οἰήια (rudder) is found only in Homeric epic.[180] Carterius is compared to the heroes Ajax and Achilles when he is described as the ἔρκος ἄριστον ἠιθέων in much the same way that Achilles (and other Greek heroes) are the ἔρκος of the Achaeans.[181] His description as a "guide" (or more strictly "charioteer") of Gregory's youth echoes a sentiment found in Aelius Aristides' *Or*. 50.45,

[178] On Carterius, see Hauser-Meury (1960:52).
[179] See *LSJ* s.v. κύδιμος; used of Hermes at *Hom. Hymn, In Mercurium*,v. 46, and Hes. *Theog.* V. 938.
[180] *Od*. 9.483, 12.218; *Il.* 19.43, see *LSJ* s.v. οἰήϊον.
[181] Achilles is ἔρκος Ἀχαιοῖσιν at *Il.* 1.284, but is more often used of Ajax, such as at 3.229, 6.5, and 7.211.

in which he writes an elegiac couplet describing himself as a 'charioteer of ever-flowing tales' (μύθων ἀενάων κύδιμος ἡνίοχος)[182]; or perhaps more likely Gregory has in mind Pindar's *Nemean* 6.66, where the trainer of wrestlers, Melesias, is described as χειρῶν τε καὶ ἰσχύος ἀνίοχον (the guide of our strong hands)[183] - for Carterius, just as the trainer Melesias, was the one responsible for fashioning Gregory into the man that he became. The closing epithet ἀρετῆς κοίρανε is also reminiscent of gods and heroes who are described throughout Greek literature as lords of men or places, but Carterius is lord of virtue. We see, therefore, a wide range of literary influences on these particular epitaphs.

The first two epitaphs have suggested to scholars - I believe rightly - that Carterius was Gregory's pedagogue on his studies abroad.[184] As Cribiore (2005:48) tells us, pedagogues were more than just minders for their young charges, but also 'functioned as links between students and families, supervised the process of learning, and provided a sense of balance and continuity as male youths progressed in their education.' Cribiore also points out the academic role that pedagogues could have, such as Julian's pedagogue, Mardonius, who would keep him on the straight and narrow by quoting Homer and the philosophers to him.[185] One can say with certainty that Carterius was of the same calibre as Mardonius and that he most likely had a hand in guiding Gregory's rudder both in a metaphorical and real sense by helping Gregory chose where to study in the ancient world, a role that pedagogues are known to have had (Cribiore, p.49). Although Carterius is most likely from a lower social standing than Gregory, he seems to have been a part of his inner-circle, and was considered a companion of Gregory's, not just in religion, but also learning as well.[186] The third of the above epitaphs would suggest that Carterius, like Gregory, was also occupied with the writing of verse.

Finally, it is worth noting here something that is unique about the epitaphs for Carterius and Amphilochus in comparison to Gregory's two other teachers in his life, Thespesius and Prohaeresius. Where Gregory is unreserved in his praise for his teachers Thespesius and Prohaeresius, he never explicitly associates with these teachers. This is not the case for Amphilochus and Carterius of whom Gregory considers himself a companion (*hetairos*). Gregory writes epitaphs for Amphilochus to pay the debt that he owes him for his teachings, and Carterius is the charioteer of Gregory's life. The distinction is subtle, but no less significant; for Gregory has no problem in praising the great learning of Thespesius and Prohaeresius, but they do not embody his ideal for the learned Christian (upon which we shall elaborate further below), who must be immersed in both sacred and profane wisdom. Carterius (and Amphilochus to a lesser degree – although he leaves no sacred or profane book unopened in 8.131) walks a via media, through which he can both practice and display his *paideia* whilst still retreating enough from society to come

[182] Translation is that of Bowie (1989:217).
[183] On this poem and this line in particular and the metaphorical use of ἡνίοχος, see the commentary of Gerber (1999).
[184] See Waltz (1944:117) – although I do not think Carterius was necessarily a priest; Hauser-Meury (1960:52), and McGuckin (2001:36).
[185] See Julian, *Misopogon* (351a) as in Cribiore (2005:49).
[186] For Carterius as a part of Gregory's inner-circle and his status, see McLynn (2012:188).

closer to the divine. Yes, it is Christ whom Carterius values the most, and he is lord of virtue (ἀρετῆς κοίρανος) not only for his practice of the Christian faith, but also for his great learning. Another interesting difference between the epitaphs for Carterius and the epitaphs for the likes of Caesarius, Martinianus, and Amphilochus, is that the reason given for the death is somewhat more positive. Whereas the cause of the death of the worldly *pepaideumenoi* is often Envy, for the ascetics, they have died in order to obtain their eternal and spiritual inheritance. That is, to ascend to Christ, the Triune God. With Carterius, however, we see that Christ has also taken him to Himself so that he may practice his *paideia* for the benefit of the angelic choirs. He is to go to heaven in order to write the poems which he was, no doubt, writing on earth as well. This comes back to the idea discussed in our introduction in which, for Gregory, *paideia* (*logos*) was made by Christ as a gift to man, and so one's learning must be sealed by Christ and be used in His service. Therefore, when Gregory establishes his relationship with Carterius as one that was forged and strengthened by the bonds of *paideia*, it is clear that this is not in opposition to their shared Christian faith, but rather in apposition, if anything. Carterius' epitaphs provide a clearer example of the synthesis of sacred and profane wisdom (which is mentioned in the epitaphs for Amphilochus). But in turning to the epitaphs for the Bishops Gregory Sr., Basil, and Gregory himself, we will see that this interweaving of the two strands of *paideia* are integral to the identity of the bishop and, therefore, of Gregory himself.

Enough has already been said about Basil in our introduction. In the *Epitaphia*, Gregory dedicates a dozen poems to his dear friend. No reference is made to their complicated relationship in the epitaphs, nor of the ups and downs that it endured.[187] What we do find is that Basil is not only portrayed as an exemplary Christian, but also as a fine example of the embodiment of *paideia*. *AP* 8.10 is the clearest example of this:

> Βένθε' ἅπαντ' ἐδάης τὰ πνεύματος, ὅσσα τ' ἔασιν
> τῆς χθονίης σοφίης· ἔμπνοον ἱρὸν ἔης.
>
> You learned all the depths of the Spirit, and as much as pertains to earthly wisdom. You were a living temple.

This image of Basil as embodiment of heavenly *sophia* is not separated from his embodiment of earthly wisdom, and, as we will see, this combination of heavenly and earthly wisdom plays prominently in Gregory's portrayal of himself and his father too. In *AP* 8.3, the heavenly choirs rejoice at Basil's entry to eternal life, but on earth (3-6):

> πᾶσα δὲ Καππαδοκῶν ἐστονάχησε πόλις·
> οὐκ οἶον, κόσμος δὲ μέγ' ἴαχεν· "Ὤλετο κῆρυξ,
> ὤλετο εἰρήνης δεσμὸς ἀριπρεπέος."
>
> Every city in Cappadocia groaned. Not only these, but the world cried out greatly: "The herald has perished, the distinguished bond of peace has perished."

It is not only the Christian community that has lost this bond of peace, but also the whole of Cappadocia and the Roman world. Whole cities mourning over the deceased can be found in the

[187] On their tumultuous relationship, see White (1992:61-84) and Van Dam (2003b:155-184).

AP, such as *AP* 7.226 by Anacreon of Teos, where the city mourns the death of a soldier, Agathon; *AP* 7.701 by Diodore the Grammarian has Nicaea weep for Achaeus.[188] Without this bond of peace, strife inevitably breaks out in the following epitaph (8.4):

> Κόσμος ὅλος μύθοισιν ὑπ' ἀντιπάλοισιν ἀεικῶς
> σείεται, ὁ Τριάδος κλῆρος ὁμοσθενέος·
> αἰαῖ, Βασιλίου δὲ μεμυκότα χείλεα σιγᾷ.
> ἔγρεο· καὶ στήτω σοῖσι λόγοισι σάλος
> σαῖς τε θυηπολίῃσι· σὺ γὰρ μόνος ἶσον ἔφηνας
> καὶ βίοτον μύθῳ καὶ βιότητι λόγον.
>
> The whole world, the lot of the co-equal Trinity, is shaken unseemly by a clash of words. Alas! The lips of Basil that once roared are silent. Arise! And stay the storm with your words and sacrifices. For you alone displayed a life equal to your words and eloquence equal to your life.

This clash of words could well refer to doctrinal issues, but we must also remember that Basil employed his eloquence in matters that did not pertain directly to the church, such as when he implored Martinianus to stop the splitting of Cappadocia – mentioned above.[189] It must also be noted that Basil's pious life goes hand in hand with his grasp of *logoi* (eloquence), and again we see the paradigm of Gregory at work, where one's eloquence is best put at the service of Christ and his Church, and without this eloquence of Basil, strife has broken out throughout the world. In many ways, this shows a very traditional view of the value of *paideia* (as discussed above), for it is the *pepaideumenoi* and their embodiment of the values of Greek education and culture that acts as a buffer between the order of civilisation and the chaos that goes hand in hand with the violence and barbarity that characterise the uneducated.

Throughout these epitaphs we also notice that Basil is – like the sophists discussed above – associated with many places and a source of glory for them, such as Cappadocia (8.3,5), Pontus (8.5), Caesarea (8.9),[190] and Athens (8.8). In leaving these behind he has caused them – as in the above sophists – to lament; but whilst these various cities, provinces, and the whole Roman world lament, heaven rejoices – and Basil gladly travels there (8.3). We see that Gregory's friendship with Basil is forged not only in Christian fellowship, but also in *paideia* (8.8):

> Ὦ μύθοι, ὦ ξυνὸς φιλίης δόμος, ὦ φίλ' Ἀθῆναι,
> ὦ θείου βιότου τηλόθε συνθεσίαι,
> ἵστε τόδ', ὡς Βασίλειος ἐς οὐρανόν, ὡς ποθέεσκεν,
> Γρηγόριος δ' ἐπὶ γῆς χείλεσι δεσμὰ φέρων.

---

[188] See also *AP* 7.716.

[189] Sterk (2004:135) notes that Gregory 'places greater emphasis on Basil's education or intellectual formation, his *paideusis*,' and that: '[Gregory] is quick to criticize Christians who belittled or scorned this quality. Bishops could and did function with limited education … but such leaders would be only mediocre. Upholding Basil as an example, he stresses the importance of learning in the bishop's struggles for the cause of orthodoxy.' See also Sterk (1998:249) who notes that 'Gregory of Nazianzus placed greater emphasis on Basil's intellectual formation, his *paideusis*, while Gregory of Nyssa presented the abandonment of pagan learning as the first major stage in the career of a model bishop.'

[190] See Alan Cameron (1993:337-338) where he notes that the word used here to describe Basil as the glory of Caesarea (ἄεισμα, which can mean song) is a nod to Callimachus' epigram on Aratus, and also appears concerning Martinianus, who is the ἄεισμα of Cappadocia (8.113.1).

> O profane learning,[191] O friendship's common hearth, o beloved Athens, O far off covenant of the divine life, you have to know that Basil is gone to heaven, as he desired, but Gregory is on earth carrying a chain upon his lips.

It is interesting to note that, with the departure of Basil (perhaps we should have here in mind his departure from Athens before Gregory, as well as his death), Gregory cannot engage in the eloquence that was common to both of them at Athens. Waltz (1944:37) puts this silence down to his forced departure from Constantinople – thus silencing him. However, it is more likely here an expression of grief than any reference to his ejection from the see of Constantinople. When Basil departed from Athens, it was to lead the life of asceticism, in the wilderness of Pontus, far from civilisation, the locus of *paideia*, the place where the eloquence of Athens had value. Gregory could not be without his friend for long, despite the chance of an illustrious career at Athens. It was for Basil, and the συνθεσίαι which they had made in Athens, that Gregory decided to give up a life as a prominent rhetorician and *pepaideumenos*. Yet, unlike Basil, Gregory seems to have been unable to fully leave behind the *paideia* which was the driving impetus behind his far – and treacherous – travels. Even in Basil's funeral oration Athens is described as "golden" (*Or*. 43.14) and as the "glory of Greece" in *Carm*. 2.1.1.97.[192] Gregory, unlike Basil, could not (or did not) want to fully leave behind Athens and everything that it represented for the elite men who went there to improve their credentials as *pepaideumenoi*.[193]

Indeed, the gift which Gregory gives to his departed friend is one which would be appreciated by any educated Roman of his time, the twelve epitaphs which he dedicated to him (8.11):

> Χαίροις, ὦ Βασίλειε, καὶ εἰ λίπες ἡμέας, ἔμπης·
> Γρηγορίου τόδε σοι γράμμ' ἐπιτυμβίδιον,
> μῦθος ὅδ', ὃν φιλέεσκες· ἔχοις χερός, ὦ Βασίλειε,
> τῆς φιλίης καί σοί δῶρον ἀπευκτότατον.
> Γρηγόριος, Βασίλειε, τεῇ κόνι τήνδ' ἀνέθηκα
> τῶν ἐπιγραμματίων, θεῖε, δυωδεκάδα.
>
> Farewell, O Basil, even if you have left us, nevertheless. This is Gregory's epitaph for you, this is the eloquence which you used to like. Take, Basil, from my hand, dear to you, a most grievous gift. Gregory has dedicated to your dust, divine Basil, this dozen of epigrams.

Here we see much more explicitly stated that, for Basil, profane learning is something which Basil had left behind (most notably in his departure from Athens) in the past – as the imperfect φιλέεσκες would indicate. Therefore, I believe that Gregory is more likely referring to Basil's self-curated image of himself (as we have discussed in the introduction) as one who feigned to keep a distance

[191] See Moroni (2006:133-144) for *mythos* as specifically secular learning/culture – though *logos* can also indicate profane speech/learning too.
[192] See Castelli (2005:376-379) who notes that Gregory is praising his own *paideia* as much as Basil's in the funeral oration. See also Konstan (2000) and Norris (2000) and McLynn (2001:179-183) on this oration.
[193] See DeForest (2011) who discusses the initiation rituals of students at Athens and how Gregory clearly experienced this ritual and took part in it frequently, whereas Gregory's winning of an exemption for Basil from the ritual hazing may have actually lead to his social ostracization from the students at Athens who may not have been pleased that such an honour was granted Basil.

from, or had no interest in, such displays of *paideia*.[194] For Gregory, however, the practice of *paideia* – not only the writing of literature, but the use of *paideia* in order to asserts one's dominance and influence in the social ranking (as we shall see) - is something that he was deeply engaged in right up to the end of his life. It is no wonder then that Gregory tries to weave these two strands of his identity, *pepaideumenos* and ascetic, into one.

Next, we must look at the father of Gregory, Gregory the elder.[195] He was a Hypsistarian[196] before he converted to Christianity when he married his wife Nonna, thus he was grafted on to a holy root from the wild olive (*AP* 8.13; *Or.* 18.11). Gregory tells us in the funeral oration for his father that he held the highest offices in the state but was known for his modesty and self-control (Or. 18.6). He became bishop of Nazianzus in 329 and built a magnificent church for Nazianzus.[197] Despite holding high offices and clearly having the wealth to engage in euergetism, Gregory tells us that his father was not so well educated, but that he had first place in piety and knowledge of Scripture – even if he held the second place in oratory (18.16).[198] This simplicity is, according to Gregory, what led to his signing of an unorthodox creed concerning the Trinity (18.18).[199] He is also described both as mild mannered and gentle in his dealings with his adversaries whilst also being a tyrant to Gregory in forcing him into the presbyterate – and helping Basil in his quest to make Gregory bishop of Sasima.

The epitaphs gloss over this tyranny as well as his simplicity and emphasise his credentials as a sound expounder of the doctrine of the Trinity.[200] Gregory even compares his father to Moses, as someone who received divine wisdom straight from God on the mountain (8.14). The character of Moses could also be relevant to Gregory the elder, in that Moses was not a good public speaker, and so Aaron spoke for him (as Gregory spoke for his father). Also, as we have discussed in our introduction, Nyssen portrays Moses as one who is both learned in heathen and sacred *paideusis*. *AP* 8.15 in particular is of interest:

> Αὐτὸς νηὸν ἔρεψα Θεῷ καὶ δῶχ' ἱερῆα
> Γρηγόριον καθαρῇ λαμπόμενον Τριάδι,
> ἄγγελον ἀτρεκίης ἐριηχέα,[201] ποιμένα λαῶν,
> ἠίθεον σοφίης ἀμφοτέρης πρύτανιν.

[194] See Gain's article on these epitaphs, who notes that Gregory does not embellish these epitaphs with classical allusions as much as the others, perhaps mindful of Basil's *Ad Adulescentes* which, as we have discussed above is at least reserved about literature – and dismissive at most (2016:220).
[195] On whom, see *PLRE* s.v. Gregorius 2 and Hauser-Meury (1960:88-90).
[196] On the cult of *Theos Hypsistos*, see Mitchell (1999).
[197] See *PLRE* 1:403 s.v. Gregorius 2, and Hauser-Meury (1960:88-90). Gregory gives a description of this church in his oration for his father (18.39).
[198] This lack of education did not verge on illiteracy, as Gregory tell us that his father wrote a letter to a governor attempting to interfere in the election of a bishop (18.34). Nevertheless, even illiteracy would not have debarred him necessarily from high office as Kaster (1988:39) followed by Brown (1992:21) notes: '…[I]t would be wrong to think that higher economic status guaranteed literacy at all times and in every area … illiteracy was no bar to curial status …'.
[199] See McGuckin (2001:111-112) for a summary of what possible theological declaration the elder Gregory may have signed.
[200] A title which could well be argued did not belong to Gregory the Elder, given his supposed signing of a heterodox creed (*Or.* 18.18).
[201] This phrase is used of Basil at *GA* 8.5.3.

> I myself roofed a temple to God, and gave to Him a priest, Gregory, made resplendent by the pure Trinity, a clear voiced messenger of the truth, shepherd of the peoples, a young *prytanis* of both kinds of wisdom.

Gregory the elder may not be termed a *pepaideumenos*, but Gregory, employing the voice of his father, makes it clear that his father has dedicated to God his greatest work – the church at Nazianzus. That this church was not just a religious, but a civic project is made clear by Kopecek (1974:295) who notes how the church was 'a "memorial" to [Gregory the Elder's] "aristocratic generosity".' Just as the building of the church is an act of piety and civic patriotism, so too is the son who was to look after it not just priest, but *prytanis* of both sacred and profane *sophia*.[202] It is difficult to translate this title into English. Of course, it has a long history before its use as a title in Athenian democracy.[203] But given Gregory's time at Athens, a time that was for him one of the best and most defining experiences of his life, a time that was above all others concerned with the pursuit and practice of *paideia*, it would seem that Gregory sees himself as an 'official' of sacred and profane wisdom. In other words, Gregory was a figure that combined these two strands of wisdom – worldly and divine – and was to act as their leader. In the very person and office of Gregory, *paideia* (the Greek education and culture that was common to all upper-class Romans) and Christianity could exist together.

Even if the son surpasses the father in learning and wisdom,[204] Gregory realises that he could not have done so without his father's support (8.22):

> 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, Gregory, have placed in your hands the shepherd's syrinx. For me, my child, exposit with understanding. Open the doors of life to all and come to the tomb of your father at the proper time (Trans. Poulos [2017:5])

Waltz (1944:41) believes that the *syrinx* (the shepherd's pipe) does not refer to the pipes of Pan, and that the metaphor is more a commendation of the Church of Nazianzus from father to son – perhaps invoking the image of Christ as the good shepherd more than any bucolic connotation. I however, agree with Poulos (2017:5-6) who states:

> I propose rather that we have here an instance of Kontrastimitation. Pan, the patron of bucolic song, is readily associated with excessive food and drink, and with "inspired" verse (as opposed to poetry based on techné). In good Callimachean fashion, Gregory rejects this approach to life and verse in favor one rooted in *paideia* and *techné*.

---

[202] It has been noted elsewhere that Gregory subtly subordinates his father to himself, as Elm notes (2012:219): 'Gregory the Elder … could progress farther only with his more philosophical son's advice, guidance, and mediation. Nonetheless, as father of a divinely called philosopher brought forth in a sacred marriage of equals (Or. 7.4), he far exceeded all in his care except his son.' Elm's argument that Gregory portrays himself (contra Julian) as a divine philosopher of a divine family is further substantiated in these epitaphs. What is seen more clearly here, however, is that it is the combination of earthly and divine *sophia*, of *paideia* and Christianity, that helps Gregory generate such an image.

[203] See *LSJ* s.v. πρύτανις.

[204] This is something to which a good education should lead – as discussed in our introduction.

Although we have not the space to draw out Poulos' conclusions in full, it is enough to state that the *syrinx* is a symbol not only of Gregory's Christian faith in the Good Shepherd, but also of the Greek culture and education which he has inherited through the gift of his father (who would have funded his extensive education). Agosti (2013:242) notes that the elite audience of Gregory would have certainly recognised the syrinx as a symbol of Gregory's noble ancestry and the idea of the pastoral as a life free from worry. Yet I believe here that, rather than his father enjoining on him a life of leisure, he is rather commanding him to a life of work in which he must employ these two strands of wisdom (sacred and profane).

In *AP* 8.75.5 Gregory portrays himself – again through the voice of his parents – as ἠιθέων λογίων τὸ μέγα κράτος ἠδ' ἱερήων (The great authority of learned youths and priests). This dual-wisdom comes not from any earthly school or teacher however, but from the *Logos* himself (8.79.4): τέτρατον, ἀμφήκη μῦθον ἔδωκε Λόγος (Fourth, the Word gave me two-edged speech). Gregory's own winged words (πτερόεντα λόγον) are given to Christ along with everything else he possesses (8.82.2). Yet it is not only his eloquence, possessions, and very self that have yielded to Christ, but his Greece as well (80.1-2):

> Ἑλλὰς ἐμὴ νεότης τε φίλη καὶ ὅσσα πεπάμην
> καὶ δέμας, ὡς Χριστῷ εἴξατε προφρονέως.
>
> My Hellas, my beloved youth, and all that I possess, and my flesh, how gladly did you yield to Christ!

For Gregory, *paideia* has been brought into the service of the Word made flesh, and Gregory's time in Athens is not portrayed here as a pursuit of letters, but for heaven (8.81):

> Γρηγορίου Νόννης τε φίλον τέκος ἐνθάδε κεῖται
> τῆς ἱερῆς Τριάδος Γρηγόριος θεράπων
> καὶ σοφίῃ σοφίης δεδραγμένος ἠίθεός τε
> οἷον πλοῦτον ἔχων ἐλπίδ' ἐπουρανίην.
>
> Here lies the beloved son of Gregory and Nonna, Gregory, servant of the Holy Trinity; who grasped wisdom by wisdom and in his youth held the hope of heaven as his riches.

Again, we see the reference to two kinds of wisdom. It is implied in this epigram that one wisdom is grasped through the means of another, most likely that divine *sophia* is grasped through the profane wisdom, *paideia*. This, again, goes back to an idea found in our introduction in which Gregory crowns his wisdom with the seal of Christ. It is clear, therefore, that Gregory believed that the Bishop should be one who was not only a *Christianos*, but also a *pepaideumenos*.[205] Rather

[205] It would not be too far-fetched to believe that not everyone agreed that the Bishop should be *pepaideumenos* of necessity. After all, the Apostles were mere fishermen. However, as Demoen (1997d) has pointed out, Gregory's poem to the bishops (*carm.* 2.1.12) makes clear that the writings of the apostles are anything but simple and illiterate, given that the learned Christian men of his day devote so much time and effort to understanding and expounding these texts. Indeed, Gregory makes clear in the same poem that the bishop must come from the very best, in order to have the education to deal with the controversies of the day – as well as be able to hold their own in an urban public forum (2.1.12.155-191). See Rapp (2005:172-207) where she discusses the social status of Bishops in Late Antiquity. Lack of status or education did not automatically bar one from the episcopate, but certainly Gregory and his contemporaries were not impressed by bishops who lacked status and education that matched theirs (p.174).

than distancing himself from *paideia*, or the life which he led in his youth, travelling around the eastern Roman world in search of *paideia*, Gregory instead crowns this experience with the *Logos*, Jesus Christ. If we see Hellas here to mean Greek wisdom, and if – as Philostratus tells us (*VA* 1.35) – everything is Greece to the wise man, then Greece is not only the world (to quote Whitmarsh [2001b]) but the Word's. Men such as Prohaeresius, Martinianus, and Basil were, for Gregory, revered – and thus lamented - throughout the (Roman) world (*kosmos*), but the very thing that won them their renown, their excellent embodiment of *paideia*, belongs to and originates from Christ. What we see then from Gregory is not so much a desire to prune back *paideia* or introduce any significant changes to Greek education and culture, but rather to imbue it, mix it, and crown it with Christianity. [206] We will see this in much more detail throughout the course of this thesis.

Conclusion

In this chapter we have seen just how nuanced and sophisticated Gregory's conception and use of *paideia* can be. In the epitaphs dedicated to the *pepaideumenoi*, the rhetors, teachers, sophists, military men, and governors, we see that Gregory does not necessarily have a "Christian" concept of *paideia*. Indeed, there is, I would say, nothing that is Christian about these epitaphs, and any reference to the afterlife in these epitaphs could just as equally be construed as non-Christian. What distinguishes this group is there outstanding embodiment of *paideia*, displayed primarily through their service to their own city and the empire. Gregory will at times use images and personae (like the Muses) drawn from Greek mythology in these epitaphs, thus displaying his own *paideia*. This would suggest that, for Gregory, these mythological tropes could well be used by Christians in their poetry and simply interpreted as representations (or embodiments) of certain emotions or values – such as the image of Tantalus (for divine punishment), or the invocation of the Muses, Graces and Erotes with their associations with poetic epithalamia.

Placed in the wider context of Christian literature and the categories into which scholars divide them, it would seem that Gregory does not fit the mould created by some, even those who have attempted to break down the Pagan/Christian dichotomy, such as Kahlos (2007).[207] For Kahlos, Christian opinion makers such as Augustine or Gregory 'insisted [that people] make a choice between Christianity and paganism' (p.35). This would, to a certain extent be true of Christians such as Gregory, Basil, Jerome, Augustine, or Ambrose (perhaps not so much of Synesius),[208] but as we can see in these poems of Gregory, even if Christianity were important and not open to compromise (such as we have seen in our analysis of Caesarius' funeral oration), Gregory still does not hesitate in these poems to invoke pagan mythology or even a conversation between the Graces and Muses – the sort of thing that scholars are more likely to attribute to those

[206] Of course, Gregory does say elsewhere to avoid the thorns and pluck the roses (*Carm.* 2.2.8.61), this is the best law when it comes to profane literature (vv.62-63), but, as we have seen throughout this chapter, Gregory is not so careful as to avoid any reference to these myths entirely. On this theme in Gregory's writings (pertaining particularly to philosophy), see Norris (1984).
[207] See also Perkins (2009) and Eshleman (2012) for studies that are conscious of breaking down or avoiding such dichotomies in their analyses in the hopes of providing more nuance to our understanding of early Christian society.
[208] On Synesius, see Bergman (1982).

figures who have been the subject of much debate as to their religious affiliation (like Synesius or Nonnus). Therefore, Gregory seems to inhabit an intellectual sphere that is both reminiscent of the Christian "hardliners", such as Jerome, Augustine, or Basil, as well as of the more nuanced Christian writers who were happy to use pagan mythology and literature to colour (or even be the main subject of) their literary output. Our above comparison of the epitaphs for Gregory's teachers, Thespesius and Prohaeresius with those for Amphilochus and Carterius, shows just how subtle Gregory's position is; for he is not reserved in his praise for the former pair but does not openly associate with them as he does with the latter pair of *pepaideumenoi* whom he considers his *hetairoi*. It is clear, therefore, that Gregory is aware of various groups within his social circles (the hardliners who frowned upon his brother's rise to the top and the more "Second Sophistic" group of *pepaideumenoi*) and is seeking to appease both. Furthermore, it must be noted that Gregory's poems have a different emphasis from his orations – or even his epistles – for his poetry is a space in which Gregory can fully display the classical Greek *paideia* that would have been at the core of his education (a time in Gregory's life of which he was deeply fond). Therefore, contra Milovanovic (1997:498), who states that Gregory's 'prose and verse' are 'as two equal, easily interchangeable means of literary expression', we see that there are some essential differences between the various literary forms which Gregory practiced, and so a study – such as this – which focusses especially upon his poetry is much needed in the study of Nazianzen.

In the epitaphs for ascetics and bishops, we finally see Christian themes emerging in the *Epitaphia*. In the poems for Carterius and the bishops, Gregory does not believe that Greek learning and culture, and its traditional means of display, are contrary to the practice of Christianity, even an ascetical Christianity for which Gregory longed, admired, and practiced to some degree with the likes of Carterius. In fact, in the bishops we see that the ideal leader of the faithful is one who is a *prytanis* of both kinds of wisdom, sacred and profane. However, given our exploration of the epistolary letters between Nicoboulus Jr. and Sr., we see that Gregory is not just a model for bishops but for all young men who seek to pursue letters in their youth. Therefore, we cannot say that Gregory has *a* conception of *paideia,* but rather that his conception of *paideia* is so broad, flexible, and nuanced, that he can change and manipulate it depending upon the context, audience, and subject. This is not unusual, as we have seen, for even Basil could create a wonderful display of *paideia* when he felt that that was what was needed to convince Martinianus to support him in his cause - similarly with Libanius when it comes to his views on the learning and practice of Roman law and Latin. Nevertheless, Gregory does provide a clear identity for his ideal bishop, and for himself. He is to be the official of both kinds of wisdom, an embodiment not only of the Catholic faith, but also of Greek learning and culture.

If we are to compare the epitaphs discussed for the *pepaideumenoi* and for those of ascetics and bishops, one clear difference emerges. When we look at the epitaphs for the likes of Martinianus and Caesarius, we have seen how little their *paideia* serves them in death. Martinianus cannot stave off the grave robbers, Caesarius, though a physician cannot heal himself. This is not to suggest that Gregory is disparaging of *paideia* or thinks it utterly worthless. But when we

compare these epitaphs with Carterius' and we see that he even in heaven can display his *paideia* in writing hymns for the heavenly choir; for he, like Gregory, has crowned his *paideia* with Christ and dedicated every facet of his life to Him, his great learning and culture included. And so, even if Gregory has no qualms with writing epitaphs that are indistinguishable from their non-Christian models (even invoking the Pagan deities themselves!), we do get a clear understanding of Gregory's ideal for the learned Christian, which is, nevertheless, not exclusive of all the traditional goals and ideals which the pursuit of *paideia* would bring to the elite, Roman male. One wonders, therefore, if the reader (most likely a well-educated man) would have read these epitaphs and seen in the likes of Gregory or Carterius a much better (everlasting) use of their *paideia* in the service of Christ as well as in, or instead of (but not in opposition to) service to one's *polis*/personal ambitions.

Thus far in this thesis we have explored two of our four research focuses: the use of *paideia* as a communication code for self-fashioning, as well as for fashioning his friends and displaying their embodiment of Greek education and culture; and Gregory's use/display of the Greek literary tradition. Furthermore, it should be clear at this point in our argument that *paideia* was seen by Gregory not so much as a things which "rubbed against" his Christianity and needed to be abandoned, limited, or radically reconciled with his standing as a Catholic bishop, but rather *paideia* and Christianity formed a seamless whole, two things that had their origins in the *Logos* and of which he was *prytanis* as a model bishop of Christ's Church. The idea of Shorrock (2011:45) in his comparison of the works of Ausonius and Paulinus, where Paulinus' staunch Christian tendencies create what Shorrocks calls a poetics of dissent, compared to Ausonius' treasuring of the (Pagan) literary tradition as a poetics of descent, finds little relevance in the poetry of Nazianzen. Given that these two things did not exist in any way in dichotomy for Gregory, it is this conception of *paideia* and Gregory's use of this image of himself as bishop upon which we will focus in this thesis. We will look, therefore, at a selection of poems that comes from – what the *PG* terms – the *Carmina Dogmatica* and *Moralia*. Our goal in exploring these poems is not so much to delve in too deeply to Gregory's theology or what these poems can contribute to our understanding of it, but rather to understand how Gregory engaged with sophistic culture – something which is often seen as diametrically opposed to the Christian mission (see our discussion of Kaldellis above) – in poems that are explicitly dealing with Christian themes. In doing this, we shall see just how these two strands – sacred and profane wisdom – weave together in Gregory's poetry, whilst further exploring our four outlined research focuses.

Chapter 2: The Biblical Poems[209]

Thus far, we have looked at the epitaphs of Gregory and seen just how nuanced Gregory's use and understanding of Greek *paideia* can be. They show that, for Gregory, *paideia* is a broad and malleable concept, which he can manipulate and activate at will as the moment, sentiment, or audience dictates. Finally, we see that Gregory fashions his own identity in the epitaphs for himself. He is a *prytanis* of both kinds of wisdom, sacred and profane. It is this particular identity and conception of *paideia* which we will now explore for the remainder of this thesis, beginning with a set of poems which takes the Bible as it main theme (*Carmina* 1.1.12-27).

The biblical poems of Gregory Nazianzen have been the subject of scholars' scorn, dismissiveness, and often perplexity throughout the ages. Various scholars have written about Gregory's use of the Bible, yet none have attempted any sort of in-depth discussion (if they are mentioned at all) of these particular poems which are wholly concerned with biblical matters.[210] Billius's metrical Latin translation of the poems in the *Patrologia Graeca* does not even bother to finish the poem on the Lucan and Matthean genealogies;[211] and West in his *Greek Metre* (1982:183) only mentions 1.1.12 (the most metrically varied of the poems) in a footnote, clearly perplexed by this 'curious mixture' of metres.[212] It is also often the case that the lines do not scan very well, which has led to corruptions in the text (as discussed by Palla [1989]) and scorn from scholars who dismiss his metre as shoddy.[213] Palla has provided one of the most in-depth scholarly discussion of this series of poems thus far, upon which later authors such as Dunkle (who published an edition and translation of these poems in 2012) have very much depended. Palla, however, does not really deal with the scansion of these polymetric poems but concerns himself much more with the correct ordering of the poems and possible corruptions that have seeped into these poems through editors' mistakes throughout time in the manuscript tradition. This has certainly advanced our understanding of these peculiar, if plain, poems; but Palla (p.175), and other scholars who have come after him (such as Dunkle [2012:21-22, 30] and McGuckin [2006:201]) have unquestionably presumed that the purpose of the polymetry in these poems is to aid the reader in memorising the scriptural data within them whilst learning their scansion at the same time. Metre was a formal characteristic of classical Greek poetry, and particular metres were traditionally used for particular genres – such as dactylic hexameter for Epic or Didactic poetry, or iambics for invective (though this is not a hard and fast rule, especially in Late Antiquity). Therefore, it would make sense that

[209] The first part of this chapter which deals with Gregory's metre was presented as a paper given at a conference at Heidelberg University, *Modulations and transpositions: the contexts and boundaries of 'minor' and 'major' genres in late antique Christian poetry* and will be published in a forthcoming conference proceedings.
[210] See, for example, Sykes (1982) on the Bible and Greek classics in Gregory's verse – that makes no mention of these particular poems; and also Norris (1997), Young (1997), and Daley (2008) which focuses specifically on Gregory's Orations in their discussions of Gregory's understanding of Scripture, noting that Gregory has very little clear exegesis of Scripture in his works (Norris, 1997:149). The most in-depth discussion of these poems can be found in the PhD dissertation of Prudhomme (2006).
[211] See *PG* 37.485, fn. 60, as noted by Dunkle (2012:20-21).
[212] Aristotle's *Poetics* (1447b20-22; 1459b37-1460a2) also expresses a certain scorn for polymetric poetry.
[213] See Whitby (2008:93) who cites various scholars' criticism of Gregory's mastery of verse composition.

scholars would ask what function this polymetry had in these poems.[214] But were the Biblical Poems made for a young, specifically schoolroom, reader in order for him/her to learn both scansion and Scripture?

Palla and Dunkle seem to imply this,[215] and McGuckin explicitly states that these poems were for a 'schoolroom audience, whom [Gregory] obviously intends to learn the various forms of Greek metre while they are at the task of memorizing the biblical books' (p.201).[216] Moreover, Martin Hose argues that late antique Greek Christian poetry in general is bound (*verhaftet*) to the school, and that it is no more than versified prose (2004:36-37).[217] This chapter will argue, however, that Gregory did not intend these poems to be (specifically) for a classroom, but rather a much wider – and more mature – audience; an audience that could deal with the complexity of the metres, which I will demonstrate. The metrics of these poems, far from helping schoolchildren grapple with the metre of canonical literature such as Homer and Hesiod, are a reflection of a conscious, forward-thinking development in the regulation of Greek metres. In arguing this, I will show that the biblical poems were not a shoddy mish-mash of metres[218] with the sole purpose of helping schoolchildren learn their scansion and Bible at the same time. From here I will explore various avenues of better understanding these poems as an innovative and interesting approach to creating a piece of auxiliary literature, that could provide a gateway to the poems' primary text, the Bible, for Gregory's learned and well-read contemporaries. Ultimately, I believe that the existence of such dry and (to us) uninteresting poetry can be best understood when viewed through the lens of (Second) Sophistic literary culture, which devoted much effort to such secondary, encyclopaedic, and miscellanist texts. I will begin my argument by showing that Gregory nowhere states that his poetry is intended/designed for the classroom. Then I will discuss the polymetry of the poems, as analysed by Palla, and highlight how such polymetry would make these poems ill-fitting for a classroom context. After this, I will outline my own metrical analysis of these poems and compare my findings to that of other such studies conducted by scholars on Gregory's poetic corpus and discuss what implications my analysis of the metre has for better understanding the

---

[214] A sound grasp of Greek metre was essential, for Gregory, to the proper writing of poetry – as Milovanovic has pointed out (1997:502-503). See also Harder (1998) for the use of generic allusion in Hellenistic poetry; Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004); and also, Gutzwiller (2007) for the development and uses of metre amongst Hellenistic poets.

[215] Palla, p.175: *Il fatto stesso che Gregorio ricorra al metro può essere considerato una novità, ma non deve sorprendere e va visto in questa prospettiva didascalica: anche oggi maestri e genitori ricorrono spesso a filastrocche rimate o ritmate perché i bambini possano memorizzare con facilità maggiore regole grammaticali e nozioni di vario genere (ad esempio di quanti giorni sono formati i vari mesi dell'anno).* Dunkle, p. 22: 'Although [the biblical poems] may not suit every grown-up's taste, his poems are, as he puts it, "a helpful plaything for children".' Dunkle here is quoting an acrostic present in the poem 1.2.31.31-47: ἐσθλὸν ἄθυρμα νέοις. He also states more explicitly at p.20 that these poems were perhaps for neophytes and children to introduce them to the 'basics of the Scriptural narrative.'

[216] See also pp. 117-18 where he claims that this desire to versify the Scriptures for the classroom was Gregory's response to Julian's proscriptions against Christian teachers. See also Wyss's comment (1949:183): *[W]as uns aus den Produkten dieser späten Rhetoren und Sophisten entgegenschlägt, ist die Luft der Schulstube.*

[217] See also Hose (2006)

[218] There are some false quantities and metrical "mistakes" in the poems, which I will point out, but overall this is not the case, and we must do more than simply dismiss these poems if we are to better understand the writings of Nazianzen.

intended audience and contemporary appeal of these poems. Finally, I will offer my own hypothesis on the function of these poems by drawing upon the work of scholars such as Genette, Whitmarsh, and König on literary paratext and the secondary-auxiliary, literary culture of Imperial (and Late Antique), Roman society.

Gregory the School Teacher?

Firstly, it should be noted that Gregory nowhere states that his poetry was designed for a classroom audience. Gregory certainly wanted his literature to be read, and to be read by the *pepaideumenoi* of his age, but his practice of *paideia* – imbued with his Christian faith - was not carried out through creating textbooks for schools, but literature to be read and enjoyed by those who cared to read such (Christian) literature once sweetened by Gregory's *paideia*. His poetry was to be literature that equalled, if not surpassed, that of the Classical poets – something which Gregory *does* explicitly state.[219] Whether or not Gregory succeeds in that objective (in the biblical poems or any other of his poems) is beside the point here. What must be emphasised is that Gregory did not explicitly want his poems to be for the classroom. Gregory does say in the poem *On His Own Verse* (2.1.39) and in his *On His Own Life* (2.1.11) that he wants his work to be a τερπνὸν φάρμακον (pleasant medicine) (2.1.39.39) and παίδευμα καὶ γλύκασμα τοῖς νέοις ἅμα (both a lesson and a source of sweetness for the young) (2.1.11.7), but this is hardly a statement of intent to write specifically for the young in the classroom; or of creating an educative programme through his poetry. Simelidis (2009:75-88) has pointed out that the poems of Gregory were, in later years, read in schools, at times used to replace the erotic (Classical) poetry of antiquity (p.78), but this does not at all mean that any of his work was intended for the classroom – in the same way that Homer or Vergil did not write their *opera magna* for the classroom, despite their use in classrooms for millennia.

We also have little evidence of Gregory's formal teaching. It would not be controversial to make the claim that Gregory taught, but we know little about the context or content of his teachings – excepting, of course, his theological teachings which more likely have an ecclesiastical as opposed to a pedagogical setting. Gregory tells us in his *De Vita Sua* that he was begged (if not intimidated) by his colleagues at Athens not to follow Basil in departing from the city, and he even hints at the promise of some sort of κράτος to be voted to him if he were to stay (perhaps a coveted public chair as a teacher of rhetoric in Athens) (249-264).[220] When he does return home to Cappadocia, we know that he teaches a certain Evagrius, and that Gregory was a good teacher to him.[221] But again we know little of what was actually taught, and it is likely that what was taught was nothing particularly different from the education in basic grammar and rhetoric that all young

[219] See the poem 'On His Own Verse' (2.1.39.47-49).
[220] I would like to conjecture that Gregory was perhaps a *hetairos* (See Watts [2006:51-53] for the meaning of the term) to a leading teacher in Athens (perhaps Prohaeresius?), and so would have taken some of the teaching responsibilities within that school. But this is, of course, only my conjecture.
[221] See *Ep.* 3; McGuckin (2001:86-87) and Hauser-Meury (1960:64) s.v. Euagrius II for Gregory's pupil, and Euagrius I for his father. She notes that Gregory would have taken on this pupil in the time before he began his clerical career.

men of high standing families were expected to undertake. Therefore, from the little evidence we have of Gregory's teaching career, we can only assert that Gregory very likely did teach in Athens and Nazianzus, but not that he attempted some sort of amalgamation of Christian and Hellenic *paideia* that would be fit for the classroom through such poems as the Biblical poems discussed here.[222]

Furthermore, in turning to the poems themselves we will see that the peculiarity of these poems goes beyond their mere polymetry. *Carm*. 1.1.12 is the most metrically varied of the poems and runs as follows:

Θείοις ἐν λογίοισιν ἀεὶ γλώσσῃ τε νόῳ τε
Στρωφᾶσθ'· ἢ γὰρ ἔδωκε Θεὸς καμάτων τόδ' ἄεθλον,
Καί τι κρυπτὸν ἰδεῖν ὀλίγον φάος, ἢ τόδ' ἄριστον,
Νύττεσθαι καθαροῖο Θεοῦ μεγάλῃσιν ἐφετμαῖς·
Ἢ τρίτατον, χθονίων ἀπάγειν φρένα ταῖσδε μερίμναις.
Ὄφρα δὲ μὴ ξείνῃσι νόον κλέπτοιο βίβλοισι
(Πολλαὶ γὰρ τελέθουσι παρέγγραπτοι κακότητες),
Δέχνυσο τοῦτον ἐμεῖο τὸν ἔγκριτον, ὦ φίλ', ἀριθμόν.
Ἱστορικαὶ μὲν ἔασι βίβλοι δυοκαίδεκα πᾶσαι
Τῆς ἀρχαιοτέρης Ἑβραϊκῆς σοφίης.
Πρώτη Γένεσις, εἶτ' Ἔξοδος, Λευιτικόν[223]
Ἔπειτ' Ἀριθμοί. Εἶτα Δεύτερος Νόμος.
Ἔπειτ' Ἰησοῦς, καὶ Κριταί. Ῥοὺθ ὀγδόη.
Ἡ δ' ἐνάτη δεκάτη τε βίβλοι, Πράξεις βασιλήων,
Καὶ Παραλειπόμεναι. Ἔσχατον Ἔσδραν ἔχεις.
Αἱ δὲ στιχηραὶ πέντε, ὧν πρῶτός γ' Ἰώβ·
Ἔπειτα Δαυΐδ· εἶτα τρεῖς Σολομωντίαι·
Ἐκκλησιαστὴς, Ἆσμα καὶ Παροιμίαι.
Καὶ πένθ' ὁμοίως Πνεύματος προφητικοῦ.
Μίαν μέν εἰσιν ἐς γραφὴν οἱ δώδεκα·
Ὡσηὲ κ' Ἀμὼς, καὶ Μιχαίας ὁ τρίτος·
Ἔπειτ' Ἰωὴλ, εἶτ' Ἰωνᾶς, Ἀβδίας,
Ναούμ τε, Ἀββακούμ τε, καὶ Σοφονίας,
Ἀγγαῖος, εἶτα Ζαχαρίας, Μαλαχίας.
Μία μὲν οἵδε. Δευτέρα δ' Ἡσαΐας.
Ἔπειθ' ὁ κληθεὶς Ἱερεμίας ἐκ βρέφους.
Εἶτ' Ἰεζεκιὴλ, καὶ Δανιήλου χάρις.
Ἀρχαίας μὲν ἔθηκα δύω καὶ εἴκοσι βίβλους,
Τοῖς τῶν Ἑβραίων γράμμασιν ἀντιθέτους.
Ἤδη δ' ἀρίθμει καὶ νέου μυστηρίου.
Ματθαῖος μὲν ἔγραψεν Ἑβραίοις θαύματα Χριστοῦ·
Μάρκος δ' Ἰταλίῃ, Λουκᾶς Ἀχαϊάδι·
Πᾶσι δ' Ἰωάννης, κήρυξ μέγας, οὐρανοφοίτης.
Ἔπειτα Πράξεις τῶν σοφῶν ἀποστόλων.
Δέκα δὲ Παύλου τέσσαρές τ' ἐπιστολαί.
Ἑπτὰ δὲ καθολικαὶ, ὧν, Ἰακώβου μία,
Δύω δὲ Πέτρου, τρεῖς δ' Ἰωάννου πάλιν·

[222] There does not seem to be any evidence of Christian (episcopal) schools at Gregory's time – that is, schools that combined Christian doctrine with a Classical education. Marrou (1956:325) can find only one in the Thebaid around 372 AD. Szabat (2015:254) notes that the school at Gaza has been called a Christian school, but only because all in attendance were most likely Christian; the curriculum would have been no different from a "Pagan" school.

[223] Calliau in the *PG* 37.473 prints this line as a hexameter (Πρωτίστη, Γένεσις, εἶτ' Ἔξοδος, Λευιτικόν τε) but I, following Palla (p.176), believe it makes much more sense here structurally to have a trimeter.

Ἰούδα δ’ ἐστὶν ἑβδόμη. Πάσας ἔχεις.
Εἴ τι δὲ τούτων ἐκτὸς, οὐκ ἐν γνησίαις.[224]

> Abide always in the divine Scriptures in speech and mind. For God has given this prize of labour to make known some glimmer of hidden light; and, most importantly, to pierce through the great commandments of the pure Godhead; and thirdly to lead our mind away from worldly things by these studies. Therefore, lest you should be misled in your mind by strange books (for many spurious and wicked works exist) receive, dear friend, this authoritative account of mine. In total there are twelve historical books of ancient Hebraic wisdom. First is Genesis, then Exodos, and Leviticus. Thereafter we have Numbers, then Deuteronomy. Then Joshua, Judges and eighth is Ruth. Books nine and ten are the books of Kings, then you have Chronicles, and finally Ezra. There are five books of poetry, the first of which is Job. Then David [Psalms], then the three books of Solomon: Ecclesiastes, The Song of Songs, and Proverbs. Similarly, there are five books of the prophets of the Holy Spirit. Twelve prophets are placed into one book: Hosea, Amos, and Micah; then Joel, Jonas, Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. They make one book. Second is Isaiah. Then Jeremiah, who was called whilst in the womb. Then Ezekiel, and the favour of Daniel. I have set out the twenty-two books of the Old Testament, which is equal in number to the letters of the alphabet of the Hebrews. Count, also, the new Mystery. Matthew wrote of the miracles of Christ for the Hebrews, Mark for Italy, and Luke for Greece. But John, the great herald, who walks in the heavens, wrote for all men. Then there is the Acts of the wise Apostles; then the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul. Then there are the seven epistles addressed to the whole Church: one by James, two by Peter, three by John and the seventh by Jude. You have all the books. If any book differs from the above, it is not counted among the legitimate books.

As Palla also notes (pp. 176-177), lines 1-8 are written in dactylic hexameter. They outline the purpose of scripture: knowledge of hidden “light”, understanding the commandments of God, and freeing the mind of earthly cares. Then it finishes with an invitation to receive Gregory’s authoritative numbering of the canonical books of the Bible. 9-10 makes an elegiac couplet that introduces the first 12 books of the Old Testament which Gregory calls Ἱστορικαὶ. There follow three lines of iambic trimeter (11-13) followed by an elegiac couplet which closes the series of Ἱστορικαὶ (14-15). Lines 16-18 recount the στιχηραὶ in iambic trimeter, which continue from line 19 to 27 recounting the book of prophets. 28-29 make up an elegiac couplet that closes the catalogue of the Old Testament. 30 is another invitation to receive the correct numbering of the New Testament written in iambic trimeter. 31-33 is another elegiac couplet followed by a dactylic hexameter which recounts the four Gospels. John’s Gospel is given particular prominence by having a whole line to itself in hexameter. The poem closes with the rest of the New Testament being recounted in iambic trimeter with a final comment that, if there be any supposedly biblical book that is different from Gregory’s catalogue, then it is not ἐν γνησίαις. Therefore, we can analyse the poem’s metrical scheme as follows: (1) the poem is introduced in dactylic hexameters; (2) the books of the bible are written in straightforward iambic trimeter in accordance with the conventions of comic dialogue, in which anapaests and resolution are admitted more freely than in tragedy, and there are many lines which have no caesura;[225] (3) elegiac couplets are used to introduce and conclude the various sections of the Old Testaments of the Bible; the Gospels are

[224] There is a paraphrase of this poem in the *PG* 38.841-846.
[225] See West (1987:24-28) for a good summary of these conventions.

given special prominence by being recounted in an elegiac couplet and hexameter and is opened and closed by iambic trimeter.[226] Palla then notes that the metrical changes would have helped the reader to learn the poem by heart, but how?[227]

This poem, as well as the other biblical poems, as Palla notes, uses polymetry to better organise the content, and to highlight important information. Sometimes it is used to note a change in subject matter, such as in the poem on the genealogies of Christ (1.1.18.33-35)[228] when Gregory briefly changes from hexameter to iambic trimeter in order to make an authorial aside (or summary) of his argument – that Matthew's genealogy is according to nature, and Luke's according to (Judaic) law. But the metrical changes within the poems would have posed a challenge to the reader, especially if that reader was just learning Greek metre; and even the well-read would never (or perhaps rarely) have come across such polymetry.[229] Furthermore, the lines (even when the metre is identified) often do not scan in a straightforward manner. The iambic trimeters are the best example of this. One could say that they broadly fit into the conventions of comic dialogue in drama, which, as West (1982:1830) notes, became popular for didactic poetry in later writers. However, Line 10 of 1.1.16 introduces a peculiarity into what is otherwise a straightforward iambic-didactic poem:

|x - ∪ -| x - - -| x - ∪ -|
Ἔφλεξεν ἄρδην πεντηκοντάρχας δύω.

He utterly burnt up the two companies of fifty men.[230]

The second metron scans as a tetrasyllabic dochmiac, a metrical scheme more likely found in dramatic song.[231] Finally, the following poem has a line that scans as two choriambs and one iambus (1.1.17.7):

| x ∪ ∪ -| x ∪ ∪ -|x - ∪ -|
Τοῦτο δ' ἀφειδῶς μεταδοῦσα τῷ ξένῳ …

She gave this [flour and oil to make oil] freely to her guest [Elijah] …

Again, such a metrical scheme is the kind one would find in dramatic song.[232] It could well be that Gregory and his audience did not have an ear for the quantities of ancient Greek,[233] and that these

[226] As I note below, iambic trimeter is used here (as in many later writers) for didactic writing but see Hawkins (2014:142-180) for Gregory's use of iambic as invective.
[227] Palla, p.177: *Difficile avere dubbi sui fini catechetici della composizione e sul fatto che i cambiamenti di metro volessero anche fornire un aiuto a chi doveva imparare a memoria*.
[228] It should be noted that Palla (p. 179), and Dunkle (p.43, fn.5) who follows him, believes this poem to be actually two poems. But I disagree with them and prefer the interpretation of Sicherl (2002:313-314) that the poem is in fact a unity, and that the manuscripts that have a *Zwischentitel* are wrong to divide it.
[229] Amphilochius' *Iambi ad Seleucum* provides a parallel to this poem, in that it also discusses the canon of Scripture in iambic trimeter, but switches to hexameters for the last three lines – but only after his excursion on the canon is complete. However, the polymetry here is nowhere near as varied as *Carm.* 1.1.12. On Amphilochius' poem, see Breytenbach and Zimmermann (2018:685-686) and for further scholarship.
[230] This is a reference to 2*Kings* 1:12.
[231] See West (1982:100) for examples.
[232] For the use of choriambs in drama in general, see West (1982, *passim*).
[233] Simelidis (2009:54), following Maas (1962:14) mentions the lack of understanding of quantities among Gregory's contemporaries. Cameron (1971: 120-121) notes the work of Marianus of Eleutheropolis (active only a little after Gregory's time) who converted hexameter poems into iambic trimeter. Agosti (2001:224)

lines are an example antecedent of the later Byzantine dodecasyllable (West, 1982:185). But given that the trimeter elsewhere is in line with comic convention, and so admits anapaests and resolution within lines (thus allowing more than twelve syllables in a line), to read these lines as a sort of forefather of the dodecasyllable would bring us no closer to understanding Gregory's metrics.

The elegiac couplets often admit *brevis in longo* in the pentameter at the caesura, such as at 1.1.14.12 on the plagues of Egypt:

| - ∪ ∪| - ∪ ∪| ∪ |- ∪ ∪| - ∪ ∪ | ∪
Πρωτοτόκων δὲ μόρος ἡ δεκάτη βάσανος.

The tenth torment, the death of the first born.

And 1.1.25.6 on the parables in the gospel of Mark:[234]

| - ∪ ∪| - -|∪ | - ∪ ∪| - ∪ ∪ | ∪
Ἑλλάδι Παύλοιο Λουκᾶς ἔγραψε τάδε·

Luke wrote these [parables] for Paul's Greece.

This is a phenomenon which only begins to develop in the third and fourth centuries (West, 1982:181).[235] It should also be noted that the '-ᾶς' of Λουκᾶς should be long. However, on this phenomenon Sicherl in Oberhaus' edition of 1.2.25 has this to say (1991:26):

> *Die Verwendung naturlanger Silben in den brevia ist oft bemerkt worden, aber infolge des Fehlens einer vollständigen Erschließung des Wortschatzes Gregors war es bisher schwer festzustellen, daß er langes α, υ und ι in manchen Wörtern immer kurz wertet, also diese nie im longum, sondern nur im breve oder anceps erscheinen.*

More peculiarities are found in the hexameter. At 1.1.27.15 the *princeps* position of the second metron is occupied by a short vowel:

|- -| - ∪ ∪| - ∪ ∪| - ∪ ∪| - ∪ ∪| - x|
Αἰνῶ **τὸ**ν ὀλίγον νάπυος σπόρον, ὡς ὀλίγος μὲν[236]

Simelidis (2009:55) – following Sicherl's metrical analysis of Gregory's poetry in Oberhaus' edition of *Carm*. 1.2.25 (1991:29-30) – notes that '[t]here are several 'long' syllables with a short vowel [in Gregory's prosody], almost always before ν, σ and ρ.' This could help us to explain another metrical puzzle at 1.1.20.7:

| - ∪ ∪ | —∪ ∪ |- ∪ ∪| - - | - ∪ ∪| - x
Δαίμονας ἦκε σύεσσι τὸ πέμπτ**ο**ν, ἐν Γεργεσηνοῖς.[237]

---

believes that such a 'translation' must have been made so that hexameter poets could be more easily read by a wider audience. Horrocks (2010:160-187) provides the most thorough analysis of the changes happening in the Greek language at this time (although its evidence is mainly based in Egyptian papyri). See especially p.169: 'The change from a primary pitch accent to a primary stress accent was directly associated with the loss of vowel-length distinctions, and was widespread by the middle of the 2nd century BC …'

[234] Palla (p.183) seems to think that only lines 1, 2, and 4 are authentic, in accordance with his reading of the manuscript tradition.

[235] Also noted by Sykes (1979:14-15) and Simelidis (2009:56-57).

[236] See, also, 1.1.18.28.

[237] *PG* 37.489 has Γεργεσσηνοῖς, but Γεργεσηνοῖς is attested elsewhere (see Bauer).

This scansion would give us a bucolic diaeresis but would still leave us with a 'long' syllable in *brevis* position in the first syllable of Γεργεσηνοῖς. Perhaps the comment of Sicherl quoted above could help us better understand this phenomenon too. However, the initial epsilon of Γεργεσηνοῖς is not long by nature but by position, and so it is not quite the same phenomenon as Sicherl describes. Nevertheless, we can add to this that the biblical poems show a certain flexibility in the quantities of words when it comes to biblical names.[238]

The poem on the genealogies of Christ (1.1.18) provides a few examples, such as the different scansions of the name Ἰακὼβ where it is scanned as ∪∪ – at line 28 and ∪ – –at line 30. Later on, we have Ἀρών scanned – ∪ at line 42,[239] but at line 45 it is ∪ –. The following poem that lists Christ's apostles (1.1.19) also has two different scannings of the same name in one line (5), where the first word Ἰούδας scans – – –, but the last word of the line with the same name scans ∪ – X. Maas (1962:20) notes the difficulty that Semitic, biblical names caused Christian poets, as such names 'could be given only an arbitrary quantitative value.' Even the more prosodically correct poets such as Synesius and Nonnus find it impossible to fit such names into Greek metre without allowing false quantities. We cannot, therefore, judge the quality of Gregory's verse too much based on these biblical poems, but we should add that - given the difficulty of writing Biblical poetry in metre – it would seem an odd choice of topic to learn one's scansion.

Finally, we can compare the biblical poems with studies already conducted on the metre of Gregory. The study of Agosti and Gonnelli (1995:289-409) has been most influential on later scholars who discuss Gregory's metre.[240] Sykes (1979:15) notes that the ratio of dactyls to spondees is 5:1 in Gregory, which is an increase from earlier authors such as Homer and Hesiod (2.5:1), but in line with the trend of poets later than Homer and Hesiod, and Gregory's contemporaries (as well as the later Nonnus), who have a ratio of dactyls to spondees much similar to Gregory. Both Simelidis (2009:54-57) and Whitby (2008:93-94) – who conducts her own study on the poem to Olympias (*Carm.* 2.2.6) – follow Agosti-Gonnelli in noting that (Simelidis, p. 56): 'Gregory's favourite patterns of hexameters are ddddd (31.69%) and sdddd (19.20%); other sequences which Gregory favours to a lesser extent are dsddd (15.22%) and dddsd (8.50%); σπονδειάζοντες: 1.44%.' Dunkle (p.22) also following these findings states that '[i]n the poems on Scripture, the ratio [of dactyls to spondees] is even higher [than 5:1], around six resolved dactyls for every spondee. Gregory's preference for resolved dactyls in these poems appears at least to help students recite or even sing the verses.' Dunkle does not state why such a ratio would help them recite (not to mention sing!) these poems, but the ratio of 6:1 is completely unfounded.

My own study of these particular poems has returned a result of approximately 3 dactyls to every one spondee (or 76.83% dactyls to 23.17% spondees). This would mean that these poems

[238] Such flexibility can also be found in Homer as noted by West (2011:226-228)

[239] The *PG* prints this name as Ἀαρών, but this does not scan, and we have Ἀρών in the same poem regardless. So, it is not an excessive emendation to the text.

[240] See also Sykes (1979) who has more or less the same results as Agosti and Gonnelli.

are even more spondaic than the poems covered in previous studies. There are similar results, however, when we look at the line patterns for the hexameters. Gregory's favoured pattern is still ddddd (21.35%) followed by sdddd (19.09%). The pattern dsddd still comes in at third (13.26%), followed by dddsd (8.41%). Fifth foot spondees only make up 0.64% (2 lines) but given that the percentages here are slightly lower for Gregory's favoured patterns than in previous studies, this means that there are more examples of lines with two or more spondees (31.02%). The reason for this higher ratio of spondees is best explained by the large presence of Semitic names in these poems, which Gregory prefers to scan with *elementa longa*. If we look at lines with 2 or more spondees, we see that the spondees predominantly fall upon the Semitic names such as in 1.1.18.83, 85-86, 88:

– □ □|– – | – – | – – | – □ □| – x
Κωσὰμ, ἔην Ἀδδί. Τοῦ, Μελχί. Τοῦ δ' ἄπο, Νηρί.
…
– – | – – | – ∪ ∪| – – | – – |– x
Ἰούδας, Ὡσώκ, Σεμεεί τ' αὖ, Ματθίας τε,
– – | – – | – – | – – | – ∪ ∪ | – x
Καὶ Μαὰθ, Ναγγαὶ, καὶ Ἐσλείμ· τοῦ δ' ἄπο Ναοὺμ,
…
– – | – –|– – | – – | – ∪ ∪ |– x
Μελχὶ, καὶ Λευὶ, καὶ Ματθὰν, Ἡλεὶ, Ἰωσήφ..[241]

Many other examples of such lines can be found in the biblical poems.[242] Therefore, we can say that Gregory's Biblical poems are in agreement with metrical analyses already carried out upon different parts of his poetic output. However, given the difficulty posed by the Semitic names that make an essential part of his subject matter, Gregory has a higher ratio of spondees in these poems compared to other parts of his corpus. Maas, as noted above, has already discussed the difficulty such names caused Gregory's contemporaries and poets after him, and so it was only inevitable that Gregory would have to forgo slightly his favoured style of (heavily dactylic) metric in order to accommodate these names.

To conclude this section, we have shown that these poems were unlikely to be intended for use as a school textbook, through which the pupil may learn both his Scripture and his scansion. Gregory nowhere states that he embarks upon such a pedagogical programme in his extant writings, but rather that he intends to write poetry that would rival that of the Classical poets (such as Homer, Callimachus, and so on). The polymetry of the poems that has seemingly led scholars to suspect such a pedagogical purpose to these poems is in fact one of the main reasons why these texts would not be suitable for learning Greek metre, as the reader would have to scan not only their lines correctly but figure out what kind of metre each line is (as there is no guarantee that one poem has one metre). Furthermore, our metrical analysis has shown that the metre of these poems is not shoddy, as previous scholars have suggested, but a reflection of contemporary developments

[241] An example of epic correption, as the final syllable of Ἡλεὶ is short.
[242] See *Carm.* 1.1.13.2,3,5; 1.1.18.100; and 1.1.19.2,3.

in poetic composition. Gregory's quirks in the metre, such as a short vowel before certain consonants scanning as long, can be found as far back as Homer (Oberhaus, 1991:29); and they show that he, like Nonnus and other contemporary poets, is looking to further regulate and order his poetry, but with an ear to the changes in the Greek language of his time that no longer distinguished the long and short quantities of more ancient Greek. It should be noted that, if Gregory intended for these poems to be used in elementary education, then surely they would seek to reflect the metre of poets such as Homer or Callimachus who would have been part of the literary canon, and more likely studied by schoolchildren.

However, if Gregory wished (as he states in his programmatic poem) for his poetry to rival the *xenoi* of his time – and of the past, no doubt – then why did he not write these poems in accordance with the metrical schemes of his forebears? Gregory could, and did, write poems that show clear influences and imitations of the great poets of the past. The epitaphs discussed above stray very little from the tradition of literary epitaphs that had been formed over centuries in Greek literature, and I have demonstrated the extensive influence that the *AP* in particular had on these poems. However, this particular set of poems have a subject matter completely foreign to Greek poetry – hence the metrical difficulties outlined above. Furthermore, Gregory is not trying to write an epic, a lyric poem, hymn, or any other kind of traditional Greek poem, but – as I will argue – an auxiliary text, which was to be used as an introduction to Scripture and, therefore, secondary to it. We have then, I believe, an example of Gregory at his most innovative; his subject matter, after all, was unconventional for a Greek poem, and so perhaps this led to an unconventional approach to its metre.

As noted above, the change in metre has a clear function within the poems: to highlight authorial asides and to note changes in subject matter (such as a transition from one catalogue of biblical book to another). Therefore, what we have in Gregory's Biblical poems is an example of didactic poetry, that reflects the developments in metre and style of the didactic genre in late antiquity. Didactic was no longer written in just hexameters, but iambic trimeter as well; Gregory does both and often within the same poem. Perhaps the reason for such a change to iambic here is to make the information conveyed in these lines easier to read and memorise for the reader.[243] That we find no such mixture of metres anywhere else is not a reflection of Gregory's mediocrity, but rather provides an example of a late antique poet looking to push the boundaries of what can be done with metre and to innovate further upon a received didactic tradition – such a style just does not seem to have caught on**.**

The biblical poems are a fine example of the real struggle that Gregory faced in creating this poetry, as the Semitic names of the Bible often forced him to abandon his preferred metrical patterns – which are very dactylic – in order to accommodate these names (a struggle he refers to in

[243] See Al. Cameron (2006:334) who notes that 'Ps-Scymnus describes these [didactic] iambics as 'comic' and gives Apollodorus' reasons (and by implication his own) for writing in this particular metrical form: clarity (τῆς σαφηνείας) and easy memorization (εὐμνημόνευτον lines 34–5)', and later on: 'There can be little doubt that Gregory was consciously writing in this iambic didactic tradition' (p.336).

Carm. 2.1.39.34-37). Therefore, we see quite clearly here Gregory's first stated reason for writing poetry in the poem "On His Own Verse" (discussed above): the need to bring measure to his own "measurelessness". Krueger (2004:1) notes, in relation to Gregory's above comment in "On His Own Verse", that '[t]he discipline of writing served as a powerful metaphor for the composition of a more Christian self.' We can see, therefore, this real struggle with which Gregory renders his subject (the Bible) into Greek metre as a struggle to create the Christian self which he marks out for himself in his Epitaphs as one who embodies both sacred and profane wisdom – and so these poems are as much an exertion of his Christian virtue (in his re-presentation of Scripture) as his Greek *paideia* (in the rendering of his subject in Greek metre).

This struggle also led him to be much more flexible with quantities in these names, as can be seen from the various scansions of the same name. In going forward with the study of Gregory's poetry, a much more extensive and detailed analysis of Gregory's metre is needed in order to find and better understand the rules and regulations that Gregory seems to have developed for his own poetry. Such a scientific study – as carried out by Agosti-Gonnelli, and others (including my own analysis of the biblical poems) – will, no doubt, further confirm the growing academic consensus that Gregory (although not, perhaps, an excellent poet) was not as careless or as mediocre as previous scholars have concluded.

Thus far in this chapter, we have been concerned with Gregory as a pedagogue (our third research focus), that is, his understanding and use of metre in disseminating biblical knowledge. From our above analysis, we can conclude that Gregory was not playing the school teacher here in writing these poems; he does not see them as a means for young men going through their elementary education to learn their scansion and Bible at the same time. Nevertheless, that does not mean to say that these poems and their use of metre have no pedagogical function whatsoever, the metre, as we have argued, would help the reader to memorise the Biblical knowledge contained within these poems. But the metrical peculiarities in these poems tell us two things: (1) the reader has an excellent understanding of the various Greek metres used within these poems, and (2) Gregory was seeking to re-regulate these traditional Greek metres with an ear to the developments in the spoken Greek of his (elite) contemporaries – such as Nonnus would later do more systematically. Therefore, Gregory's understanding of *paideia* goes beyond mere imitation of the literary models with which it would imbue the *pepaideumenos*. Rather, Gregory desires to innovate upon this literary tradition and have a hand in moulding and shaping it for future generations. A topic that was in no way part of the traditional curriculum (the Bible) quite possibly, for Gregory, called for a more innovative approach to its assimilation into the tradition of Greek poetry. Gregory's weaving, therefore, of sacred and profane wisdom often calls for innovative and experimental approaches to his poetry (as we shall see throughout this thesis). It should be added, furthermore, that this mixture of metres and the polymetry of these poems no doubt was meant to be a fine display of Gregory's *paideia*.

Poetry as a Gateway to the Bible

Above, we have asserted through a close analysis of the metre of these poems that they were not meant for the schoolroom to teach children their Scripture and scansion at the same time. Rather, these poems reflect contemporary trends in Greek metrics, and show a certain innovation in both its construction and mixtures of metres that would suggest that Gregory has a mature, learned audience in mind. These poems are, nonetheless, didactic, but not - as many scholars have suggested - a sort of elementary school exercise.

However, it still remains to be clarified what exactly were the functions of these poems. Here I will explore a few possible ways in which these poems can be better read and understood. Primarily, I will be viewing these poems as a kind of secondary or auxiliary literature. They are secondary in that they are subservient to a primary text (the Bible), and auxiliary in that they help its reader engage with and understand the Scriptures. Much scholarship has already been done on the rise of catalogue, reference, medical, encyclopaedic, and epitomising texts that arose in the Imperial and late antique era.[244] König and Whitmarsh (2007:29) have noted that '[t]he reconfiguration of pre-existing texts is viewed not simply as a second-order intellectual parasitism, but as a major intellectual project in its own right.' König (2007) in his article on Plutarch's miscellanist *Sympotic Questions* provides some parallels between Plutarch's text and that of Gregory. The article as a whole shows that what is needed in order to better understand a text that seems obfuscated and fragmentary is an attentive reader. Plutarch wishes his reader not simply to learn from what is written but also learn how to interpret and discern what is good, and right in the written word. They are to provide, in short, an opportunity for reflection and thought.[245] Given the (often difficult) metre, the literary allusions outwith the Bible, and the, sometimes cryptic, references to episodes in the Bible found in these poems (discussed below), it makes sense that Gregory's reader too must be attentive and well-read to fully comprehend these poems.

Yet another study on auxiliary texts by M. Dubischar (2010) provides more insight into the practice and purpose of condensing primary texts. Dubischar notes that the purpose of an auxiliary text is to help a primary text in trouble of not being read. Auxiliary texts 'allow, facilitate, or even assure that a primary text … is read as … it deserves to be read' (p. 42). They are designed to encourage (slothful) readers to engage with a primary text that might be lengthy or difficult, thus providing them with a sound introduction to the primary text. He then goes on to quickly explain P. Grice's theory of communication which deals specifically with verbal conversations (pp. 51-52). Grice outlines four maxims: Quantity – make your speech no longer or shorter than it should be; Quality – contribute something useful to the conversation; Relation – make sure what you say is

[244] These will be discussed below but see also Sluiter (2000) on genre and secondary literature. However, I would side more with Rosenmeyer's (2006) view of genre when it comes to ancient literature – especially when it comes to these particular poems by Gregory, which are unlike anything else I have come across in ancient literature. See also König and Woolf (2013). In line with their thoughts given here, I would say that there is an element of encyclopaedism in these poems; for Gregory is ultimately condensing the information contained within the Biblical texts for his readers in his poems, though it is not perhaps in any sense encyclopaedic.

[245] See also König (2009:66-67).

true; and Manner – do not be obscure, ambiguous, or prolix. As Dubischar points out, these maxims are useful in understanding texts, but ultimately fail to take into account three main problems of textual communication (pp. 54-56): (1) Over time, texts become de-contextualised from their original audience; tastes change, and what counts as good literature constantly changes over time and space. (2) Conversations are engaged in one at a time, but there is a myriad of texts with which a reader can engage; and simply being considered worth reading or a 'must read' does not necessarily mean that the reader will have the time to engage with it – especially if the text is lengthy. (3) Finally, a reader does not have to commit to reading a book in the same way that one must commit to engaging in a conversation, especially when the conversation is underway; one would risk social embarrassment if one disengaged in an untimely fashion from a conversation. Furthermore, the reader can pick and choose which part of a text he/she likes or wants to read, and so the reader may not engage as fully with a text as they would in a conversation.

As Dubischar goes on to argue (pp. 56-64) these three problems are by and large what auxiliary texts aim to tackle in (re)portraying their primary texts. The biblical poetry of Gregory most certainly does so. The Bible, however, was not like any other text that underwent condensing. For the *Septuagint*, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, was divinely inspired;[246] and the New Testament contained the words and deeds of Christ and his Apostles. The Bible, therefore, was a sacred text, one that was held by Christians (and Jews) in the highest regard. Nevertheless, the Old Testament was no doubt for Gregory's contemporaries an ancient and foreign (Judaic) text, accessed only through an old Greek translation of said text that had little claim to high literary accomplishment.[247] By writing these poems in a very ornate style that imitated the greats of Hellenic poetry, and by portraying episodes in a way that does away with references to the foreignness of the texts themselves, Gregory manages to represent the Bible in a way that would be appealing to his audience. In selecting specific episodes, themes and subject matter – such as what books are canonical, the Ten Commandments, the list of disciples, or the various *thaumata* discussed above – he presents to his reader a selection of passages from the large, biblical corpus; and presents to them important pieces of information along with a form of exegesis – for the reader who cares to contemplate and delve more deeply into the primary text. Finally, by the abbreviated and somewhat cryptic style of his poetry, he encourages, if not demands, his reader to engage with the primary text, and gives him/her good reason to commit to understanding more about what would become an indispensable source for aiding Christians in discovering and living out right Christian dogma and devotion. In short, we can see that Gregory is not only using his poetry as an

[246] On Christian insistence of the divine inspiration of the LXX, see Dines (2004:75-79) for a summary and further scholarship.

[247] See Lamarche (1997) on the various Greek translations (including the LXX) of the Old Testament; and Simon (1997) who outlines the various controversies over the Old Testament/Hebrew Bible and the solidification of the canon over time; Rahlfs (2006:XXXVII) outlines the various attempts by ancient scholars to render the Hebrew as accurately as possible into ancient Greek, including the Rabbi Aquila's, which sought to render the Hebrew text so accurately that 'he did not shrink from perpetrating the most appalling outrages to the whole essence of the Greek language.'

aid to read the Bible, but as a gateway to reading it. He is trying to secure a larger readership for the Bible and to make sure that it is read in a way that is in line with (his) orthodox teaching.

Firstly, I will look at the exegetical value of these poems, and how they might expound the Scriptures for its readers. Then, I will view these texts from the perspective of the paratext as defined by Gerard Genette, before finally discussing the wider implications that the production of such a display of *paideia* had for the author's identity. I should add here that I do not think all of the poems that I have termed "Biblical Poems" have equal exegetical or paratextual significance, but what all of these poems do share is an auxiliary or secondary nature, which will have over-arching implications for our main topic of discussion - Gregory's conception and use of *paideia* to form his identity as *prytanis* of sacred and profane wisdom.

Exegesis

Gregory's role as a Biblical exegete has only recently become a subject of greater focus in scholarly circles; and even within these considerations of Gregory's role as exegete his Biblical poetry is barely discussed at all.[248] The vast majority of the biblical poems are catalogical in nature. *Carm.* 1.1.12-16, 18-26 can easily be defined as catalogue poetry. Apart from 1.1.12 which catalogues the authentic biblical books, these poems catalogue people or events that occur throughout the bible. Furthermore, each poem catalogues its subject (whether that be the plagues of Egypt or the miracles of Jesus in Matthew's Gospel) in the order in which it appears in the Bible.[249] This would suggest that Gregory wanted these poems to be committed to memory by the reader and act as an index of important biblical passages or pieces of information/exegesis (such as the canonical books of scripture and the meaning behind the genealogies of Christ). Many of these poems have little exegetical value, in that they do little to explain the Scriptures, and seek only to list in chronological order the events, people, and so on, with which the poem is concerned. Occasionally the poem will open with a rationale as to why the reader should read (and commit to memory) these poems, such as the poem on the plagues of Egypt – so that the reader "might tremble before God's might" (1.1.14.2, trans. Dunkle [p.39]) – or the poem on the ten

[248] Demoen's monograph, *Pagan and Biblical Exempla in Gregory Nazianzen* (1996) does pay some attention to the Biblical poems and goes into great detail in identifying the various rhetorical uses of the Bible in his poetry. Young (1997) and Norris (1997) also discuss Gregory's exegesis without reference to these poems. Matz (2012) has looked into Gregory's role as a Biblical preacher and Fulford (2012) also discusses Gregory's unique approach to Biblical exegesis, but both of these works focus entirely upon the orations of Gregory. Much more scholarship has been done on Christian poetry and exegesis in Latin, on which, see Otten and Pollmann's edited collection of essays on the topic (2007).

[249]There are two exceptions to this: 1.1.13, the catalogue of the sons of Jacob, is based on Gn. 46:8 but does not reflect the order of the biblical passage; and 1.1.26, the catalogue of the parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke, which includes one parable that only appears in Matthew, and swaps the order of two parables so that the parable at Lk. 15:8-10 is recounted before the parable of Lk. 15:4-7. These two alone interrupt what is otherwise an impeccable chronological account of Gregory's chosen biblical subject matter. It could be that the edition from which Gregory was working was in fact different from that which we have at hand today, or simply that he forgot the exact order of the Sons of Jacob or the parables of Luke. See, also, Demoen (1996:235-237) where he discusses some other examples of Gregory's mistakes or distortions of the Biblical text, and p.235 where he discusses the texts of Scripture with which Gregory was familiar.

commandments (1.1.15) – that they may be written on the reader's heart (that is, memorised and preserved by the reader).

Demoen's discussion of Gregory's exegesis is perhaps the most thorough discussion of it in current scholarship (1996:233-288). Here Demoen notes that Gregory leans more towards the Alexandrian (particularly Origen) school of exegesis, which gives more attention to the typological/anagogical interpretation of Scripture – as opposed to the Antiochene school that focuses more on historico-critical analysis of the Bible.[250] Gregory's exposition of Scripture, therefore, can be broadly split into two categories: *gramma* and *pneuma*. The former is to do with the literal sense of the passage, the latter with the moral and/or anagogical meaning. In discussing the functions of the Bible, Demoen (pp.286-288) notes the three functions laid out by Gregory in his poem on the biblical canon: (1) to gain insight into the mysteries of faith (2) – to be stimulated by God's commandments – which is the best – and (3) to carry one's mind away from earthly to heavenly things (1.1.12.1-5). Demoen notes, however, that there is a fourth function alluded to in *Or*. 2.105) – that the authors of Scripture have written down these things as *paideumata*, *tupoi,* and *paradeigmata.*[251] Furthermore, it should be noted that – as Gruenwald (1995:76-77) points out - 'the very act of declaring the nature and scope of a canon in itself is tantamount to an interpretative act.' So when Gregory decides to make this the subject of his poem (1.1.12), he is – in a way – engaging in an interpretative act. But what is more, he is also establishing his own authority to declare what is canonical and what is not.[252] That the practice and establishment of power is often tied up within such secondary texts has already been established by König and Whitmarsh (2007) and will also be discussed further below.

As noted above, 1.1.17 on the genealogies of Christ twice changes metre from hexameters to iambics, and these iambic lines are the only place where Gregory engages in any sort of detailed explanation of a Biblical passage.[253] The first time it changes is at lines 33-35, in which Gregory explains the difference between the genealogies of Matthew and Luke:

> Εὐαγγελιστῶν δ' ὃς μὲν εἶπε τὴν φύσιν,
> Ματθαῖος, ὃς δ' ἔγραψε Λουκᾶς τὸν νόμον.
> Παῦσαι διοχλῶν τὴν καλὴν συμφωνίαν.
>
> Of the Evangelists, Matthew speaks of [Joseph's ancestry according to] human nature, but Luke is writing about [Joseph's ancestry according to] the law. Stop disturbing the sound harmony!

[250] This is, of course, a very brief summary of these two schools which is far from understanding the complexities and nuances which exist within these schools of exegesis. As well as Demoen, see Schäublin (1974) and Hilda (1996) on the Antiochene school, and Paget (1996) on the Alexandrian school; see Kannengiesser (2004:748-753) for his entry on the Biblical exegesis of Gregory Nazianzen (and for further studies on this topic).
[251] Furthermore, see Demoen (1997).
[252] I have mentioned *passim* in this chapter various works that discuss the canon of Scripture or various versions of it, but see especially McDonald (2006), especially p. 796 which lists the various ancient compilations of the canon of Scripture, and the edition of McDonald and Sanders (2002) which has various articles on the creation and ongoing debate on various aspects of the Jewish and Christian canon.
[253] As Dunkle notes (2012:43), Gregory is depending upon the explanation of the differing genealogies as given by Julius Africanus in his *Letter to Aristides*, on which, see Guignard (2011), especially, p. 231 where he discusses briefly the similarities between Julian and Gregory.

What Gregory means exactly by Παῦσαι διοχλῶν τὴν καλὴν συμφωνίαν is not entirely obvious. It could be that he rebukes himself for disturbing the general flow of the argument – and possibly the metre – by inserting his little summary of his arguments. The word συμφωνία, however, more likely refers to the harmony - or agreement – between the various Gospels.[254] Therefore, Gregory is here rebuking those who deny the authenticity or consistency of the Gospels on grounds of supposed contradictions or inconsistencies.[255] This change to iambics then would seem even more suitable, for he is lambasting his imagined opponent(s) for their disbelief.[256] The next time Gregory switches to iambic trimeter is after he has recounted the genealogy according to Luke and before he begins that of Matthew (100-104):

> Λουκᾶς μὲν οὕτω. Πῶς δὲ Ματθαῖος μέγας;
> Ἐξ Ἀβραὰμ μὲν μέχρι Δαυῒδ, ὡς ἔφην.
> Ἔνθεν δὲ Λουκᾶ τὴν ἱερατικὴν παρεὶς
> Σποράν, τίθησι τοῦ γένους ἀνακτόρων.
> Εἰσὶν δ' ὅσοι τε καὶ τίνες, λελέξεται.
>
> Luke recounts thus, but what does Matthew the great say? As I have said, [he goes] from Abraham to David. But then leaving behind the priestly offspring of Luke he recounts the offspring of God's appointed kings. How many and who they are will be said below.

Yet again we see that Gregory makes an authorial interjection in the text, and to show that more clearly, he also changes the metre from the main metre of the poem (dactylic hexameters). Exegesis like this shows here a concern for *gramma* as opposed to *pneuma*, but we will see that some of these poems attempt a more anagogical exegesis of the Scripture.

Take for example 1.1.28, a short hexameter epigram on Christ rebuking the storm while he and his disciples are in the middle of the Sea of Galilee, which gives Gregory a chance to invoke a time-honoured topic of Greek (especially lyric) poetry: the ship of state. It is worth quoting the poem in full:

> Ἦν ὅτε Χριστὸς ἴαυεν ἐφ' ὁλκάδος ἔμφυτον ὕπνον,
> Τετρήχει δὲ θάλασσα κυδοιμοτόκοισιν ἀήταις.
> Δείματί τε πλωτῆρες ἀνίαχον· Ἔγρεο, Σῶτερ,
> Ὀλλυμένοις ἐπάμυνον. Ἄναξ δ' ἐκέλευεν ἀναστὰς
> Ἀτρεμέειν ἀνέμους καὶ κύματα, καὶ πέλεν οὕτως.
> Θαύματι δ' ἐφράζοντο Θεοῦ φύσιν οἱ παρεόντες.[257]

[254] See *PGL* 1.a. s.v. συμφωνία which attests this meaning of the noun to Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.31.3. The *LSJ* speaks only of the musical connotations of συμφωνία, with the added metaphorical meaning of harmony/agreement. But, given that musical harmony would be – to some extent – tied up with metre, one wonders if 18.35 is perhaps also a reference to Gregory's metrical change and interruption of the main topic (and metre) of the poem

[255] Not only Pagans but also heretics. See Young's discussion of Origen's defence of inconsistencies in Scripture (1997:22), which shows that this is a problem that concerned even the earliest Christians; and Borret (1997:276-278) which discusses Celsus' attack against the Christians based on inconsistencies between the law of Moses and the teachings of Jesus.

[256] I won't discuss G.'s iambic poetry extensively in this thesis but see Agosti (2001:231-233) on Gregory's iambics and its use to lambast his opponents – also Hawkins (2014:142-185).

[257] This epigram also appears in *AP* 1.92. Zimmermann (2019:142) notes that this poem was inscribed beneath a church painting showing Christ calming the storm in Caesarea Mazaca (*SGO* 3.13.06.04). The *SGO* is here citing an article by Grégoire (1909) noting that: '*H. Grégoire hat eine recht entstellte, wohl mittelalterliche Kopie des Epigramms in der Felsenkirche der Pentekoste gefunden in dem damals*

> It happened when Christ was sleeping a natural slumber on the boat, the sea was stirred up by the roaring gales. The sailors cried out in fear: "Arise, Saviour! Come to the aid of those who are being threatened." Standing, the king commanded the winds and the waves to be still, and they were. By this miracle, those present recognised the nature of God.

The key word here is the verb τετρήχει, which appears in Archilochus Fr. 56 (Γλαῦχ', ὅρα· βαθὺς γὰρ ἤδη κύμασιν ταράσσεται / Πόντος) and Solon Fr. 11 (ἐξ ἀνέμων δὲ θάλασσα ταράσσεται).[258] Both fragments are replete with nautical imagery, and both are used metaphorically. Archilochus' fragment resonates somewhat more with the epigram. Both the disciples and Archilochus experience fear. Archilochus makes it explicit that this fear arises ἐξ ἀελπτίης (from an unlooked for event), whereas the πλωτῆρες above cry out in fear. Archilochus, however, perhaps has a stronger resemblance to the Gospel passage than Gregory's poem in that fear (φόβος) comes at the end of the piece, and so it is with the Gospel of Mark (4:41) and Luke (8:25).[259] Both Archilochus' and the disciples' fear arises from an unexpected event.[260] Furthermore, what all of these lyric poems have in common is that they use the naval image of the ship caught in the storm to describe political/factional strife within the *polis*, often with the implication (as in Alcaeus, for example, footnoted above) that the sailors in the boat must bandy together and fight on to safety. This reference to political turmoil and strife is made much more apparent when we look more closely at v. 2, for the sea is stirred by κυδοιμοτόκοισιν ἀήταις, which I have translated above as 'roaring gales.' Yet κυδοιμοτόκοισιν is a *hapax legomenon*[261] meaning more literally '[gales] that carry the κυδοιμὸν (din of battle)' a word used throughout the *Iliad* to describe the din and confusion of battle (10.523, 18.218) and is personified along with Ares and Eris (strife) (5.593, 18.535). Further parallels with Epic can be found in ἀνίαχον, which is used by Apollonius of Rhodes (and later Nonnus) to describe the scream of the Argonauts – another famous group of sailors - as the Harpies swoop down upon them (2.270).[262] Ἄναξ is, of course, found throughout Homer.[263] The learned reader, picking up on the references to the lyric poets and Homer, would quickly realise that this poem is more than a learned embellishment of the Gospel episode, but also an allegory of sorts, just as Heraclitus says of Archilochus 56, where the nautical image used refers to the war in which the

---

griechischen Dorf Sinasos (vielleicht dem mittelalterlichen Asuna).' Palla (1989:169-185) in his re-ordering of this group of poems classes this poem and 1.1.17 differently from the rest of the biblical poems. This poem is certainly different in style from the other "catalogical" poems discussed in the chapter. Nevertheless, they do have similar themes (the Bible) and all exhibit the weaving of sacred and profane wisdom with which we are concerned.

[258] Numbering is according to Diehl (1936).

[259] Mk. 4.41: καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν; Lk. 8.25: φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν. See Nestle-Atland's 27th edition of the New Testament.

[260] See also the fragments 6 and 326 of Alcaeus (see the edition of Lobel and Page [1955]) which also shares in the naval imagery as a means of portraying allegorically political strife.

[261] See *Lampe*, s.v. κυδοιμοτόκος.

[262] It is also used at 3.253 for the scream of Medea when she sees the Argonauts. For Nonnus, see *LSJ* s.v. ἀνιάχω.

[263] See especially the monograph of MacDonald (2000:58-62) who notes the parallels in this episode (specifically in the Gospel of Mark, although it is more or less the same in Luke) to Homer's *Od.* 10.1-69. He suggests that the reader is to see Jesus as a type of Aeolus, one who has mastery over the winds. Furthermore, see Talbert (2003:175-195) for a similar (though concerned with more than the Homeric Epics) discussion of the sea storm in Luke's Gospel and Acts.

poet himself was involved.[264] As we shall see there is more than a re-telling of the Gospels in these lines.[265]

Gregory introduces a certain ambiguity to the poem by calling the disciples simply 'sailors' (πλωτῆρες). The reference is clearly to the scriptural passage, but there is something made explicit here that is implicit (at least for Gregory) in the Gospel. The first line describes Jesus' sleep as ἔμφυτον (natural), a word normally used for inner (abstract) qualities as opposed to the act of sleep,[266] but the final line tells us that those present pondered the nature of God (Θεοῦ φύσιν). This story as recounted by both Mark and Luke makes clear that Jesus was sleeping during the storm, but Gregory has given us more than what the Gospel says about the disciples' response. In both Gospels the disciples talk amongst themselves, wondering who Jesus could be since the wind and the water heed his command.[267] Gregory has gone beyond what the Scripture says and given for us an answer: God.

It is clear that Gregory is making reference here to the twin natures of Jesus, His humanity and divinity. It would seem, then, that this poem acts as a subtle exegesis of the Scriptural passage which draws out the higher meaning, the meaning of the Scripture according to *pneuma* that Jesus is both man and God. This was a topic which Gregory devoted himself to defending at the end of his career, after his dismissal from Constantinople. He vehemently opposed the Apollinarians and their attempts to take control of his father's vacant see at Nazianzus.[268] This in itself would be a strong indication of the late date for the writing of this poem; but what is more pertinent here is the fact that the reference to the doctrinal controversy that was current in Cappadocia at Gregory's time around the nature of Christ calls to mind even more strongly the lyric poetry of Archilochus, Solon and Alcaeus, and the Epics of Homer and Apollonius of Rhodes. All of these writers wrote their naval themed poems as a form of political allegory. Alcaeus uses the word *stasis* to refer to the directions of the wind,[269] but *stasis* is a word that stood also for political discord and strife – a thing with which Alcaeus was all too familiar. But so too was Gregory, having led for a short time the Council of Constantinople and the Nicene community of the city. Gregory, then, is not simply making an exegetical point in this poem by emphasising the divinity of Christ implicit in the Gospel passage, but he is, furthermore, putting Christ at the centre of his ὁλκάς, of his faction within the Church.[270] In other words, Christ will

[264] On which see West (1982:150).
[265] I cannot see any significant linguistic crossover with this poem and the Gospels. I have limited my discussion of the influence of Scripture and Greek literature on these poems to this particular poem. However, see Prudhomme (2006:277-313) who discusses at length the various linguistic similarities that the biblical poems have to the Scriptures, as well as the use of Classicising language (i.e. references to Greek literature). She does not consider 1.1.28.
[266] See *LSJ*. s.v. ἔμφυτος.
[267] Mk. 4.41: ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους, Τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούει αὐτῷ; Lk. 8.25: λέγοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους, Τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν ὅτι καὶ τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ τῷ ὕδατι, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ;
[268] See *Eps*. 101-102 – on which see Beeley (2009 and 2011) and Hofer (2013) and Daley (2018:133-137) for Gregory's Christology; and *Carm.* 1.1.10.
[269] Fr. 326.1: ἀσυννέτημμι τὼν ἀνέμων στάσιν
[270] One wonders, then, if poems such as this could have had a sympotic context like its lyric counterpart. It is certainly not beyond the realms of possibility, as McLynn (2006) has pointed out that *Carm.* 2.2.1 most likely

save them from the current storm, Christ will justify them by saving them from certain doom; and, therefore, the other faction(s) will perish without acknowledging Christ, man and God.[271] Furthermore, Gregory was not the only one who used the storm at sea as an image to describe the harmful force of heresy. Even Basil uses it in his work to describe the dangers of Arianism.[272] This Hellenisation of Jewish literature – which the New Testament is to an extent - is not unique to Gregory. Even the LXX will obfuscate or change particularly Jewish terms (such as the Tetragrammaton for the Greek *Kyrios*) in order to abandon particularly 'local' or 'archaising' aspects of God. God remains the God of Abraham and Moses, but he is also universalised – in as much as Hellenising something made it more accessible to the wider Mediterranean world – and made accessible to all peoples, not just the Jews (Lamarche, 26:1997). Therefore, when Gregory weaves together his sacred and profane learning, he is making the episodes of Scripture more appealing to his learned contemporaries and utilising the Greek, literary tradition in order to spread the message of the Gospel, and so giving classical culture (*paideia*) an important place in the realisation of the bishop's mission of evangelisation.[273]

In looking at these poems as a form of exegesis, we can see that there is very little in the way of extensive exposition or elaboration on the Scriptures in these poems. Much more detailed and traditional exegesis can be found in Gregory's orations. However, outwith the majority of poems that simply catalogue the Scriptures, we have seen in our discussion above that there is some exegesis of the Scriptures, for those willing and educated enough to delve more deeply into these poems. They are also a fine example of how Gregory brings together sacred and profane wisdom – the eloquence of Greek literature (*paideia*) with the content of Holy Writ - in order to allow his readers to better appreciate and understand the Bible. Yet Gregory is doing more than simply imbuing these poems with the eloquences and metre of Greek literature. Firstly, he is demonstrating his belief that *logoi* come from the *Logos*. Greek literature (*paideia*) is a gift from God, as Gregory makes clear in *Carm.* 2.2.4-5, and Gregory makes this clear by enhancing (and expounding) the Scriptures with his eloquence and knowledge of the Greek, literary tradition. Furthermore, Gregory is putting into practice his identity as *prytanis* of sacred and profane wisdom, showing quite clearly that classical culture is not inimical to the Christian life and could help draw his learned readers towards the right (that is, his) interpretation of the Scriptures through the many learned allusions which he weaves into his re-telling of the Gospel here.

Paratext

had a sympotic context with Gregory's audience being the ascetic aristocrats of Nazianzus and its environs – along with the governor Hellenius to whom the poem is addressed.

[271] On the ship as an image of the Church or Christ cross (in the ship's mast), see Daniélou (1964:58-70).

[272] Take, for example, *Eps.*82.9-19; 203.1 as discussed by Trenchard-Smith (2016). See also p. 328, fn. 50 for further scholarship on the image of the ship in early Christianity.

[273] See Young (1997:97-113) for his discussion on Gregory's use of Scripture in his orations not only as ornament but as a text that had authority.

Although it is not something that scholars normally have in mind when discussing secondary literature, Gerard Genette's theory of the paratext is certainly relevant here.[274] After all, even for Genette the paratext 'is only an assistant, only an accessory of the text' (1997b:410), which in this case is the Bible. To briefly sum up the theory of Gerard Genette, the paratext is that which exists around a text. This can be everything from titles, blurbs, illustrations, and contents pages which physically exist around a printed text; but it can also include things such as interviews given by an author, which are not normally appended to a text. Strictly speaking, these poems are not - as Genette defines it – a paratext. It is clear upon reading these poems that they fulfil a paratextual function. As Genette himself says, the paratext 'provides an airlock that helps the reader pass without too much respiratory difficulty from one world to the other' (1997b:408). In the case of these poems, we can say that they are designed to help its readers more easily inhabit, understand, or, at least, become vaguely familiar with a Biblical world that most likely did not form a part of their formal education.

Adding to the above observation that the Bible was not a major part of the canon of literature with which the education of Gregory's contemporaries was concerned,[275] paratext is something which the modern reader – even the attentive one – takes for granted. Take, for example, a modern edition of the Bible. The most basic edition would have a title page, identify the translators, and a table of contents. The more attentive reader might note the religious affiliations of the translators, or the edition's approval (or lack thereof) by various churches (a *nihil obstat*). Perhaps the edition does not include the "deutero-canonical" books of the Old Testament, or maybe it includes them under the title "apocryphal" – which in itself would be a statement of the editors' theological affiliations. Perhaps, like the *New Jerusalem Bible,* there is a "study edition", replete with notes, cross-textual references, and lengthy introductions to certain books or groups of books within the Bible, that aim to help the reader understand the Scriptures.

Such paratextual apparatus, designed to help the reader access any given text is almost always found wanting in the ancient world. It is especially unlikely that one would have a complete copy of the Bible with all the canonical books included – even if there were consensus amongst Gregory's contemporaries about what books were (not) canonical. Furthermore, if such texts did exist, in which one could obtain a copy of the whole Bible – or even one book from it, such copies must have been rare and difficult to procure in Gregory's time.[276] It is in this

[274] Certainly, Genette considered paratext as secondary literature. In his work *Palimpsests*, Genette identifies paratext as one of five kinds of transtextuality (1997a:1-7). For Genette, 'paratext in all its forms is a discourse that is fundamentally heteronomous, auxiliary, and dedicated to the service of something other than itself …' (1997b:12). We will discuss further below the very recent work of Crawford (2019) which was not yet published when I first considered these poems and delivered my paper on the Biblical poems (forthcoming). See also the edited volume of Jansen - particularly her introduction - (2014) which focuses on paratext in Latin literature.

[275] However, as Stenger (2016:96) points out, the goal may not have always been the Christianisation of secular literature, but the encouragement of parents to educate their children on the Scriptures – as is the program of John Chrysostom in his treatise *On Vainglory*. This was most likely how the Cappadocian fathers gain their in-depth familiarity with Scripture.

[276] See Gamble (1995), Millard (2006:558-560), and Grafton and Williams (2006:102-104) for an introduction to the writing and reading practices in early Christianity. See Haines-Eitzen (2000) on the role

realisation that we see the need, use, and (most importantly) the power inherent in such texts as these poems – drab and unnecessary as they may seem to the modern reader.

If we begin with *Carm*. 1.1.12 (quoted in full above) on the "canonical" books of Scripture, we see that they function in much a similar way as a contents page.[277] We begin with the "old books" (ἀρχαίας βίβλους) – as Gregory terms them at 12.28 – subdivided into three categories: historical books; books in verse; and prophetic books. These books number 22, one for each letter in the Hebrew alphabet, which is how the Jews themselves organised the Hebrew Bible, but for the fact that Gregory does not see the Pentateuch as a category in itself.[278] This would act as a helpful mnemonic device, along with the versification of the books (for those learned enough to scan the lines). Then we have the books of the new mystery (νέου μυστηρίου) (12.30), subdivided into the four Gospels, Acts, fourteen Pauline epistles, and seven Catholic epistles, before ending with a statement that anything outside this list is οὐκ ἐν γνησίαις (not among the genuine books) (12.39).[279] Furthermore, as we have noted above, the change in metre in this poem indicated changes in sections of the Bible. The elegiac couplets normally open and close particular subsections in the Old and New Testament, and the books within those subsections are written in iambic trimeter. This is an example of what Riggsby (2019:29-41) has termed a nested list, or a list of a list, and so the metre would therefore aid (or emphasise) the paratextual nature of these poems.[280] We could also consider poems such as the one on the plagues of Egypt (1.1.14) or the various poems on the miracles of Jesus (and Elijah and Elisha) and the Gospel parables. In listing these, Gregory is not only providing a sort of "intertitles" for the books of Scripture concerned, but also providing a brief summary for particular passages (or pericopes) within Scripture. However, as Genette points out (1997b:316-318) this practice is not without its perils; for one can easily overemphasise certain aspects of a particular book or passage, or even leave large swathes of a book out. Take, for example, the poem on the miracles of Elijah and Elisha (1.1.16). With just a quick look at the translation of Dunkle, which highlights the biblical passages referred to, we see that Gregory, in focussing on the *thaumata* alone, misses out large chunks of the text.

---

of scribes in copying and transmitting early Christian literature – as well as Haines-Eitzen (2009). Millard (2000:43) notes that there were certainly whole copies of the Bible that existed in Gregory's time (such as the still surviving Codices Vaticanus and Siniaticus) but that these would have been for public reading as opposed to private study.

[277] See Chapman (2003) for a summary of scholarship on the formation of the canon of the Old Testament and Markschies (2003) for the formation of the New Testament.

[278] For the Jewish organisation of the Hebrew Bible, see McDonald (2006:782).

[279] For the absence of the book of Revelations, see Thielman (1998). Other books such as Maccabees are missing, yet Gregory devotes a whole oration to this book of scripture (*Or*. 15). As Norris notes (1997:151-152), G. also quotes Tobit, Judith and Ben Sirach, which are also not included in this list. See, also, Demoen (1997:233-234). It is beyond the scope of this thesis to discuss why Gregory uses these books in his Orations as (it would seem) canonical Scripture but does not include them in this poem. Perhaps it indicates a change or development in his theology, or perhaps Gregory has a more nuanced idea of canonicity and what is Scripture.

[280] This poem is, of course, not an exact parallel, and I would prefer to say a list *within* a list. Nevertheless, Riggsby does provide some point of comparison for Gregory's poem to other ancient practices, though we will discuss Riggsby and others in more detail below. But see also Goody (1977:74-111) for the use of lists in ancient cultures more generally.

Another advantage of a collection of poems such as these is that they allow the reader to cross-reference various books quickly. This is something that we see in modern editions of the Bible, such as the *New Jerusalem Bible*, study edition. Passages or events that may appear in multiple places in the Bible – such as in the case of the Gospels – are often noted in critical editions of Scripture. When we look at some of these poems individually, we see that they encourage a reader to look at a book (or books) of the Bible from a broader perspective. Take, for example, the poem on the genealogies of Christ, which compares the genealogies found in two Gospels. In writing poems that either highlight the *thaumata* or the parables of the Gospels, the reader can quickly compare and contrast the major events of each Gospel and see where they agree or vary in the order in which they appear in each Gospel. We can also see how the poem that recounts the miracles of Elijah and Elisha allow the reader to see how the two prophets and their ministries mirror each other. What is more, if these poems were in some sort of collection, then one could also quickly compare this poem to the various poems on the miracles of Jesus and see that these prophets are in fact pointing (typologically) towards Christ. This sort of exposition of Scripture where the New Testament is foreshadowed in the Old Testament is one common in Gregory's writing (as already discussed by Demoen).

On the face of it, such functionary poems seem pointless to the modern reader, who is used to having a contents page at the front (or back) of any given text, as well as intertitles and notes to help them break up and digest the text. But, in the ancient world, poems such as these could be appreciated by anyone interested in reading or better understanding the rather large corpus of divinely revealed Scripture. It would give its reader vital information as to what was part of the Hebrew Bible, and what belonged to the new Mystery, the teachings of Christ and his Apostles. Of course, there were multiple canons of Scripture at this time, and what one considered canonical often depended on one's theological bent. The poems could also help the reader cross-reference the books of Scripture and help them better see how the books were ordered or how books like the Gospels compared and differed from each other.

Works cataloguing various facets of information either through commentaries, encyclopaedia, lexica, or other forms were incredibly common in the early empire through to Late Antiquity (as the work of Whitmarsh and König [2007] have made very clear). Gregory's attempt at such literature is unique, in that one (or at least I) cannot find any work of poetry that is similar to these poems, cataloguing briefly in verse various episodes, events, or other important bits of information in a work of literature.[281] But then again, why would one find anything similar to this? After all, anything else that was considered worthy of reading would most likely have been covered within one's education, especially if one had an education as extensive and thorough as Gregory's was. The reason why there is nothing else like these poems is because there was never a need for

[281] There is one notable exception, the *Iambi ad Seleucum* by Amphilochius of Iconium (on whom, see Ch.1) which recounts the canon of Scripture (vv. 261-319), but even then, it is embedded in a wider poem on the Christian life in general and without the metrical complexities of Gregory's above poems. See the edition of Oberg (1969) for text and scholarship, though there is very little scholarship on this poem itself and we have not the room to bring it into our discussion presently.

such poems as these, until, of course, the Bible came on the scene.[282] As learned discourse turned to matters theological, as rhetoric and formally trained rhetoricians became concerned with engaging in the various Christian controversies of the time, there was a need not only for the speakers but their listeners to have a base familiarity with Scripture; for the Bible (whatever books that actually entailed for the various sects around the empire) was not a thing that formed a part of school curricula at the time of Gregory (see above) – and, as we have made clear, these poems were not to be a part of such a curriculum. Perhaps similar to the explosion of information during the Renaissance that lead to the beginnings of modern encyclopaedias, the presence of the Bible in the fourth century could be seen as a similar "explosion" of literature (which is not just one but several books of various Judaeo-Hellenic origins) that needed an information management system.[283] These poems, I argue, are one such example of this need to manage and condense this data (i.e. the Bible).

Finally, there is in fact evidence that these poems served a clear paratextual function in some ancient manuscripts. One manuscript of the Gospels in particular at Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Library 24, shows that several of these poems were used as book epigrams. In this way the poems fulfil for this manuscript a paratextual function, as they are printed alongside the main text of Scripture – particularly the Gospels.[284] However, it must be made clear that these Byzantine manuscripts show how these poems were received and used at a later date well after Gregory's death, and do not provide sure evidence of Gregory's intention for the text to be used as a paratext in such a way. Nevertheless, the manuscripts do provide evidence of the poems' use (and usefulness) as paratexts.

Given that there was a clear gap in the market for such secondary literature, and since these poems have survived the ravages of time in multiple manuscripts, it is relatively safe to assert that they did in fact have an engaged readership.[285] The simplicity of these poems, their inability to

---

[282] We could compare them to a poem found in the *Greek Anthology* (16.92) on the labours of Hercules, but this does not seem to fulfil the paratextual function that many of Gregory's poems have. A much closer parallel can be found in the metrical book titles (in dactylic hexameter) for the works of Homer – on which see the following link for a comprehensive overview of the manuscripts in which these titles appear: https://www.dbbe.ugent.be/types/search?limit=25&ascending=1&page=1&orderBy=incipit&filters%5Btext_fields%5D=text&filters%5Btext_combination%5D=all&filters%5Bsubject%5D=1115. Although these certainly fulfil a paratextual function like the poems discussed, they exist as one of lines that act as intertitles and not as a complete poem in and of itself. Furthermore, where these titles serve to embellish the text of Homer. Gregory's poems clearly fulfilled a much more pressing need for the learned reader who had most likely had his fill of Homer at school but received little in the way of formal education on Scripture.

[283] On this and information management in antiquity in general, see Blair (2010). Furthermore, if we accept the hypothesis of Stroumsa (2012) that Holy Writ and the reading of it was integral to early Christians, then the development of and demand for texts such as Gregory's biblical poems makes sense.

[284] I must thank prof. Demoen for pointing this out to me. A full list of the Biblical poems that appear in the above manuscript – as well as two other manuscripts from Cambridge, University Library (kk. v. 35 and Ll. ll. 13) – can be found on the *Database of Byzantine Book Epigrams* (https://www.dbbe.ugent.be/types/search?limit=25&ascending=1&page=1&orderBy=incipit&filters%5Btext_fields%5D=text&filters%5Btext_combination%5D=all&filters%5Bperson%5D=275&filters%5Brole%5D=poet_public).

[285] Evidence of this can be found in the two anonymous paraphrases of *Carm*.1.1.12 on the canon of Scripture (*PG* 38.841-846) which would suggest that they were used eventually in schools. See Simelidis (2009:75-88) for Gregory's poetry being used in the Byzantine classroom and the various paraphrases available. Prudhomme (2006:277-279 and *passim*) explores these poems as in line with the paraphrases of

provide any great insight into Gregory's exegesis, or his life and teachings, are what have inevitably led to their being neglected by scholars. . Furthermore, if the existence of such literature implies that there was a need amongst the *pepaideumenoi* to familiarise themselves with Scripture, then these poems speak volumes about the author and his *paideia*. A comparison between these poems and another work of Christian secondary literature may prove useful.

The canon tables of Eusebius of Caesarea provide an example of a work that, as Crawford (2019) (also working from Genette) has made clear, act as a kind of paratext to the Gospels. The purpose of the tables was to divide up and present the four Gospels in a way that showed the similarities and differences between the Quoting another recent work (Riggsby, 2019:8), Crawford notes (p.29):

> 'Even in their most literary moments, Romans preferred imagining texts (at least potentially) as speech acts. This makes many informational devices (tables of contents, section numeration, tables, illustrations) problematic, insofar as they are inherently paratextual'. The reason for the 'problematic' status of such paratextual features is at least twofold, according to Riggsby. First, imagining text as speech means that paratexts are even more ephemeral in relation to text than they otherwise would be, and, secondly, many forms of paratexts create discontinuous text, which disrupts the imagined continuous oral performance.

Again, the dissimilarity between Eusebius' table and Gregory's poems is that Eusebius (like Origen) leans more towards the academic, as he, even if it is not strictly philological, deals more closely with a technical, literary-critical scrutiny of the texts of the Gospels.[286] Gregory's poems, on the other hand, do not suffer from the same problem noted by Riggsby in his note on paratexts in Roman literature. Although these poems too break up the text by focusing on particular episodes within (a book of) the Bible, the poems, nevertheless, flow from one miracle/parable to the other in well-wrought Greek metres, which – along with their classically influenced language – would be much more aesthetically pleasing to the learned, Greek reader than a concordance or table of contents. It would seem, therefore, that in a period where there was intense experimentation with ways in which Biblical material was organised and understood (Crawford, 2019:32), Gregory was conducting his own experiments too. If Gregory were to, for example, simply list episodes of the Gospel in prose in alphabetical or chronological order, it would no doubt be considered inelegant (as Riggsby has noted in his discussion of alphabetical lists [2019:12]). It is clear, therefore, that Gregory's aims lie beyond the creation of a mere school textbook, reader's aid, or paratext; rather

---

other Latin writers such as Juvencus or Sedulis. I, however, am sceptical of how much this can help us understand these poems, as Juvencus, Sedulis (and eventually Nonnus in the east) have continuous narratives of their Biblical topic lacking the condensed, selective nature of Gregory's poems – even if he embellishes them in a similar way to the paraphrases of other authors. It is possible that Gregory was familiar with the *Metaphrasis Psalmorum* attributed to Apollinaris of Laodicea, but there is much debate as to whether these paraphrases of the psalms were written before or after Gregory was active (on which, see Simelidis [2009:60-61]). This is why I believe it is worth exploring my current line of enquiry (secondary literature/paratext) to help us better understand these poems. See also Roberts (1985).

[286] Perhaps we could see the architectural embellishment which often accompanied the tables in the manuscript tradition as a parallel to the poems. For Strøm-Olsen notes that 'the tables, with their architectonic setting, acted as a kind of monumental gateway to the Gospel text' (2018:404). The metre and high diction of the poems, therefore, equally act as a gateway, drawing the reader into a deeper exploration of the Biblical texts.

he is displaying his credentials as a Christian litterateur, a man imbued with *paideia*, both sacred and profane. We can say, then, that a pedagogical function is present in these poems, but perhaps it comes second to (or at least alongside) Gregory's display of his Greek literary credentials and thorough knowledge of the Greek and Judaeo-Christian literary tradition.[287]

Gregory's biblical poems are certainly not on the intellectual scale of Eusebius' Canon tables, but therein lies its advantage. . In a way, it is in the rather underwhelming presentation and subject matter that the genius of these poems lies. For on the one hand, they fulfil the very basic function that any paratext would fulfil for its text – through providing contents, (inter)titles and preliminary/explanatory notes – but on the other hand, these poems, as Eusebius' work, display Gregory's *paideia* and his grasp of a text that was hitherto uncouth, semi-Hellenised, and unworthy of consideration by the learned elite, but that was now becoming of greater concern to those aristocrats who now called themselves Christian. And so the text, like the Eusebian tables, as Strøm-Olsen has argued, acts as a gateway for the reader, who could read these poems to get a general sense of the Scriptures, gain an idea of their unity (such as the similarities in the various accounts of the Gospels as exemplified through their miracles and parables), but also be forced to delve into Scripture itself in order to fully understand to what Gregory's (sometimes cryptic) poetry refers. One more comparison could perhaps be found in what Stobaeus would go on to do in his compilation of excerpts. Konstan notes (2011:21-22):

> Stobaeus was not merely producing a didactic primer for his son [in extracting various passages from Classical literature] … he was sharing with him … his '*Lesefrüchte*,' putting into circulation the results of a lifetime of active reading …

Gregory's poems too are much more than a collection of excerpts from the Bible and shows through his versification (and linguistic polishing) of the Bible a particular kind of 'active reading', in which he displays not only the fruits of his reading of Scripture, but also his profane education. We must add to this how Scripture was increasingly becoming a means by which one could commune with God and know His will, just as Augustine or Anthony would open the Scriptures and consider its words to be directly aimed at them.[288] Gregory, therefore, is displaying through these poems his close intimacy with Greek literature and the Bible and the power which both of these things were considered to wield. These poems, therefore, are a prime example of Gregory crowning the education which he received throughout the Roman world with the Logos, Christ.

[287] It could be argued that these poems, as lists, may provide an argument for these texts having a schoolroom audience in mind. Riggsby, after all, notes that alphabetical lists and alphabetisation 'is also a common feature of school exercises' (p.12). However, we do not have here alphabetical lists as a mnemonic aid – although some poems are numbered – and, as we have shown, the complexities of metre (and language) would make a schoolroom audience unlikely, even if the poems are to be an *aide-memoire*.

[288] On this, see Rapp (2007) where she discusses the importance of the biblical text in the spiritual life of early Christians, as well as the power which the physical text of Holy Writ was considered to have.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we began this chapter by refuting, through a close analysis of the metre of these poems, that these biblical poems were written for a schoolroom audience so that they could learn their Scripture and scansion at the same time (the common consensus of scholars to date). Rather we see that these poems, due to their polymetry, would have been more suitable for a learned audience who have already went through the traditional education of the elite. A closer analysis of the metre has also shown that Gregory was attempting to adapt his metre to the changes happening in the Greek language at his time and provides an excellent example of Gregory's struggle with the metre as a display not only of his secular erudition, but also his Christian virtue. The metre also has a didactic function (as already established by Palla) in structuring each poem, with a change in metre indicating, for example, an authorial aside in the text. Furthermore, these poems were a form of secondary literature that was much admired, read, and written by the educated elites of Greco-Roman society. Such literature, although secondary and subservient to a primary text, was not at all looked down upon by the *pepaideumenoi*, but rather provided a chance for one to display one's *paideia*, and to increase one's power and authority amongst one's contemporaries.

As we have noted, these poems are thin on the ground for the type of information which scholars are often looking for when scouring Gregory's poetry – such as information on his life, contemporaries, theology, or exegesis. Nevertheless, they did provide an important service to his contemporary reader: a paratext to the text of Scripture. This is something which the modern reader takes for granted, especially since s/he is used to versions of the Bible in which all the books are collected together in one volume with contents page, titles, intertitles, notes, and cross-references all readily available – not to mention a number of authoritative translations and critical editions which would have been somewhat lacking in Gregory's time, unless one had the resources to buy a work like Origen's *Hexapla*.

These poems, therefore, far from being the dry, uninteresting, and shoddy versifications which most scholars believe them to be, are in fact an interesting display of Gregory's *paideia.* They not only function as a vital tool to understanding Scripture, but they also help Gregory assert his self-image as *prytanis* of sacred and profane wisdom, for these poems are an excellent display of this combination of sacred *sophia* and Greek *paideia*. Nevertheless, Gregory is, as we have seen in the *Epitaphia*, capable of much more sophisticated and interesting poetic compositions. We now turn to a poem, again, misunderstood by scholars but, like the biblical poems, is a vital source for understanding Gregory's concept of *paideia*, how he practised the identity of *prytanis* of both kinds of wisdom, and how he engaged with the sophistic culture of his learned contemporaries - a poem dedicated to Virginity.

Chapter 3: The Hymn and the *Agon*: *Carm*. 1.2.1

Asceticism and *Paideia* in Jerome and Gregory Nyssen

In the 4th century, the ascetic landscape was vast and varied from region to region.[289] How the virgin/monastic life was lived in the deserts of Egypt varied significantly from the life of those dwelling in the Levant, Asia Minor, or the various cities of the empire. Even the concepts and terms used to describe the ascetic during this century quickly developed with a tendency towards assimilation of ascetics of all stripes and colours into the framework of the Church, thus putting them firmly beneath the control of their local bishop – though this is not always the case. Within Gregory's family, Gorgonia marries though encourages her husband to lead an ascetic life (*Or.* 8.8), Caesarius leaves no wife nor children behind after his sudden death, though he seems to have had no interest in the ascetic life given his glittering career, his mother (though clearly not a virgin in the strictest sense) has all the zeal of an ascetic and leads the life of a virgin with frequent fasting and vigils. One can contrast this with the family of Basil and Nyssen, which – according to the evidence that we have – was the catalyst for the development and restructuring of the ascetic life of Pontus and Cappadocia. Basil's Rule has a lasting impact on the monastic life of the Church in both the East and West.

That is not to say that the Cappadocian trio had a monopoly on asceticism and its development in the fourth century. There were rival ways of life of which the Cappadocian fathers disapproved, but could, nevertheless, not completely quell. Take, for example, the epigrams of Gregory on the *syneisaktoi* (ascetics of both genders who live in the same dwellings) (*PG* 38.86-95). Such communities were clearly popular in Asia Minor to warrant thirteen epigrams on the topic. In these epigrams, Gregory speaks directly to such ascetics. He does not question their piety or their virginity, but he highlights throughout these epigrams the scandal which such ascetics caused by leading a life that was not clearly one of continence, nor that of a married couple. Today, they may be pure, but tomorrow brings fear that the winds of change might lead to the downfall of the man and woman's chastity (38.93). Foremost in Gregory's mind, however, seems to be the potential for scandal which the *syneisaktoi* might cause. For some, they may well have just been hypocrites who maintained the façade of the ascetic, but in truth satisfied the desires of the flesh. This would not be the only example of Gregory's concern for scandal that may arise from

[289] Scholarship on this is vast, but most notably one must consider the works of Festugière (1959:*passim*) which discusses the role of monasteries in education according to John Chrysostom, Bellini (1971) discusses specifically Gregory's conception of the place of monks and virgins in the Church, Brown (especially 1971a, 1981, 1983 and 1988), Rousselle (1988:129-197), Sissa (1990) who focusses on virginity (and more specifically the hymen) in ancient, pre-Christian Greece, Clark (1993:94-118), Elm (1994), Brakke (1995), Cooper (1996), See McLynn (1998) on Gregory's construction of his own, ascetic identity, Burrus (2000) which looks more specifically at the issue of gender that surrounds asceticism and her later essay (2006) on Gregory's oration for his sister, Gorgonia; Av. Cameron (1980) also views asceticism as a way orthodox Christianity excluded women from its institutions – as Elm also discusses; Caner (2002) looks at the lives of wandering beggar-monks; the works of Rubenson (2007 and 2018) have explored eastern monasticism and the role of monasteries in education; but see also Anderson (1994) and Finn (2009) which makes clear that this landscape did not appear suddenly in the 3rd/4th Century, but has a long and complex tradition. It should be added that the practice of writing verse could well be in itself an ascetic practice for Gregory, who seeks to write verse to bring measure to his own measurelessness (as discussed in the introduction).

the ascetic communities. Elm (1994:148-150) highlights an incident in Cappadocia in which a deacon ordained by Gregory, Glycerius, neglects his duties as deacon in order to gather about him a band of virgins with which he travelled around the province, displaying them at festivals, profiting financially from this escapade, before living dispersed in the Cappadocian countryside. Gregory even goes so far as to call them a "band of brigands" (λῃστρικοῦ συντάγματος) (p.189, *Ep.* 246), but, nevertheless, offers them amnesty if they repent from their wicked ways – something which seems not to have happened.[290]

However, it was not only Christians who took note of the outrageous behaviour of some groups of monks. Libanius speaks vehemently against the rabble-rousing monks of the Antiochene countryside.[291] In *Or.* 2.32, Libanius laments that those who worked the land used to have money, goods, and marriages with a dowry, but not only has taxation caused the countryside to empty, the scourge of the monks has also led to it becoming a desert place. These monks cram themselves in the caves of the countryside and are modest only as far as their dress is concerned.[292] Those who do remain in the countryside, are left destitute. It seems that Gregory was not the only one to refer to ascetics who acted like bandits.[293] Monks come in for a more extensive scathing at *Or.* 30.8 ff.. They are men clad in black (μελανειμονοῦντες) who eat more than elephants (πλείω μὲν τῶν ἐλεφάντων ἐσθίοντες)[294] and drink excessively whilst singing hymns. Their external ascetic look is procured artificially (διὰ τέχνης). In destroying the temples of the countryside, they have completely drained the very lifeblood of the country estates (8.9-10).[295] Monks even destroyed a magnificent statue of the son of Cleinias at Beroea. But what is interesting here is that this is not an attack on the temples, or non-Christians, but an act in which the monks desecrate the city itself (ἀποκοσμοῦντες τὴν πόλιν) (30.23). What is clear in Libanius (and implied in Gregory, though we will explore his views more below) is that these bandit-monks are a scourge on society that are completely opposed to the established social order, not only the Pagan temples, but also the institution of marriage and other practices of elite society – such as erecting statues.

If the above evidence is not enough, later on in this same speech, it becomes much clearer that the monk is the polar opposite of a *pepaideumenos* such as Libanius. It is implied at 28-29 that the actions of the monks are to force the conversion of the rustic populace, but Libanius points out that they have been hoodwinked by these false converts, who still pray quietly to the old gods at the ceremonies of the Christians. In constraining them from practicing the faith which they wish to profess, they have made converts in name only. The monks cannot do what is needed in order to

[290] One could imagine them living in the cone caves of Cappadocia, which Gregory elsewhere refers to as a home for various cenobitic and anchoritic ascetics in the region, as discussed by Arena (2019:97).
[291] For another account of monks' outrageous behaviour, see also Eunapius *V.S.* 472-473.
[292] τῶν τὰ ἄντρα σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐμπεπληκότων, τῶν μέχρι τῶν ἱματίων σωφρόνων.
[293] For more on this topic, see Caner (2002:158-205) who discusses the issue of pseudo-monks and how such types gave "real monks" a bad name in civic society.
[294] This calls to mind one of Gregory's criticisms of the *syneisaktoi* (*PG* 38.87.5-6): σάρκας ἐγείρων / Εὐρυτέρας ἐλέφαντος (arousing the flesh spread wider than an elephant), referring to the sexual desires which the young feel who live in close proximity to the opposite sex.
[295] See Stenger (2009:384-6) who points out that Libanius' view of these monks is but a springboard into a more in-depth critique of Christianity.

win real converts: that is, persuade them (πείθειν) – a thing which a man like Libanius has dedicated his life to perfecting. What we must take away from this brief excursus of Libanius' views of Christian ascetics, is that they were trouble for the cities and threatened the institutions that were integral to (urban) society, not only the temples, but marriage and husbandry as well. The monks, for Libanius, are nothing but bandits, easily hoodwinked into believing that their violent activities win converts to the Christian faith, but these converts are Christian in name only, for the monks cannot do what a learned man like Libanius can do so well, persuade them. These tradesmen turned monks that commune with the divine (30.31) have not a fraction of the *paideia* of a man like Libanius.[296] Even Gregory would call Glycerius' group of ascetics 'bandits' for their scandalous behaviour.[297]

Although there was a strain of ascetic life promoted amongst Christians that glorified the illiterate and uneducated monk (such as the desert monks of Egypt),[298] another strand of ascetic was much more popular amongst the aristocratic, educated classes of the Roman elite. The letters of Jerome provide ample evidence for how this sort of education may look, especially *Ep.* 107 to Laeta, a mother seeking advice on how to educate her young girl, dedicated to God as a consecrated virgin. At 107.12, Jerome sets out a very clear reading plan for Laeta's daughter. It is entirely made up of the Scriptures and approved Christian authors, such as Athanasius and Hilary. She may read apocryphal writings, but only with extreme caution, and he ends this section with the comment *caeteros sic legat, ut magis judicet quam sequitur* (she may read other [books], so that she may judge more than follow them). Whether or not Jerome is referring to non-Christian literature here is unclear but also unlikely. Despite Jerome's oath never to read secular books again after the Lord accuses him of being a Ciceronian before a Christian (*Ep.* 22.30), he was not averse to quoting the Classics *passim* throughout his letters. Nevertheless, David was to be the Christian's Pindar and Alcaeus, Horace and Catullus (*Ep.* 53.8); for the contrast between Scripture and the classics was that of light with darkness. *Quid facit cum psalterio Horatius? Cum Evangeliis Maro? Cum Apostolo Cicero?* (What does Horace have to do with the Psalter? Vergil with the Gospels? Cicero with the Apostle? [22.29]). The ascetic, therefore, was to be educated, but in the Scripture and its commentators. If the ascetic were to possess any worldly learning, then it could be as much of a stumbling block as any other worldly temptation – as *Ep*. 22.30 makes clear. Those like Jerome who had a good education could use *paideia*'s eloquence in the service of Christ

[296] Libanius view is, of course, biased. But see Rubenson (2018) who notes that the monastic movement was indeed an educational one which shared some values with the Classical school (of Libanius), and that many of its members were once *pepaideumenoi*. See also Urbano (2013:205-244) who notes that the conflict between the Christian philosopher reared by the traditional school (such as Origen) and the new (monastic) philosopher whose school was the desert cell (Anthony).

[297] See, furthermore, Engels and Van Nuffelen (2014:12-14) on the potential for religious cults throughout Greco-Roman history to cause social instability. However, see Brown, contra Libanius (1971:86-87), who gives an example of a monk acting as a patron to a village in the Lebanon – the opposite of a menace to the fabric of rural society.

[298] However, see Cavero (2008:201, 212) who notes the importance of education in the life and rule of Pachomius, the Egyptian Abbot. See also Markus (1990:157-211) for a more Western (Latin) perspective on the various kinds of monasticism. He contrasts the more refined monasticism of St. Augustine (the city) with the more Egyptian asceticism of John Cassian (the desert).

– as he outlines in a letter to Magnus, an orator at Rome (*Ep.* 70). Nevertheless, it could, as it did once for Jerome, lead the ascetic Christian astray, or perhaps instil in them a greater desire for worldly applause through their rhetorical acumen than for the heavenly life.[299]

Jerome was not the only one to believe that the ascetic should be completely unadorned by the learning of the world – even if s/he were to be educated. The treatise on virginity by Gregory Nyssen makes clear in its opening lines that lengthy and extravagant laudations do little to help the cause of Christian asceticism, and even hinder it (*De Virg.* 1).[300] For Nyssen, the words of the apostles that the virgin be "holy and without blemish" (ἁγίαν καὶ ἄμωμον) is sufficient enough praise πᾶσαν ἐγκωμίων ὑπερβολὴν ἀποκρύψας (eclipsing every excess of panegyrics). Those who write lengthy treatise on virginity often make virginity suspect through the praise of their panegyrics (ὕποπτον ποιοῦντες διὰ τῶν ἐγκωμίων τὸν ἔπαινον). For Nyssen, no force of eloquence can match the great grace that is the virgin life, and so any rhetorical display risks insulting the virgin life, since it could never produce a display so beautiful as to match the ascetic life (2.1-2). Of course, this is not to say that the work of Nyssen, and of Jerome, was totally devoid of rhetorical style or sophistication. Such educated men could not help but to display their *paideia*. But what must be noted is that their preferred method of communicating the value and manner of the ascetic life is through the writings of treatise or letters – forms of literature by no means devoid of eloquence but that, nevertheless, do not match the sophistication and beauty of poetry, which is Gregory's preferred medium for communicating the beauty of the ascetic life (*Carm.* 1.2.1-2) and the rules to which the ascetic must adhere in order to live it well (1.2.2). One of the explicit aims of Gregory's poetry is to equal or surpass that of the *xenoi*, the non-Christian writers that have come before him, and so it seems that, for Gregory, an exhortation of virginity is not exempt from this endeavour of his – despite his contemporaries' suspicions of such learned displays.[301]

---

[299] This is not to say that Jerome had no space for rhetorical style, or that we should take his vow after his dream too seriously. Adkin (1999) makes clear that whether or not Jerome kept his vow is a moot point and that his works were often embellished with quotations from poetry and prose, as well as being rhetorically sophisticated. However, see Adkin (1991) who notes that Jerome's relationship with Gregory was not as cordial or positive as it may seem. I agree with Adkin's reading of *Ep.* 52.8, in which Jerome recounts a remark of Gregory on the Lucan word δευτερόπρωτον. Here 'Gregory had promised to generate such applause that Jerome would actually think he understood' (p.19). Adkin believes that this was, for Jerome, an example of 'empty rhetorical display in church'. Gregory's poem on Virginity is not at all devoid of content, but it is clearly a fine display of his *paideia* that could match the *xenoi* referred to in the poem *On His Own Verse*. See Beck (1977) on the eloquence of Gregory's speech, and Cain (2009) in which he discusses Jerome's letters as a means of creating his authority as a leading ascetic – and man of great learning.

[300] It is worth noting here that there is some debate on the exact date of Gregory's *Carm.* 1.2.1, upon which I shall elaborate below. Nyssen's treatise can safely be dated to the 370s (though it is likely that it underwent a "second edition" of sorts according to Aubineau edition of the treatise [1966:235-238]), but whether Nyssen is responding to Nazianzen's elaborate exhortation of Virginity or vice-versa makes no difference to the fact that the two, as I will argue, had completely different ideas about how best to promote asceticism (this and the dating of the poem are discussed further in the footnotes below).

[301] We could also add Athanasius' *Life of Anthony*, with which Gemeindhardt (2018:34-40) has noted that Gregory was familiar (*Or*. 21.5), and the *Vita* ultimately rejects the traditional course of secular education, which Gregory so eagerly pursued around the Greek world, even if Anthony is not completely unlettered and becomes a teacher of a new, Christian-ascetic education.

In this brief discussion of Jerome and Nyssen, we have highlighted an area of subtle, but fundamental, difference between them and Gregory. Although they themselves could not write without the influence of their literary and rhetorical education creeping into their works (or rather there was no way they could write without in some way invoking the eloquence of *paideia*; for everything that they wrote – from the words that they used to the ways in which they structured their writings – had its foundations in the traditional, elite education which they both received), Jerome and Nyssen make clear that a secular education was largely unnecessary for the successful pursuit of the life of virginity.[302] At best, such eloquence would only ever fall short of properly capturing the beauty of virginity, and at worst the *pepaideumenos* devoted to the ascetic life *and* his secular books may be accused of being a *ciceronianus*, not a Christian, before the throne of God. No such concern is present in Gregory, however. The very act of writing upon this topic in verse, as opposed to an epistle or treatise, goes to show that Gregory does not agree with his disciple Jerome or Basil's brother Gregory. But, as we shall see, Gregory's choice to harness the force of *paideia*, activating its various features and concepts as he sees fit (as we have seen throughout this thesis thus far), goes beyond mere window dressing of his chosen topic, but is integral to an understanding of his poetry and its subject.

In this chapter I will begin with a brief synopsis of the poem followed by an analysis of it which seeks to disprove the hypothesis of Sundermann (1991) that vv. 1-214 makes up a separate poem that has little to do with the rest of *Carm.* 1.2.1. Rather, this poem - along with *Carm.* 1.2.2 - make up a triptych to be read together.[303] In so doing I will make clear how a sound understanding of Gregory's knowledge, utilisation and manipulation of *paideia* is necessary to appreciate properly his poetry, and to understand his use of *paideia* in communicating his Christian teachings. Then, I will take a closer look at the rhetoric of the *agon* between Marriage and Virginity where we shall see more clearly how Virginity uses *paideia* as a means of creating her own identity, and how the poem as a whole sheds light upon not only Gregory's conception of asceticism, but also of a Christian *paideia*.

The Poem on Virginity

By way of a brief summary of *Carmina* 1.2.1, the poem can be broadly split into two sections: the first section (vv.1-214) is a hymn to Virginity, followed by an oratorical competition (*agon*) between Marriage and Virginity personified (vv. 215-732). In the end Virginity is crowned the victor by the judges (although they desire Marriage), but Christ gives a place of honour to both Marriage and Virginity – with Virginity having the higher honour of the two (728-732). Sundermann (pp. 4-5) believes that 1.2.1.1-214 (described above as the hymnic section) and 215-732 (The *agon/Rangstreit*) are two separate poems. He cites, as evidence, the fact that the manuscript traditions have conflated two poems into one elsewhere; and that this fusion must have

[302] See Jacobs (2014) on Christianity's struggle with the secular world. However, I disagree with Jacobs placing Nazianzen among those who were more cautious of urban/profane life.
[303] I have not the space to deal here with *Carm.* 1.2.2. Nevertheless, a close analysis of 1.2.1 is enough for our current purpose, which is to better our understanding of Gregory's conception and use of *paideia*.

happened at a very early stage in the tradition. Furthermore, Jerome in his *De viris illustribus*, ch.117, attributes to Gregory *liber, hexametro versu, Virginitatis et nuptiarum contra se disserentium*. Given that Jerome does not make mention of the opening παρθενίης ἔπαινος in this passage, Sundermann concludes that he had no knowledge of lines 1-214, and is, therefore, a completely separate poem. He also argues that the transition between the hymn and the *agon* is much too sudden and disruptive for the work to be one, seamless poem. He notes that the formulaic δεῦρ' ἄγε (or εἰ δ' ἄγε) often marks the beginning of many poems in Gregory's corpus (such as *Carm.* 1.1.4,8,24). These points together provide a fair amount of evidence in support of Sundermann's conclusions. Sicherl (2002) agrees with Sundermann, adding to this the fact that the Syrian manuscript tradition preserves the hymn (lines 1-214) without the *agon* (p.13). This in itself could be strong evidence for *Carm.* 1.2.1 being two poems.

However, just because we can find examples of fusion (*Verschmelzung*) in other poems within the manuscript tradition, it does not necessarily mean that we have an occurrence of the same phenomenon here. Secondly, Jerome's very brief mention of Gregory and his works in the *De viris illustribus* cannot be cited as any sure evidence of what exactly was in the book *Virginitas et Nuptiae*. Jerome clearly only gives a brief list of Gregory's literary output, makes no mention of his letters, and cites only this poem. That Jerome identifies this poem as an argument between Virginity and Marriage makes sense, as this is exactly what the majority of 1.2.11.2.1 is concerned with (517 out of 732 lines, to be exact). Furthermore, although it is true that many of Gregory's poems begin with the formulaic δεῦρ' ἄγε/εἰ δ' ἄγε, it is not definitive evidence that we have here two poems; for at line 56 the phrase εἰ δ' ἄγε is used to introduce the section of the hymn on the creation of the world and the incarnation, and at 717, Virginity use the formula δεῦρ' ἄγε to mark the conclusion of her speech – and it makes no sense at all to suggest that these mark the beginning of a new poem as opposed to the beginning of a new section of the same poem. The existence of a Syrian MS that has only the hymn, however, is strong evidence for *Carm.* 1.2.1 being two poems. I certainly agree that we have here two, not one, poems. But, as we shall see, the two poems (the hymn and the *agon*) create a rhetorical structure for the poem that cannot be ignored.[304]

The Hymn as prologue

I have referred to *Carm*. 1.2.1.1-214 above as a "hymn", without saying why I have termed it so or what exactly I mean by that term. It is here that I will explain what I mean by hymn, how 1-214 is a hymn, and why.[305] A hymn - broadly speaking – is a poem dedicated to the praise of God/gods. The hymn will often recount the names and places associated with the deity, and it will normally

[304] It should be noted here that *Carm*. 1,2,2 (*praecepta ad virgins*) also seems to take up the close of 1.2.1: Νίκη μὲν δὴ σεῖο, καὶ ὃς μάλα σαρκὸς ἑταῖρος, / Ὧδε δίκην δικάσειε. Sundermann, however, also notes that *es ist aber fraglich, ob beide Werke in einem Fluss geschrieben wurden*. It Is beyond the scope of this thesis to delve into the details of this poem. See also Keydell (1950), which shows that *Carm*. 1.2.3 (on the same subject as 1.2.2) is not by Gregory.

[305] For a much more thorough examination of the hymn in Gregory's poetry, see Frangeskou's dissertation on the subject (1984), in which she also provides a very thorough introduction on the various kinds of Pagan and Christian hymnody. Frangeskou does not discuss *Carm*. 1.2.1 – nor does she even mention this poem as among those poems in Gregory that contains hymnic elements (p.10) - but only *Carm*. 1.1.29-38 and 2.1.38. I will show below just how much this poem is indebted to ancient Greek hymnody.

end with a petition or prayer. The very word *hymnos* (ὕμνος) is a word of obscure etymological origin, and was subject to much scrutiny amongst ancient scholars, who distinguished many and various types of hymns – in both poetry and prose. The very earliest hymns in Greek literature are the Homeric hymns, written in hexameter in praise of various Greek gods such as Artemis, Zeus, and Dionysus; we can also count various poems of the lyric poets such as Sappho, and the odes of Pindar and Bacchylides in the genre *hymn* – coming under the subgenre of paean or dithyramb. Then we have the Callimachean hymns of a similar type to the Homeric hymns, and in praise of much the same gods.[306] The Orphic hymns (discussed in more detail in Ch. 4) can be dated to the early imperial period; and in Gregory's time Julian wrote prose hymns to various deities.[307] After Gregory, we have the Bishop Synesius of Cyrene and the Neo-Platonist Proclus also writing hymns in hexameter.[308] Furley and Bremer (2001:50-64), following Norden (1913:143-77), identify a tripartite form that fits to most hymns: (1) an invocation of the god(s), in which the god's various names and associated cities, temples, and divine relations are invoked; (2) a section praising the god, normally through recounting past deeds and/or his/her birth (sometimes termed *pars epica* – although this term is too restrictive according to Furley and Bremer); and (3) a final prayer/request from the petitioner (hymn-singer) to the god(s). Van Den Berg (2001:15) notes that not all hymns have this closing petition prayer, such as the *physikoi hymnoi* – hymns wherein gods are identified or explained through physical phenomenon (such as Apollo as the sun).[309]

That the opening lines of 1.2.11.2.1 are hymnic is beyond question (1-2):

> Παρθενίην στεφάνοις ἀναδήσομεν ἡμετέροισιν,
> Ἐκ καθαρῆς κραδίης καθαροῖς μέλποντες ἐν ὕμνοις.
> Let us wreath virginity with our laurels, singing pure hymns from a pure heart.

Sundermann (1991:1, fn.1) notes the formulaic *Hymnenbeginn* of Homeric hymns similar to this poem. He further notes that '*Der Plural der 1. Person (*ἀναδήσομεν*) begegnet in den homerischen Hymnen noch nicht; vgl. aber den Artemishymnos des Kallimachos, 1f.:* Ἄρτεμιν…ὑμνέομεν.' It is certainly peculiar that a hymn to a virgin-goddess is the one that has a unique similarity to the opening of Gregory's hymn to Virginity, and, as we shall see, there are many more clear allusions to earlier poets throughout the hymn. Virginity is a ἡμετέροιο βίου ξεινήϊον ἐσθλὸν (noble gift of our life), but the word ξεινήϊον means more than 'gift', but rather a gift that establishes a relationship of guest-friendship.[310] The word is certainly epic and Homeric, but a much clearer

[306] On the Homeric Hymns, see Clay (2011) for a general introduction and further scholarship. For more extensive discussion by Clay see her monograph (1989). For Callimachus' hymns, see the collected volume of Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (1993), and see especially Poulos (2019) for Callimachus' influence on Gregory.
[307] Julian wrote a hymn *To the Mother of the Gods* and *To King Helios*. See Nesselrath (2015) for the text. See also Bouffartigue (1992:331-337) for Julian's sources for his discussions found in *To King Helios*, and pp. 359-379 for *To the Mother of the Gods*. Furthermore, Elm (2012:118-136, 286-299) discusses these hymns in her monograph comparing the emperor and Gregory.
[308] I will refrain from going into too much detail on a topic that has been discussed in full elsewhere. See especially Bremer (1981) Burkert (1994), Furley and Bremer (2001), and Van den Berg (2001).
[309] See also Race (1982) for his analysis of the tripartite structure of hymns and their rhetorical aspects. Frangeskou (pp.107, 119) points out that *Carm.* 1.1.33-34 uses this tripartite structure.
[310] See the *LSJ* s.v. ξεινήϊον.

echo of Homer is found in the following line, where Gregory says that this gift, Virginity, is Χρυσοῦ τ' ἠλέκτρου τε φαάντερον, ἠδ' ἐλέφαντος (more resplendent than gold and electrum and ivory). This is a clear echo of *Od* 4.73 (χρυσοῦ τ' ἠλέκτρου τε καὶ ἀργύρου ἠδ' ἐλέφαντος) where Telemachus compares the halls of Menelaus to the courts of Olympian Zeus. It is very likely that the learned, contemporary reader would pick up on such an allusion, and Gregory makes clear – in terms completely devoid of Biblical allusions – the divine nature of Virginity which he hymns.

Now that the hymn has begun (Ἀρχομένου δ' ὕμνοιο), Gregory exhorts the holy ones (ἁγνοί) to cheer together (συνιαίνοισθε) (v.7). Apart from here, this verb is found only at Oppian *Cynegetica* 3.167 - θυμὸν δ' ἐσπομένοιο συνιαίνουσι νομῆος – which is, interestingly, in a section on the mating of cattle, but more specifically here recounts how cattle take delight in licking each other (see *LSJ* and *Lampe* s.v.), yet another example of Gregory's great learning. Before the hymn proper begins Gregory issues a warning to the unworthy (9-10):[311]

> Οἱ φθονεροὶ δὲ θύρῃσιν ἐπιφράσσοισθε ἀκουάς·
> Εἰ δέ τις ἀμπετάσειεν, ἁγνίζοιτο φρένα μύθῳ.
>
> Let the envious by the doors stop up their ears, but if one should open them, would that he makes holy his mind by this poem.[312]

Perhaps Gregory has Philo in mind here, for phrases similar to ἐπιφράσσοισθε ἀκουάς can be found throughout his works,[313] most notably in his *De Cherubim* (42.2) when he is about to embark upon a discussion of virtue but begins by telling the curious (οἱ δεισιδαίμονες) to stop up their ears (ἀκοὰς ἐπιφραξάτωσαν). What is of most interest here is the word θύρῃσιν, which now situates this hymn within a particular space; for the singer of this poem must be in a (sacred) building of some kind in order for the jealous to be at the door. Given the clear reference above to the halls of Olympian Zeus, the reader no doubt has already conjured in his/her mind a grand – and divine - setting for this hymn, one befitting the divinities of Greek myth; and once the reader reaches the end of the poem, they will see that Christ and the *dikastai* have been present the whole time, thus making a heavenly (Olympian) setting quite natural. Gregory, therefore, has created for the reader a space in which an *agon* can take place that is coloured by these various literary references; but instead of gods arguing over the fates of heroic men, we have a contest between Marriage and Virginity.[314] Furthermore, there is a clear effort at reconciliation in these lines, for Gregory leaves it open for the φθονεροὶ to change their ways and thus be reconciled with Virginity (or rather Gregory's conception of it). Given that the ascetic life was often a field mired with controversy and division (as briefly noted above), this seems to be one of the clear aims of this poem.

---

[311] Something that can be found at the beginning of hymns, such as Callimachus' hymn to Apollo (discussed in more detail in the following chapter).
[312] Gilbert (2001:88) translates these v. 9 as 'But let the malevolent muzzle their ears with doors', but this makes little sense to me, and it is more likely that the dative here indicates place, than the instrument with which the φθονεροὶ close their ears (presumably he thinks that they are invited to shut the doors).
[313] *Legum Allegoriarum*, 2.25; *De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, 131; *De Migratione Abrahami*, 191; *De Vita Mosis* 2.200; *De Specialibus Legibus*, 3.174. Numbering is that of Cohn (see bibliography).
[314] For the concept of space in ancient Greek narratives, see De Jong (2012a), her article on the Homeric hymns (2012b) are also of interest and discussed further below.

After this proem, the hymn proper begins (11-13):

> Παρθενίη, μέγα χαῖρε, θεόσδοτε, δῶτερ ἐάων,
> Μῆτερ ἀπημοσύνης, Χριστοῦ λάχος, οὐρανίοισι
> Κάλλεσιν ἀζυγέεσσιν ὁμόζυγε.
>
> Virginity, great tidings to you, the gift of God, giver of good things, Mother of safety, lot of Christ, wed to the unwed heavenly beauties.

The phrase μέγα χαῖρε is found throughout Pagan hymnody (Hom. Hym. *To Apollo,* 466; Call. *Hym*.3.44, 6.2, 119). The phrase δῶτερ ἐάων is found throughout Hesiod and once in Homer.[315] Virginity is addressed paradoxically (in a style quite common in Orphic hymns as we shall see in the following chapter) as οὐρανίοισι Κάλλεσιν ἀζυγέεσσιν ὁμόζυγε. The reader's knowledge of pagan hymnody is certainly invoked in these opening lines. The point made by Sundermann above is not the only reference to Callimachus' hymns to Artemis. In the Callimachean hymn, Artemis herself is also addressed as Παρθενίη (3.110) as part of an invocation by the hymnist.[316] The epithet Μῆτερ ἀπημοσύνης is unique in that ἀπημοσύνη is found extant with the meaning 'safety, freedom from harm' only in Theognis (757), where Zeus is invoked to ever keep his right hand above the city in safety,[317] and in *Inscriptiones Graecae* XII(5).215, which is an inscription from the Isle of Paros in which Demokydes, Telestodike, and the people set up a statue to the maiden Artemis.[318] One would be forgiven, thus far, for thinking that the hymn to Virginity is not a Christian hymn at all. The hymn could just as easily be Neo-Platonic or Orphic. However, the next epithet makes it quite clear that this is a Christian hymn, Χριστοῦ λάχος. The verb λαγχάνω (among other verbs) is often used to express a god's relationship to a place, or to show that a certain place is allotted to a specific god. Here, however, Christ is not allotted a specific place or region, but an abstract concept, virginity; but what is more, the Trinity Itself is the first virgin (Πρώτη παρθένος ἐστὶν ἁγνὴ Τριάς [20]), and so Gregory emphasises that virginity is not just God's domain, but an attribute of God Himself. Gregory is clearly indebted to the traditional vocabulary and formulae of the Greek hymn. Nevertheless, he transforms them in order to serve his own purpose, and to conform it to his own theology. A quick survey of the opening lines of this poem already makes clear to the reader that this poem is to be a learned and eloquent display in praise of Virginity as the special domain of Christ.

Next, we have the *pars media* (*epica*) of the hymn, in which Gregory recounts the nature of God and angels, the creation of the universe, the creation of man and his fall, and, finally, the incarnation of Christ and his salvific mission.[319] At line 56-116 Gregory begins an account of the

---

[315] See Hom. *Od.* 8.325; Hes. *Theog*. 46, 111, 633, and 664.
[316] The whole invocation is Ἄρτεμι Παρθενίη Τιτυοκτόνε (Artemis, Virginity itself, slayer of Tityus).
[317] Ζεὺς μὲν τῆσδε πόληος ὑπειρέχοι αἰθέρι ναίων / αἰεὶ δεξιτερὴν χεῖρ' ἐπ' ἀπημοσύνηι, / ἄλλοι τ' ἀθάνατοι μάκαρες θεοί (Would that Zeus, dwelling in the Aether, keep his right hand always over this city in safety – and all the other happy and immortal gods) (757-758).
[318] Δημοκύδης τόδ' ἄγαλμα Τελεστοδικη τ' ἀπο κοινῶν / εὐχάσμενοι στῆσαν πα[ρ]θένωι Ἀρτέμιδι / σεμνῶι ἐνὶ ζαπέδωι κο(ύ)ρηι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο. / τῶν γενεὴν βίοτόν αὖχσ' ἐν ἀπημοστύνηι (Demokydes, Telestodike, and those of the people who beseech [her] set up this statue on hallowed ground for the maiden Artemis, daughter of Aegis-bearing Zeus, whose people and livelihood he [or she] will increase in safety).
[319] Many of these themes are also found in the *Poemata Arcana*, discussed in Ch.4. Interestingly many of the lines found in those poems are also found here (*PA* 6.13-16 = *Carm.* 1.2.1.31-34; *PA* 7.59-77 = *Carm.*

creation of the material world, and of Adam and Eve, with the aim of showing how Virginity 'shone resplendent in the last age' (57). The *cosmos* is created by the Son. Then, Christ expresses His wish to make mortals who have a share in the spiritual life of angels. Once Adam is made, God then creates Eve from his side, and Gregory adds that it is the marriage bond that sets a limit on man's desire and prevents him from sleeping with whomsoever he wishes like the other animals (110-115). It is after the Fall, when humanity is further burdened by fleshliness (i.e. a proclivity towards sin), that we see the purpose of marriage in the grand scheme of salvation history. Marriage is a defence from destruction for the human race. It ensures that humanity continues on, as a stream, both existing in constant flux, as a river flows, and yet – through its offspring – always remaining in existence. In short, the purpose of marriage is to keep the human race alive and well. Marriage, along with the law and the prophets, keeps humanity close to God, and prevents it from falling too deeply into the pit of sin. We should also note that the comparison of marriage to the flowing of a river further invokes the importance of rivers in Greco-Roman society to the rituals traditionally concerned with marriage and fertility (and to speeches in favour of marriage, as we shall see below). In a way, Gregory highlights why the river might have been associated with these particular parts of human, civilised life.[320]

It is not for mortals to ask why God must become incarnate in a virgin womb and suffer and die in order to expiate our sins and save us. Nevertheless, it is true (ἀτρεκὲς) that man has been raised up by Christ's sufferings and brought into a life of freedom (180-181). Where mankind for many ages searched for a king (βασιλεύς) to lead – and save – them, it is not until the advent of Christ the true king (ἄναξ) that man finds redemption and can inhabit a better world. It should be noted here that Gregory almost always in his poetry uses βασιλεύς of earthly kings, but the epic ἄναξ is preserved for God/Christ, giving us yet another example of how Gregory uses the poetic tradition to place God – and perhaps more importantly Christ – above earthly kings. And so, κεῖνο γάμος μερόπεσσι, τὸ δ' ἀζυγίη θεοειδής. / Κόσμος ὁ μὲν γαίης, ἡ δ' οὐρανίοιο χορείης (here you have marriage for mortals, but there is virginity, which is godlike. The former belongs to the earthly order, the latter to the heavenly one [187-188]). Why exactly this is the case, Gregory concludes his hymn with an answer based upon an allegorical reading of Scripture (189-214). Just as a painter begins by drawing the vague form of a man on canvas before enlivening it with detail and colour, so too is virginity's supreme role in salvation history found in Scripture (195-204). Virginity, therefore, is the fullness of God's revelation to man, and the pinnacle of our salvation – and since God Himself is virgin, it is the fullest revelation of God. It is not so much opposed to the earthly life of man, but rather excels it, since it belongs with the heavenly choirs of heaven, who exult God without ceasing.

1.2.1.81-99), Gregory's recycling of lines is a phenomenon that I have noted throughout his poetry. However, discussion of this is beyond the scope of this thesis.

[320] On rivers in Greco-Roman society and literature, see P.J. Jones (2005), Depew (2007), and Håland (2009). Perhaps Gregory also has in mind an oration of his former teacher, Himerius, an epithalamium in which he discusses at length the connection of marriage to rivers (*Or.* 9.11), which will be discussed further below.

Myths about a god's creation of man or his deeds upon earth – in guise of a human or animal – are commonplace in the hymns of Homer and Callimachus; but here the *pars media* has more of a didactic function, explaining to the reader the origins of virginity (and, therefore, why it is worth pursuing), why man is both attracted to an earthly and heavenly life, how man fell and its consequences (and marriage's function as a means of preserving the human race), and, finally, why Christ became incarnate of a virgin. This is not to say that they are out of place in a hymn, but rather, the way Gregory conveys these myths is in more of a didactic than hymnic style, which would simply relay the various myths of the god before making a final prayer. What is more, the hymn does not finish with the traditional prayer to God but goes straight into the *Rangstreit*. It must be said, however, that almost all extant examples of hymns have this closing prayer – at least in poetry. Gregory's contemporary – and rival – Julian has a closing prayer in his prose hymns to king Helios and the Mother of the gods. Proclus, writing later than Gregory but in hexameter, finishes his Neo-Platonic hymns with a prayer. Even hymns that might end with a simple *chaire* (farewell) to the gods, are doing more than simply saying good bye to the deity but asking for their blessing (upon the hymn and hymnist).[321]

It must be asked why Gregory did not finish this hymn with a closing prayer. That Gregory's poems are both indebted to longstanding Hellenic literary traditions and imbued with a certain innovative spirit we have already noted in the previous chapter on his biblical poetry. It should also be noted that hymns – especially the Homeric hymns – acted as prologues to longer, normally epic, poems; and that these hymns did not necessarily correspond, in respects to its contents, to the following poem (Furley and Bremer, 2001: 41-43). However, it may well be that Gregory quite deliberately moved this final section of the hymn to the middle of the *agon*. I have yet to discuss the speeches of Marriage and Virginity within the *agon*, but there is clearly a mediator in this poem, someone who introduces the *agon* (215-221), as happens in some tragedies (see below), but who also here has to encourage Virginity to speak (349-354):

> Ὦ τέκος Οὐρανίοιο, καὶ ἔνδοθι κυδήεσσα,
> Ὦ μεγάλοιο χοροῖσι παρισταμένη μεδέοντος
> Ὑμνοπόλοις, εἰ καί σε δέμας καὶ γαῖα κατίσχει,
> Δεῦρ' ἴθι, καὶ φάθι μῦθον. Ἐγὼ δὲ σέο προπάροιθεν
> Στήσομαι. Ἦ γὰρ ἔμοιγε θεόσδοτος ἦλθες ἄνασσα·
> Ἦλυθες, ἀλλ' ἔτι μᾶλλον ἵοις τε καὶ ἵλαος εἴης.
>
> O child of heaven, glorious within, O you who stand near the hymning choirs of the great Guardian, even if the flesh and the earth hold you down, come here, and speak your argument. I will stand before you. For you have come to me, God-gifted queen, you have come but still you should come and be gracious.

Sundermann (1991:86) sees this passage as the poet interjecting to encourage Virginity to speak. However, it is quite clear here that this passage acts as the final prayer (the traditional 'part III') of the hymn, that the deified Virginity would be present, and come to the mediator between Marriage

[321] See Race (1982:8-10).

and Virginity, which must be Gregory.[322] Although we do not have the word *charis* here, we do have Δεῦρ' ἴθι, which is used to summon the virgin goddess Artemis by Aristophanes in the *Clouds* (1271-1272). Furthermore, we have the call for Virginity to be ἵλαος, a word often used to describe deities in Greek literature.[323] It would not be too far-fetched to suggest that the learned reader would be quite familiar with such a tripartite structure, which was the most common (if not the only) form for metrical hymns. And so the absence of this third part – as well as its appearance halfway through the *agon* - would not go unnoticed by the reader. What we have here, therefore, is an example of Gregory's in-depth knowledge of the Hellenic, literary tradition, and his willingness to be innovative and playful with his *paideia*.

Ultimately, whether or not *Carm.* 1.2.1.217 marks the beginning of a new poem becomes a moot point. For it is clear that the hymn and *Rangstreit* exist in unity with each other, and that it is necessary for the *Rangstreit* to be read in light of the hymn in order for it to be fully understood (as I will point out below). *Carmina* 1.2.1 would, therefore, be yet another example of Gregory's grasp of the Greek, literary tradition, and his willingness to innovate within that tradition. Furthermore, since the hymn was often recited in an agonistic context (Furley and Bremer, 2001:35-40), the hymn to Virginity fulfils the traditional function of making the deity present and invoking his blessing before the competitor(s) begin(s) their main recital(s). The hymn, then, not only makes God/Christ (and Virginity) present for the *Rangstreit* but installs him as its judge. In *Carm.* 1.2.1, Gregory is displaying his in-depth knowledge of Greek hymnody (and his *paideia*), its history and context, whilst simultaneously creating a poem that is a fusion of various literary forms. This poem is more than a display of Gregory's education, for it also marks a clear difference in the way in which Gregory seeks to communicate his ideas about virginity. He does not do so through letters (like Jerome) or a treatise (like Nyssen), literary forms in which one's *paideia* can deliberately muted or underplayed, but in a hymn followed by an oratorical *agon*; and so *paideia* and its display becomes an integral means for Gregory of communicating his ideas on the matter. It provides yet another example of Gregory's weaving of sacred and profane wisdom and of crowning his *logoi* with the Logos, Christ. In turning to the *Rangstreit* section of the poem, we will see that this too is based on a long standing, literary tradition, and that he is again providing further evidence of his conception of a Christian *paideia*.

The Rhetoric of the *Rangstreit*

At v.215 the *agon* between Marriage and Virginity begins with a description of Marriage's appearance (215-221):[324]

[322] That Virginity had come to the narrator before would suggest that this is Gregory referring to his dream in which Virginity appears to him to encourage him to chastity (*Carm.* 2.1.45.321-263).
[323] See *LSJ* s.v. ἵλαος, 1; and Frangeskou (1984:31) who notes that the epithet ἵλαος is commonly found in the closing prayers of hymns (further bibliography on this is noted in here as well [fn. 5]). See the Homeric Hymn to Demeter (2.204) and Hestia (29.10), and Sundermann (p.97) on Δεῦρ' ἴθι, and p.98 on ἵλαος εἴης.
[324] I will not speak too much about gender here, although both Marriage and Virginity are presented as female personifications very similar to Virtue and Vice in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* II.1.2.21-34. See especially Clark (2011) which is a collection of articles on gender and asceticism in Late Antiquity.

Δεῦρ’ ἄγ’, ὅσαι πλευρῇσιν ὁμόφρονες, ἠδὲ γάμοιο
Μυστίδες, ὑψικάρηνα[325] καὶ ὄμματα γοργὰ φέρουσαι,
Καὶ χρυσὸν λιθάκεσσι μεμιγμένον εὐγενέεσσι,
Καὶ μαλακοὺς ἁπαλοῖσι περι ῥεθέεσσι[326] χιτῶνας,
Λέξαθ’ ὅσα θνητοῖσι γάμος καὶ δεσμὸς ὀπάζει
Κέρδεα, καὶ μετέπειτα καλέσσομεν ἄζυγα μοίρην.
Αἱ μέν τοι ἐρέουσιν ἐπίτροχα φυσιόωσαι·

Come now all you how are in accords with the ribs, the initiates of marriage, with your wide and terrifying eyes, and gold mingled with precious stones, the soft coats upon your dainty limbs, tell us how many advantages does the bond of marriage give to mortals. Thereafter, we shall summon the unwedded lot. Then they, puffed up, will speak these well flowing [words].

Although there is a number of initiates of marriage described here, it becomes clear that the debate takes place between Marriage and Virginity, who are portrayed as mother and daughter. In describing Marriage’s physical appearance, Gregory focusses upon the eyes which are both lofty (wide) and terrifying. The adjective ὑψικάρηνα is often used of oak trees.[327] Most interestingly, it is used of the warriors Polypoetes and Leonteus in the *Iliad* (12.132) to describe them as like lofty oak trees defending the gate to the Achaean camp. The military imagery becomes much more apparent when we see that there is another parallel with a warrior guarding a gate in the other adjective, γοργὰ. In Aeschylus’ *Seven Against Thebes* Parthenopaeus guards one of the gates γοργόν τ᾽ ὄμμ᾽ ἔχων (537).[328] The characters even go on to note how his demeanour is *un*-maidenly (*parthenios*) - that is, unbecoming of his name (536). The reader familiar with Aeschylus (and Homer) may make the connection between the un-maidenly Parthenopaeus and Marriage – who is, by definition, not a maiden (*parthenos*). Marriage, then, is depicted like a (Homeric) hero, ready for a battle of words with an army of initiates behind her. Furthermore, in addition (or contradiction) to this description, we see Marriage portrayed as dainty-limbed and draped in fine clothes, jewels and gold. For those familiar with both Greco-Roman and Judeo-Christian literature on the proper decorum of women, such a portrayal of Marriage would no doubt be seen as unbecoming of sober, virtuous women.[329] Most relevant to our argument are the cynic and Judeo-Christian traditions which speak out against women who refine themselves with jewels, clothes, and make up, as the ideas of these traditions, and their means of communicating them, become much more prevalent in the speech of Virginity.[330]

It becomes apparent quite quickly that Marriage is both familiar with the contents of the preceding hymn, and yet presents an argument in contradiction to it. For, according to Marriage, since mortals are born from the earth, they honour the ancient law of the earth, and of God (230-231). The unwed state is advantageous to the heavenly natures, but the wedding bond is mortals’

[325] *PG* 37.539 prints ὑψικάρηναι, but I accept the emendation of Sundermann (1991:25) as ὑψικάρηναι would not scan properly here.
[326] *PG* 37.539 prints περιῤῥεθέεσσι, but I accept the emendation of Sundermann here (1991:28).
[327] See *OH.* 38.18 and *Hym. Hom.* 5.264 to Aphrodite.
[328] See also Euripides’ *Phoenician Women*, 146 where it is used to describe Parthenopaeus.
[329] See also the ideal of the married woman put forward by Gregory in *Carm*. 2.2.6.4-10 where he advises Olympias not to adorn herself in such a way. See Bacci (1996) for an edition and commentary of this poem.
[330] See Sundermann (1991:26-28) for the various (Non-)Christian works that discuss this.

advantage (232-234). Since Marriage is giving a speech in defence and praise of marriage, we shall see elements of the epithalamium - or speech or song recited in praise of marriage and/or a newly married couple - throughout her speech.[331] Firstly, it must be noted again here that much of the *Rangstreit* section of the poem shows that Marriage and Virginity – as well as the reader – have a knowledge of the hymn section of 1.2.1. Line 35 points out that angels do not have marriage, 110-111 points out that marriage sets a bridle on human desire, and line 124 tells us that marriage is a defence against the destruction of the human race. The same points are made in the opening of Marriage's speech (222-234). Here, Marriage touches briefly upon subjects that have been expounded in full in the preceding hymn – such as the creation of Man, the purpose of marriage, and the nature of angels. Where Christ comes forth from his Mother in the hymn (Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ καὶ Χριστὸς ἀγνῆς διὰ μητρὸς ὁδεύσας / Παρθενικῆς [197-198]), Marriage tells us that Christ the initiate διωλίσθησε γυναικὸς (slipped forth from his Mother) – a much less solemn (almost offensive) way of describing the incarnation. The word is used by Aelian three times: of a crab shedding its shell (9.43), of a foetus coming away from the womb in miscarriage (12.17), and of poison passing through the body (14.20). This is not the only time Marriage will refer to scientific writings, but what must be noted here is the clinical and corporeal connotations which the verb διωλίσθησε has, thus emphasising the fleshly – as opposed to the spiritual/divine – nature of Christ.

The unwed life is for the angelic choir and God alone; for men, it is their best lot to be married; for it is both the root of their life (since it is through marriage that children are begotten), and also a means of pursuing happiness (Ῥίζα τε καὶ βιότοιο μελίφρονος ἐσθλὸν ἔρεισμα [236]). Marriage is a bond which the Son of God laid down as a law for 'the human race and our blood' (Ἀνδρομέης γενεῆς, καὶ αἵματος ἡμετέροιο) (225-224).[332] It should be noted with Sunderman (p.33) that this line is reminiscent of two lines in the *Iliad* in which the heroes Glaucus (6.211) and Aeneas (20.241) boast of their ancestral lineage, thus adding to the image of Marriage as a warrior like the heroes of Epic poetry.[333] Marriage here is also boasting of herself, ultimately, as the root of mankind. God is no longer described as the first virgin (Πρώτη παρθένος ἐστὶν ἁγνὴ Τριάς [20]), but as the begetter of all things (Πρῶτα Θεὸς πάντων γενέτης [237]). Marriage here is following the advice of Ps. Dionysius in the *Ars Rhetorica* who suggests that the speaker of an oration in favour of marriage begin by outlining the origins of Marriage from the gods, as Zeus and Hera were the first to join in marriage and have intercourse, hence the reason why Zeus is called the Father of all (οὕτω τοι ὃ μὲν καὶ πατὴρ καλεῖται πάντων) (2.2).[334] Here, God is πάντων γενέτης, a similar phrase, and it is clear that Marriage comes from God the Son.

[331] Relevant scholarship on epithalamia will be cited below, but first and foremost, Menander Rhetor discusses the *epithalamium* at length (*Treatise* 2.399-412) – see the edition by Russell and Wilson (1981) and Race (2019) – and Ps.-Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Ars Rhetorica* (Race, 2019). Ps.-Dionysius distinguishes between the speech in favour of marriage which would have made up one of the initial exercises practiced by the student of rhetoric, and the epithalamium proper, which is composed for a specific couple. .
[332] Note that the line numbers are inverted. This is on the suggestion of Sundermann (1991:32).
[333] The line runs ταύτης τοι γενεῆς τε καὶ αἵματος εὔχομαι εἶναι in both sections of the *Iliad*.
[334] The edition of the *Ars Rhetorica* used is that of Race (2019).

It is the marriage bond – and its gift of offspring - that keeps the desire of all things in check, both animate and inanimate things (241-246):

> Εἰ δ' ἐτεὸν φοίνιξι πόθου νόμος ὑψικόμοισι,
> Μιγνυμένους θῆλύν τε καὶ ἄρσενα εἴαρος ὥρῃ
> Ἐρνοκόμων παλάμῃσι βρύειν βοτρυώδεα καρπὸν,
> Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐκ δυάδος λιθάκων λίθος εἰς ἓν ἰούσης
> Τίκτεται, ὡς ἐνέπουσι λίθων ἐπιΐστορες ἄνδρες,
> Ἔστι καὶ ἀψύχοισι γάμος καὶ δεσμὸς ἔρωτος.
>
> If, indeed, there is a law of desire for the date-palm with its high plumage that the male mixes with the female in the Spring time so that they pour forth fruit like grapes into the hands of gardeners, if even a stone is begotten from a pair of stones moving into one (as men familiar with stones tell us), then there is also marriage as a bond of desire for inanimate things.

Marriage, as an advocate for earthly creatures, is certainly well versed in the natural sciences, and engages in a clear display of her (scientific) education.[335] The sum of the argument thus far is that marriage keeps sinful desires in check, and makes sure that the worldly order is stable, and does not fall into ruin or destruction through a lack of procreation. Furthermore, the nature of the argument thus far does have some resemblance to the structure of a speech in favour of marriage as outlined by Menander and Ps.-Dionysius. Menander suggests that, after the proem, the speaker should speak in praise of the god of marriage, and that marriage is a good thing (400.29-401.2). What is more, he suggests that the speaker discuss the presence of marriage in nature between rivers (an image discussed above), animals and also trees (401.29-402.7) – as we have in the poem here.[336]

After rebuking herself for showing off her knowledge of natural science (247), Marriage then goes on to pose a series of rhetorical questions, in order to demonstrate the things which sensible marriage (γάμος ἐχέφρων) provide (248-260):

> Δέρκεο τὰ μερόπεσσι γάμος πόρσυνεν ἐχέφρων.
> Τίς σοφίην ἐδίδαξε φίλην, καὶ βένθε' ἀνεῦρεν,
> Ὅσσα χθὼν, ὅσα πόντος, ὅσ' οὐρανὸς ἐντὸς ἐέργει;
> Τίς πτολίεσσιν ἔθηκε νόμους; καὶ τῶνδε πάροιθεν
> Τίς πτόλιας δ' ἀνέγειρε, καὶ ηὕρετο μήδεσι τέχνας;
> Τίς πλῆσεν ἀγορὰς καὶ δώματα, καὶ τίς ἀγῶνας;
> Τίς στρατὸν ἐν πολέμοισι, καὶ ἐν θαλίῃσι τραπέζας;
> Τίς χορὸν ὑμνητῆρα θυώδει πήξατο νηῷ;
> Τίς θηρῶν κατέλυσε βίον, καὶ γαῖαν ἀράσσειν,
> Καὶ φυτοεργείην ἐδιδάξατο, καὶ πελάγεσσι
> Νῆ' ἐπαφῆκε μέλαιναν ἐπειγομένην ἀνέμοισι;
> Τίς γαῖαν καὶ πόντον ὑγρῇ συνέδησε κελεύθῳ
> Νόσφι γάμου, τὰ δὲ πολλὸν ἀπόπροθεν εἰς ἓν ἄγειρε;
>
> See the things which wise Marriage has given to mortals. Who has taught beloved wisdom, and searched the depths, as much as the land, as much as the sea, as much as the heavens shut up within? Who laid down laws for the cities? And who built the cities before that and discovered with cunning the arts? Who filled the

[335] See Sundermann (1991:43-45) for the various references to the coupling or marriage of plants and the mating of stones in Greco-Roman literature. See also the epithalamium by Choricius of Gaza who alludes to this common trope in epithalamium (*Or.* 6.9) (Penella, 2005:139), and Cavero (2008:350-353) on poetic epithalamia from Egypt.

[336] See, also, Ps.-Dion. *Ar. Rhet.* 2.3, where he notes the speaker should argue that conceiving and bearing children is found in plants and animals and so is natural.

> marketplaces and households, who filled places of competition? Who provides the army in times of war and the tables during feasts? Who set up the hymning chorus in the fragrant temple? Who put an end to the life of beasts [for men] and taught [them] to plough the land and cultivate it, and let loose the black ship upon the seas being driven on by the winds? Who bound land and sea with an aquatic thoroughfare if not Marriage, who has gathered all these things that are very far flung into one?

Again, Marriage is structuring her speech in accordance with the advice outlined by Ps.-Dionysius (2.3, 5) and Menander (401), who discuss extensively that the speaker should emphasise the societal benefits which marriage brings to men. There is, as Sundermann points out (1991:47) a clear parallel between these rhetorical questions and the first stasimon of Sophocles' Antigone (332-375). Also, Sundermann (p.49) notes here that this part is reminiscent too of another epithalamium of Gregory's former teacher, Himerius, who has a very similar list of marriage's achievements (*Or*. 9.9).[337] In the first rhetorical questions posed by Marriage, there is a parallel between these words and a rhetorical question posed at line 172 of the hymn: Ὦ Ἄνα, τίς δέ κε σεῖο νόον καὶ βένθος ἀνεύροι (O King, who can search through your mind and depths?). The answer is, of course, no one. But where Marriage claims to search the depths (βένθε' ἀνεῦρεν) of knowledge of the natural world, and actually have knowledge of it, Marriage implicitly shows that her focus is upon earthly, not spiritual, things – as well as making her vain and proud. The attentive reader, therefore, will see not only how Marriage is familiar with the opening hymn to Virginity, but also misinterprets or contradicts it. Although not made explicit, the reader or listener of this speech would clearly note that Marriage is a *pepaideumenos* and sees herself as the very origin and root of Greek culture and literature, in accordance with the rhetorical treatises of Menander and Ps.-Dionysius.

Marriage goes on to make one more argument for her way of life that can be found in the treatise of Ps.-Dionysius (2.5, 4.3). Marriage allows the couples to support and strengthen each other, bringing joy to friends and sorrow to enemies (262-275). Marriage, however, makes one final point that is not found in rhetorical handbooks, which is that Marriage helps one cling closer to God. For, since the married person has more to look after – spouse, children, and wealth – they must, therefore, pray more earnestly to God that these things be kept well (276-287). Thus far, we have seen in the description of Marriage (and her entourage) that she is an imposing, if not terrifying, figure – much like the un-maidenly hero Parthenopaeus. She is, in a way, like a Homeric hero of old who would have engaged in similar *agones*, both of words and of steel. Marriage is also clearly well educated, ordering her speech thus far in accordance with the advice given by Menander Rhetor and Ps.-Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The learned reader would no doubt recognise these various references to Homer, the tragedians, and the rhetoricians, and perhaps would be inclined to agree with marriage, since they may well have heard or given such speeches, since it was an important part of their rhetorical education – as Ps.-Dionysius points out (Ch. 2.1).

[337] On Himerius, see Kennedy (1983:141-149).

Marriage then moves from looking at the advantages of her own institution to the defects in the life of Virginity (288-304). Virginity's life is one bereft of friendship (φιλότης). It is a life that exists outside of human society and does not share in the desires of the rest of humanity. Furthermore, it has no defence against the desires of the flesh – something which marriage has in the conjugal bed. Virginity, in choosing to lead a life outside of human society, has not only chosen a life bereft of friendship, but has also dishonoured it (296); and, for Marriage, there is no virtue without friendship (Οὐδ' ἀρετὴ φιλότητος ἀπόπροθεν [297]). This is not only because marriage was dear to the pious men of yore, but also because marriage is the offspring of friendship, and marriage is made up of those privy to the desires of Christ, such as the patriarchs, priests, and kings of the Old Testament (297-302). For virtuous men are not born from the earth, like the tribe of Giants, but marriage (302-304). Again, we see Marriage's speech reflecting that of Himerius (one of Gregory's teachers), who also raises the myth of autochthonous men from the Attic earth only to disregard it (*Or*. 9.9); Ps.-Dionysius also makes clear that Marriage is a means of chastity (*sophrosyne*) (Ch. 2.4) and Marriage here points out that her institution is a defence against the passions (290). One wonders, furthermore, if the read might make a connection here between Virginity and the Cyclopes of Homers *Odyssey* bk. 9. After all, as Segal (1994:203) notes, the *Odyssey* twice draws a relationship between the Giants and the Cyclopes (*Od.* 7.59, 206). The virgin life is one without friendship (φιλότητος ἄνευθε), ruthless (νηλὴς), dwelling in the hills (οὐρεσιφοίτης) (v.289). The virgins take no delight in the marketplaces (Οὐκ ἀγορῇσι / Τέρποντ') (vv. 292-293), nor do they have sympathy for mortals (οὐ μερόπεσσιν ὁμόφρονα θυμὸν ἔχουσιν) (v. 295). In a similar way, the cyclops, Polyphemus answers the captive Odysseus with a ruthless heart (νηλέϊ θυμῷ) (9.272, 287, 368). The cyclopes dwell on the tops of hills (οἵ γ' ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων ναίουσι κάρηνα) (9.113), have no marketplaces (οὔτ' ἀγοραὶ) (9.112) and take no care for others (οὐδ' ἀλλήλων ἀλέγουσι) (9.115). Those who practices asceticism, therefore, are much like the uncivilised cyclopes, who are completely devoid of culture, piety, or civilisation, not only cut off from the rest of mankind, but also leading a life of isolation without friendship.[338] The literary allusion, therefore, would serve to strengthen Marriage's othering of Virginity.

It is here that Marriage then lists the famous characters of the Old Testament, alongside John the Baptist, the apostles, and Paul (305-328). Women, furthermore, can only flourish within the confines of marriage. For Τοὺς πάντας μερόπεσσι γάμος καὶ Χριστὸς ἔδωκεν (Marriage, and Christ have given all of them to mortals [329]). By drawing upon Biblical exempla, Marriage is again harnessing the advice of Menander (402) and Ps.-Dionysius (ch.2.5) who advise the speaker to draw upon mythic exempla on the goods of marriage. For Marriage, even the incarnation of Christ is not a mixing of human nature with the divine, but rather a mixing of mortal marriage with divinity (336). The unmarried come from the married, and so marriage is superior.
Εἴ τοι μὴ πατέρες, πατέρων γε μὲν ἐξεγένεσθε (If, indeed, you are not father, then you have been born from fathers [341]). Marriage, in her authority as mother of the unwed, calls upon her

[338] On the (lack of Civilisation) of the Cyclopes, see Segal (1994:202-215) and Hernandez (2000).

children to stop the competition right here and now. For her, the competition is already won. Nevertheless, Virginity takes her turn to speak.

Before moving on to the speech of Virginity we should recap on some of the major points of Marriage's speech. Firstly, Marriage has a clear outline for her speech: a proem outlining her argument (222-236); arguments for Marriage (237-287); arguments against Virginity (288-295); Biblical exempla in support of Marriage's claims (296-336); epilogue (337-341). All in all, Marriage's speech is a concise 119 lines. Furthermore, it is clear that the speech of Marriage incorporates elements of the oration in favour of marriage. She praises the institution of marriage, gives it divine origins, and shows its prevalence in nature – all things which Menander and Ps.-Dionysius recommend that the rhetor mention in delivering their speech. Also, we see that Marriage and Virginity, according to Marriage's speech, embody certain symbolic and physical spaces. Marriage is for mortals, but Virginity is exclusively for the angelic hosts. Marriage is the thing that creates the civic space on earth and fills the temples with worshippers. Virginity, on the other hand, has (unnaturally) taken a mode of life not for mortals and excluded herself from civilised society, the space of *paideia*. Marriage surreptitiously compares Virginity to the Giants, mythical monsters that live far from ordered, civilised society, and make her out to be an 'other' that has shunned the origins of life – both as physical existent and as civilised, human life. In Marriage's speech, we see a very clear example of *paideia* put into action. For speeches in favour of marriage – as Ps.-Dionysius tells us – would have been one of the first *progymnasmata* that students would have composed in their education.

We have, therefore, a real-life application of Gregory's (and the readers') rhetorical training for an issue that was (as we have noted above) a prevalent and divisive topic in the fourth century. The speech is suitably Christianised, however, in harnessing Biblical (as opposed to "pagan") exempla in the argument and makes a strong case for the primacy of marriage. On the one hand, the reader may well have been positively disposed to Marriage's arguments, given their rhetorical education that included writing speeches in favour of marriage and for married couples with these very arguments. On the other hand, however, the very closing words of Marriage (as well as the initial description of her appearance) could well make her out to be a tyrant. The speech closes with Marriage ordering Virginity to stay back from contest (340). Gregory, in his first speech against Julian, notes that Julian was like an athlete who claimed to be the best by ordering that no one else compete or injuring the other competitors (*Or*. 4.6). Perhaps Marriage, in her words and menacingly warlike appearance, could also be seen as tyrannical here, and not acting like a mother at all. Seen from a pedagogical point of view, Gregory has presented to his reader a fair and well thought out argument in favour of Marriage, and many of the things which Marriage claims to be the benefits which she provides to humanity (social, political, religious, and cultural institution) Nicoboulus Sr. claims to be the benefits of *mythoi* (culture) (2.2.5.165-216). He has, however, subtly undermined this position in the way he presents Marriage as warlike (un-maidenly), her extravagant attire and jewellery (which may be deemed unchaste), and in her tyrannical disposition in ordering Virginity not to join the competition. Nevertheless, Virginity,

despite her life lead outside society, is not at all deprived of eloquence or reason, as evidenced by her speech.

Virginity is described in a polar-opposite fashion to Marriage (342-347):

> Τοῖα γάμος. Μετέπειτα κατηφιόωσα παρειῇ
> Ἐν τρυχίνοις ῥακέεσσι, καὶ ἄψεσιν ἀνδρανέουσι,
> Νήλιπος, αὐαλέη τε, κατὰ χθονὸς ὄμματ' ἔχουσα
> Παρθενίη, τυτθὸν τε[339] διαστέλλουσα σὺν αἰδοῖ
> Χείλεα, φοινίσσουσα παρήϊον αἵματι σεμνῷ,
> Κἀκ κεφαλῆς ἐρύουσα προέσχετο σῖγα καλύπτρην.[340]
>
> Thus spoke Marriage. Thereafter, her cheeks downcast, with frail limbs in tattered rags, barefoot, rough, keeping her eyes to the ground, Virginity, parting her lips a little out of modesty, reddening her cheeks with pious blood, and drawing the veil from her head she comes forward silently.

If Marriage can be compared to Parthenopaeus, or any other (Homeric) hero, then Virginity could well find her parallel in Odysseus. In the latter part of the *Odyssey* Odysseus wears a ῥάκος in his god-given disguise from Athena (*Od*. 6.178 - when Odysseus asks for a rag to cover his naked body; 13.434; 14.434, 349, 512; 18.67, 74; 19.507 to describe his beggar's-rags). Unlike Odysseus, however, Virginity's rags do not hide strong and supple limbs. Nevertheless, like Odysseus Virginity's rags hide a nobility of character that for Odysseus is display in his physical prowess, but for Virginity is portrayed in her speech. Otherwise, Virginity's appearance – as noted by Sundermann (p. 88-94) is very much in line with the cynic and ascetic ideal of various ancient (Christian) writers. There follows vv. 349-354 (discussed above) where the speaker exhorts Virginity to speak in defence of her way of life. Sundermann (p. 97) notes that this interjection is a typical *Elemente des Diatribenstils*, but this is not your typical Diatribe. For, as we noted above, the opening hymn which clearly imitates the Homeric hymns with its tripartite structure, does not have a final prayer that typically asks the deity to be present for the singer. The attentive and learned reader of this poem would not miss the absence of such a vital part of a hymn, and would, no doubt, see its fulfilment in these lines spoken by the speaker here who encourages Virginity to speak.

Before she begins her argument in favour of her way of life (355 -380) she makes it clear that she speaks somewhat unwillingly and confirms that Marriage is right to say the Virginity does not take part in human society. She does not mingle in the marketplace or sit at the feet of teachers who think little of righteousness, nor does she care about favourable judgements from judges who care little for justice, and often pervert its course (360-364). The honours of this life are for others, but for Virginity, there is one law, one ideal: to journey towards God (365-367). The honours of men come and then go, like steam or smoke (370-371). We get a clear sense that Virginity is quite conscious of the space in which she is giving this speech and of the judges set to pass judgement on it. The trope of the unjust jurors is common enough in antiquity, but I see this as one of the

[339] *PG* 37.548 has τυτθὸν δὲ.
[340] On the difficulty of this particular line, see Sundermann (1991:92-93).

rhetorical ploys of Virginity; for in calling the integrity of the jurors into question, she has them eventually give the victory to her, even though they prefer Marriage (728-730). Furthermore, Virginity distinguishes herself as an 'other' in this space, just as Marriage had depicted her. She cares little for the honours that come with fine speeches and men's approval. Virginity would rather be a source of shame among men and have a little glory in heaven, than be honoured by men and fall far from God (374-376). At this point Virginity expresses her concern that her words this far might cause scandal or put people off pursuing her lifestyle, and so she will go on to give her argument for the virgin life (377-381):

> Ἀλλ' ἔμπης τρομέω καὶ δείδια, μή τις ἀερθεὶς,
> Παρθενίης νεόπηκτον ἐπὶ πτερὸν αἰθέρι νωμῶν,
> Τοῖσδε λόγοις ἐπὶ γαῖαν ὀλισθήσειε τάχιστα.
> Τοὔνεκεν εἰς μέσον ἦλθον ἐμῶν τεκέων ἐπίκουρος,
> Μῦθον ἀοσσητῆρα Θεοῦ σὺν χειρὶ φέρουσα.
>
> But yet I tremble and am afraid that one who has been raised up, aiming for the heavens on the new-found wings of virginity, might be quickly cast down to the earth by these words. For this reason, I came as a guard for my children into their midst, bringing with the hand of God an argument as helper.

It seems that Virginity is aware of the scandal her previous words on contempt for earthly honours and the approval of judges may cause. The listener may worry that what Marriage said of Virginity is true, that it is a life completely devoid of friendship and society, but Virginity, the helper (ἀοσσητῆρα is a word found throughout epic poetry),[341] brings with her a *mythos*, an argument, to convince those present of her superiority. At this point we get a slightly clearer indication as to who is Gregory's intended audience. The young, educated man (or possibly woman), who is considering the life of a virgin, but is perhaps deterred by the belief that the virgin life is one that must be led completely outside of human society. Yet, as we shall see more clearly below, Virginity – despite her contempt for the vacuous honours of men and judges – is clearly one well versed in the eloquence of the learned elite.

In all respect, Virginity begins to argue with her Mother, Marriage. She begins by agreeing wholeheartedly with Marriage – taking up where she left off – that marriage is the root of the unmarried (385-386); but Marriage has failed to tell the whole story when it comes to the origins of humanity (388). Sundermann (p.115) notes a parallel with this line to *Od*. 23.62, where Penelope cannot believe the nurse's report of Odysseus' return.[342] Not only would this be a subtle display of Virginity's education, but it would further align her in the reader's mind with the chaste Penelope, in contrast to the un-maidenly description of Marriage. In sum, Virginity argues that Marriage, in her preoccupation with earthly things (along with most real mothers and fathers), is accused of neglecting the best and eternal part of her offspring in preference for that part which perishes. And so, Marriage should not resent God the Father, or those offspring of hers who choose the better part (400-405).

---

[341] See *Il*. 15.254, 22.333, *Od*. 4.165; Apollonius Rhodius, 1.471.
[342] *Od*. 23.62: ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅδε μῦθος ἐτήτυμος, ὡς ἀγορεύεις; *Carm*. 1.2.1.388: Οὐ μὴν πάντ' ἀγόρευσας ἐτήτυμα … See Sundermann for other literary resonances.

Virginity then proceeds to give a miniature salvation history which culminates in the birth of Christ – as we see in the hymn above (414-421). The law purified childbirth, but Christ, a virgin born from the virgin womb is Τοῦ νόμοιο τέλος (the consummation of the law) (422). In other words, Christ's birth marks the end of the law's supreme rule over mankind so that marriage might descend into the earth (ὅπως γάμος ἐς χθόνα νεύσῃ), and with the secession of marriage, a better world arises (423-424). But what is more (425-428):

> Καὶ μόρος ἀρχεγόνοιο λυτῆς διὰ σαρκὸς ὁδεύων,
> Ῥοιῇ τικτομένοισι, καὶ ὀλλυμένοισι γενέθλῃ,
> Παρθενίῃ γ' ἐνέκυρσε, καὶ ὤλετο, ὡς ὅτε πέτρῃ
> Ἀγχιάλῳ μέγα κῦμα, καὶ ὕδατι βοσκομένη φλόξ.
>
> And death, passing through the primordial, dissoluble flesh - the fate that belongs to those born of the forbidden fruit, and who are destroyed through the age – lighted upon virginity and was destroyed, just as a great wave dashed upon a rock by the sea, or a flame fed with water.

We can see here that Christ here is equated with Παρθενίῃ- a leap that is not too great to make when one keeps in mind that the Trinity is the first virgin (see above). Furthermore, Virginity is clearly mirroring the elements of the oration in favour of marriage, as found in Marriage's speech; for where Marriage gave the cosmic/divine origins of her institution, Virginity proposes that she not only has divine origins but also *is* divine. Where Marriage provides mortals with a defence against death, Virginity destroys death. This invocation of the speech in favour of marriage continues throughout Virginity's oration. For she then goes on to ape the rhetorical questions of Marriage listing the benefits marriage brings (248-260;429-437). Virginity's list is not so flattering, including the toils of labour and the clamour of war. She, furthermore, makes the point that these things are not so much the gift of marriage, 'as a small share of Adam's first punishment, in which the vigilant, bitter snake takes aim at my heel' (438-440). All of this puts to rest the claim of Marriage that both Christ and marriage has given everything for mortals; for Christ is not at all of marriage but is – in a way – Virginity itself. What is more, Virginity has made it clear that marriage has been tainted by the punishment inflicted on mankind by the serpent, an indignity which Virginity has withstood since it, in the person of Christ, has destroyed death. In short, 'marriage flows with the unsettled stream of this world, passing through the ebb of life, touching little and passing by this life that moves quickly on' (κόσμοιο σὺν ἀστατέοντι ῥεέθρῳ / Ῥευστὸς γὰρ ῥευστοῖο διεκπεράας βιότοιο, / Βαιὸν ἐφαπτόμενός τε παρατροχάων τροχάοντα) (443-445). This reflects a point made in the hymn that humanity, through marriage, is like a stream that is ever flowing through death but ever existing through its offspring (125-127). We see here that Virginity is taking an image common in speeches on marriage (the image of the river as a positive symbol of marriage) and subverting it to her own ends – to show Marriage's intransient, futile nature. In short, Virginity makes it clear that it is not life which Marriage preserves for mortals, but death (vv. 424-428) – a clear inversion of the *topos* of marriage speeches that Marriage grants to mortals immortality.

The *refutatio* of the speech in favour of marriage continues, as Virginity goes on to point out that marriage is not only the root of virgins and good men, but also the wicked. Marriage is the

root of Cain and Sodom (Ῥίζα Κάϊν, Σοδόμων τε [448]); and virginity goes on to list the wicked men whom marriage has produced, such as those at the tower of Babel, Herod, and the murderers of Christ. The list culminates in describing the arch-enemy of the Church of Gregory's time, the apostate Julian, whose terrible power is the wicked pit of Baal, the destroyer of souls (κακὸν Βελίαο βέρεθρον … ψυχῶν ὀλετῆρος [457-458]). Marriage has given such men to the world, and will continue to produce liars, cheats, and robbers (461-464). And what is more, it is quite clear that Marriage has produced more wicked than good, just as dust is more common than gold (Ὡς πλείων χρυσοῖο κόνις, πλείους δὲ κάκιστοι / Τῶν ἀγαθῶν [465-466]). A little on from this Virginity seems to bring her speech to a close, letting Marriage have her earthly honours if she no longer claims to be the companion of the Divine (θεότητος ἑταῖρον) (468-473). If she were to bring her speech to a close here, it would stretch over 118 lines – roughly matching Marriage's 119 lines.[343] However, Virginity continues to defend her way of life, turning her speech into a diatribe that thoroughly overwhelms Marriage's argument.

Once Virginity makes clear that Marriage has no control over whether she produces good or bad offspring (476-501), she then begins a discourse on how a man can become good. For it is not Marriage that begets wise or wicked offspring, 'but the nature or learning of mortals teaches them' (ἐδίδαξε βροτῶν φύσις ἠὲ μάθησις) (507); and the best, once formed by the Spirit and *logos*, become the best (508-509). *Logos* here is certainly ambiguous, either referring to Christ or to instruction, education more generally. Virginity goes on to note that the 'spark of piety' (Σπινθὴρ εὐσεβίης) is hidden within man, just as fire is hidden within certain stones or by the striking of iron with a stone – and so it is *logos* that leads forth piety from man (510-513). Virginity is clearly displaying her scientific knowledge, as Marriage did so earlier with her discussion of marriage amongst plants and stones, but more importantly she is engaging in a discussion that is found throughout Greek thought, particularly the works of Plato and Xenophon: is it nature or learning that makes a man good?[344] Virginity seems to have Xenophon (*Mem.* 4.1.2) in mind primarily, where it is made clear that *physis* alone, even if good, can turn to evil without a proper education; and since Marriage of itself does not produce good men but mostly wicked, it is clear that *logos* is necessary to lead man toward goodness.

Furthermore, there follows a much clearer reference to Plato and one of his more famous discourses on *paideia* (1.2.1.523-532):

> Εἰ γάρ τοι καὶ μικρὸν ἀποσκεδάσειας ὀπωπῆς
> Ἢ λήμην ῥυπόωσαν, ἀπ' αὔγεος ἢ σύ γ' ὁμίχλην,
> Καὶ γλήνην πετάσειας ἐς αὐγὰς ἠελίοιο
> Ἡμετέρου, καθαρῷ δὲ νόῳ λεύσειας ἅπαντα,
> Δήεις παρθενίην μὲν ὅλην ἀνάθημα Θεοῖο,
> Χρυσοῦ τ' ἠλέκτρου τε φαάντερον, ἠδ' ἐλέφαντος,
> Εὔσκοπον, εὐδιόωσαν, ἐΰπτερον, ὑψικάρηνον,

[343] Those familiar with Euripidean *agones* would expect the speech of Virginity to stop here, as the *agones* of Euripides typically contain two speeches of equal measure. See Lloyd (1992) for an extensive discussion of the *agon* in Euripides.
[344] See Sundermann (pp. 153-154) for the various references to Plato and others.

> Κούφην, παμφανόωσαν, ἄνω χθονὸς, ἀστήρικτον
> Γαίης ἐν γυάλοισιν, ἐν ἄστεϊ δ' εὐρυθεμέθλῳ
> Οὐρανίῳ …
>
> For if you would scatter a little the defiling sleet from you vision, the mist from the dawn, and if you would open your eyes onto the rays of our sun, and cast stones upon all these things with a pure mind, then you will find Virginity as a whole offering to God, more resplendent than gold and amber and ivory, watchful, calm, well-winged, lofty, nimble, radiant, above the land, not remaining in the hollows of the earth, but dwelling in the city with broad foundations, heaven …

Firstly, it should be noted that Virginity is invoking some of the vocabulary used earlier in the poem. Marriage is also described as ὑψικάρηνον (lofty), and the description of Virginity as more resplendent than gold, amber, or ivory, is an exact copy of a line found in the hymn to Virginity (v.4) which – as we have noted – is an echo of *Od*. 4.73 that describes Menelaus' palace. More importantly, however, there is a reference here to Plato which Sundermann does not seem to identify. When Virginity says that the man with unimpeded vision will see *our sun*, and that she does not dwell in the hollows of the earth (in other words, *a cave*) she is a clearly referring to Plato's *Republic* and the allegory of the cave (7.514a-541b). Where Virginity's speaks of the sight being clouded by 'defiling sleet' (λήμην ῥυπόωσαν), Socrates talks about the eye of the soul being buried in 'barbaric filth' (ἐν βορβόρῳ βαρβαρικῷ) (7.533d). Virginity, as one who does not stay in "the cave" but dwells in the heavens, can be seen as one of the escaped prisoners who can view the sun, the form of the Good. The parallel between Virginity and Plato's cave goes beyond a mere literary allusion. For the one who escapes Plato's cave must, out of a sense of justice, go back into the cave to educate and rule over the prisoners (519b-520d),[345] and so too does Virginity – compelled like the philosopher of Plato's *Repbulic* – descend to take part in the *agon* and to correct the imperfect argument of Marriage.

Another reference to Plato is found a little further on (588-591):

> Εἰ γὰρ οϊστεύσειε τεὴν φρένα Χριστὸς ἄνωθεν,
> Καὶ μεσάτην τρώσειεν ἀναψύχοντι βελέμνῳ,
> Ἀμφοτέρους κεν ἔρωτας ἐποπτεύουσ' ἑκάτερθεν,
> Γνοίης κέντρον ἄνακτος ὅσον γλυκερώτερόν ἐστι.
>
> For if Christ from above would shoot your mind with an arrow and wound your midriff with a soothing dart, observing both kinds of Eros from each side you would know how much sweeter the King's arrowhead is.

Christ here mirrors the portrayal of Eros in Euripidies *Iphigenia at Aulis* (547-551), who has twin arrows – one that brings a blessed fate, another that confounds one's life. Yet Christ is the kind of Eros who brings arrows that are soothing (ἀναψύχοντι βελέμνῳ), and their points are sweeter (κέντρον γλυκερώτερόν). The explicit mention of two Erotes, furthermore, calls to mind Plato's *Symposium* and the speech of Pausanias (580D), in which he discusses two kinds of Eros: the heavenly (*ourania*) and the popular *(pandemos*). Virginity, therefore, becomes a model of a good teacher (or philosopher) who dwells outside of human society but descends into it when needed to

[345] On which see Davie (1977), Hall (1978), Andrew (1983), and Losin (1996).

teach – and to rule – the *hoi polloi*. But what is more, she is a philosopher/teacher who is clearly adorned with eloquence and learning to match that of Plato's symposiasts.[346]

It is now Virginity's turn to recount the many disadvantages of the married life. Firstly, a man may marry a terrible wife, or a wife a terrible husband; and this can only lead to life of domestic misery (625-630). But even if the couple live in domestic harmony, other troubles may plague the married state. The possibility of an untimely death – or, quite simply, the death of a dearly beloved spouse – always looms (638-639):

> Ἄρτι κόρη, μετέπειτα γυνὴ, μετέπειτα δὲ χήρη.
> Νυκτὶ μιῇ τάδε πάντα, καὶ ἤματι πολλάκι μούνῳ.
>
> First a maiden, then a wife, finally a widow. All of these things occur in a night, and even very often in a single day.

Line 638 has the ring of a pithy and memorable saying and sums up succinctly the suffering that the married inevitably must endure. In such situations, the loss of virginity is all for nothing (642).[347] Lines 633-643 take the epithalamium and inverts it into an *epitaphium*, a common trope found in epigrams (as we have noted in ch.1, especially the epitaphs for Euphemius). In the style of a *praeteritio* (645-650), Virginity feigns to keep silence about the misfortunes of childbirth. Not only can the mother's womb be a tomb for a stillborn child, but it can also produce mentally and physically disfigured offspring (ἠλιτόμηνα, καὶ ἔκφρονα, καὶ παράσημα [649]). This is yet another inversion of Marriage's speech; for where Marriage discusses the world's natural beauty through procreation, Virginity highlights the grotesque and tragic nature of the flesh from which she professes to be far off.

Virginity will go on to make some other arguments against Marriage but concludes by exhorting parents and unmarried youths to leave behind family, wealth, success, happiness, indeed, everything (v.718), so as to leave marriage on the earth and return to man's state before the Fall (718-727). In leaving behind these earthly goods, one is fully free to focus purely upon God, to stand in his court and joyfully sing a festal hymn to the King (Γηθόσυνοι μέλπωμεν ἑόρτιον ὕμνον ἄνακτι) (v. 723). There is here an echo of the beginning of the hymn to Virginity where the pure are encouraged to sing pure hymns to Virginity (καθαροῖς μέλποντες ἐν ὕμνοις) (v. 2). But where the singer of the hymn lauds Virginity, Virginity here exhorts her listeners to hymn God. As Sundermann (p. 231) notes, this list of goods which the virgin must shun can be found in varying forms throughout pre-Christian literature and becomes in *Virginitätsliteratur* a list of earthly goods in contrast to divine ones. These goods are even things which the Christian *pepaideumenos* values – as we have seen in the letter exchange of the Nicobouli – but, as we have noted in our discussion of the epitaphs for Carterius, the singing of hymns for God is not a rejection a rejections of eloquence or Greek education and culture. Instead, it is a reutilisation of the *pepaideumenoi's* skills. If the virgin were to truly imitate Gregory's personified Virginity s/he would not only be holy and chaste, but also learned. The ideal virgin, therefore, exercises both the body and the

[346] See Sundermann (pp. 186-187) for these and other references to (non-)Christian writers.
[347] See Sundermann (1991:209) for this point as found in other Christian writers who favour virginity.

intellect in their ascetic practice, and their life need not be an imitation of the Egyptian or Syrian peasant turned ascetic who busied themselves with agricultural labour and who was so admired by the likes of Athanasius or John Chrysostom.

Before considering the concluding decision of the *agon*, we should note some of the significant aspects of Virginity's speech. Firstly, it is clear that Virginity is just as learned and rhetorically adept as Marriage is. Virginity successfully inverts the tropes of the speech in favour of marriage to bolster her argument and diminish Marriage's, she also subverts the marriage speech itself by introducing the epithalamium turned *epitaphium* – which is also a common *topos* of literary epigrams. Where Virginity can match Marriage's display of erudition like for like, she also adds a more philosophical aspect to her speech, invoking some of the most debated ideas found in Platonic discourse – that is, what makes up a true education, and the role of nature (*physis*) and learning (*mathesis*) in forming good men. In subtly invoking the allegory of the cave, Gregory makes use of a Platonic model to describe the role of the virgin/ascetic in society, why they must leave society and live on its peripheries (as Marriage rightly claims) and why they return (like Virginity does here too, although reluctantly). The virgin, like the prisoner escaped from the cave, can see the good in its clearest form, but, nevertheless, out of a sense of religious (as opposed to – or as well as – civic) duty, it returns to the cave (the mundane world) to teach and rule over those still within it. The virgin, therefore, becomes not only the ideal teacher. However, we must note that Gregory's ascetic is not the unlearned desert monk – like Athanasius' Anthony – nor the learned aristocrat who vocally (if not entirely) turns away from his earlier learning (like Basil), but one who is immersed in and actively practicing both sacred and profane *paideia*. For Virginity is not only reciting a learned speech, but one recited in dactylic hexameter that clearly echoes the lines and language of Homer and other great poets.

We must now consider the conclusion of this poem (728-732):

> Τοῖα καὶ ἀζυγίη θεοείκελος.[348] Οἱ δὲ δικασταὶ
> Συζυγίην φιλέοντες,[349] ὅμως στέψουσι κάρηνον
> Παρθενίης. Χριστὸς δὲ διδοὺς γέρας ἀμφοτέροισι,
> Τὴν μὲν δεξιτερῇ παραστήσεται ἐγγύθι χειρὶ,
> Τὴν δ' ἑτέρην λαιῇ, κῦδος δέ τε καὶ τὸ μέγιστον.
>
> Thus spoke unwed and Godlike Virginity. The judges, although they loved the wedded life, will crown the head of Virginity, nevertheless. Christ, giving both a prize, will place one near his right hand, the other at his left, which is a very great honour as well.

Sundermann (p. 237) points out that many Christian writers such as Methodius, Athanasius and Gregory Nyssen all make clear that Marriage, although Virginity is best, is respectable. A similar view can be found in Gregory. Sundermann here quotes one of Gregory's epigrams where he states that marriage is honourable, but it is better to be free from the flesh (*PG* 38.90), and this poem itself is testament to Virginity's superiority. But where the judges intend to give Virginity

[348] Gregory only uses this epithet twice of Virginity, here and at v. 51 of this poem.
[349] *PG*. 37.578 has ποθέοντες for φιλέοντες, for which see Sundermann's (p. 235).

alone a crown, Gregory is quick to emphasise the importance of the married state,giving both a share in the glory.[350] Furthermore, when we considered our brief discussion above of Jerome and Nyssen (and we can add Athanasius' portrayal of Anthony) we see a fundamental difference in their portrayal of the ascetic to Gregory's. For where the ascetic in the latter group is completely unlearned (Athanasius' Anthony) or schooled strictly in biblical, theological, or hagiographical literature (Jerome), Gregory's Virginity is immersed in classical *paideia*. She might prefer to lead a life outside of society, far from men, but here she thrives in the contest of words to which she is summoned.In other words, where the ideal ascetic for other church fathers – even those like Basil who were once immersed in Greek education – was either unlearned or shunned their secular education, Gregory's ascetic embraces their *paideia* and utilises it, not for their own aggrandisement, but for Christ and those who have chosen to be wed to him. [351]

Finally, it is worth considering why Gregory sought to frame this debate between Marriage and Virginity as a literary *agon*. We have not the space here to go into detail on the various literary *agones* with which Gregory's one bears resemblance.[352] I would like to briefly draw attention, however, to the work of Barker (2009) which discusses literary *agones* from epic, history, and Greek tragedies. In this work, Barker makes it clear that the *agon*, when understood as an open, public debate, is a means by which dissent is permitted, institutionalised, and controlled. We have noted at the start of this chapter just how contentious the ascetic life of Christians could be for groups from every walk of life – from bishops to non-Christian intellectuals. It was a walk of life that was clearly strange, if not inimical, to the audience of this poem, who are undoubtedly well educated and delight in Greek education and (agonistic) culture.[353] Nevertheless, Gregory clearly values asceticism as much as he values *paideia*. In this, therefore, we see Gregory dissenting from the view held by other *pepaideumenoi* who praised marriage above all else – as seen, for example, by the speeches in favour of marriage discussed here. Yet the poem is a form of dissent that does not usurp marriage – even if it places it in second place to virginity – nor does it diminish the place of *paideia* in raising the status of the ascetic life. This *Rangstreit* allows Gregory to portray the ascetic life – which could well be seen as inimical to the values of the educated elite – in a way that controls or diminishes many of the factors which would make this life abhorrent to his fellow *pepaideumenoi*. The poem not only creates a space in which this dissent from social norms could

[350] A very similar *agon* and conclusion can be found at *carmina* 1.2.8, the *Comparatio Vitarum*. See Werhahn's commentary (1953) for a detailed discussion and analysis of the poem. Moreschini (2012:120) notes that '[t]he conciliatory proposal between the two types of life [given at the end of *Carm.* 1.2.8 (and, we can add, 1.2.1)] was probably prompted by the practical necessities of Gregory's ministry.' This suggestion is also found in *Or*. 21.19-20, and *Or*.6.

[351] This idea of monks as completely uneducated has been challenged more recently by scholars. See Rousseau (2000) and Rubenson (2000), but see also Johnsén (2018).

[352] I have in mind here particularly Xenophon's *Memorabilia* II.1.2.21-34; the competition between Euripides and Aeschylus in the underworld in Aristophanes' *Frogs* – which is also preceded by a hymn like Gregory's poem; and the competition between Homer and Hesiod – on which see West (1967), Graziosi (2001), Rossen (2004), who also discusses *Frogs*, and Van Noorden (2018). Furthermore, one should not forget to mention the works of Av. Cameron (2014) and Lim (1995, 2008) on dialogue in Late Antiquity; and Engels and Van Nuffelen (2014) on religion and competition in antiquity – especially Van Nuffelen (2014) where he discusses other Christian *agones* found in Late Antique (Christian) literature.

[353] Cooper (1996:48) in quoting Jerome (*Ep.* 39.6) makes clear the repugnance felt in Rome towards ascetic practices for its potential to destroy (noble) families.

be displayed and defended, but it also portrays asceticism in a way that would be much more pleasing and acceptable to Gregory's elite audience who would more likely value marriage (like the judges at the end of the poem) and the various socio-political institutions which surrounds it.

Conclusion

To conclude, *Carmina* 1.2.1 is yet another poem (or two poems) wrongly overlooked by scholars. Although Sundermann deemed the *Rangstreit* to be worthy of scholarly attention, he failed to take into consideration the striking complexity and innovative style of two poems that no doubt belongs to the work of an experienced and learned poet. For both parts clearly need each other in order to be interpreted and understood fully. These poems, therefore, are a virtuosic display of Gregory's *paideia*, a piece that draws in many facets of Greek literature and culture, and which the learned reader could delve into, savour, and appreciate as they digest the various eloquent references to the poets and philosophers of antiquity. That Gregory would compose such intricate and rhetorically sophisticated poetry – where his contemporaries condemned the praising of virginity in lengthy, rhetorical works[354] – shows that his view of the use of *paideia* in promoting the Christian faith and ascetical practices is quite far from the reservedness of his Cappadocian contemporaries and one-time disciple Jerome.

It, furthermore, shows through Virginity's rhetorical display that Gregory did not see *paideia* as in opposition to ascetical practice, or that the ascetic should be, or tend to be, uneducated – at least in non-Christian literature. And so, *paideia* is not just a communication code for the elites of society, but even for the ascetics who dwell outwith the physical (and metaphorical) confines of the *polis*; for it is through the medium of poetry, its literary tradition, and the philosophical tradition of Plato, that fashions and communicates her own identity. To the learned reader of this poem who may have heard or been influenced by Libanius' or Eunapius' view of ascetics, Gregory's ascetic provides a clear counterpoint. The latter part of our discussion should also make it clear that Gregory saw Christ and his teachings not as a means of getting rid of *paideia* (as non-Christian, Greek literature/culture) but of perfecting it. For where Marriage displays her learning to win the argument and the competition, Virginity cares little about the outcome of the competition and more about setting right the errors in Marriage's argument. This is done by matching, if not surpassing the eloquence of Marriage.

---

[354] It is difficult to get a clear date for this poem. Szymusiak (1963:55) dates the poem to 370-371, assigning the poem to the time of the beginning of the dispute between Basil and Eustathios. No reason is given for this date other than the poems spiritual maturity, and that it is *sans doute* dated to the time of Basil and Gregory Nyssen's reaction to the asceticism of Eustathius of Sebaste. Szymusiak-Affholder (1971:55) dates the poem to 372, the time of Gregory's retreat before his consecration as bishop of Constantinople. She gives no real reason for dating the poem to this time. The main concern of her article is the *carmen lugubre* (*Carm*. 2,1,45), which she dates to 372, and adds that *Carm*. 1,2,1 and 2,1,11 are also of the same date. Zehles and Zamora (1996:2-4) date the poem after the *Poemata Arcana* (*PA*, discussed in Ch. 4), which date to sometime after Gregory's departure from Constantinople. See Poulos (2019:150-151) who believes that Nyssen is responding to Nazianzen, as well as his appendix on the date of this poem (pp. 168-179). Poulos makes a convincing argument that *Carm.* 1.2.1 predates the *PA* and Nyssen's treatise, though I am not so sure we can predate it to the treatise, even if it was written before the *PA*. Whether or not Nyssen's treatise comes before or after this poem matters little; for it still shows a clear difference in the two fathers' attitude to *paideia*.

The above makes quite clear that Virginity and those who practice her way of life need not be unlearned but could belong to the elite group of *pepaideumenoi* in the Roman world. Nevertheless, this begs the question: why did Gregory see the need to praise and defend Virginity in such an eloquent way? As our discussion of Libanius and other likeminded sophists made clear above, the practice of Christian asceticism was considered by many to be inimical to the fabric of Greco-Roman society – something which is seen most manifestly in their lack of *paideia*. But what is more, the ascetic life and those who promoted it were often hostile to marriage, which for many writers from the early Imperial period was a source of familial (and thus societal) concord.[355] It is quite clear, therefore, why many non-Christians (and even some Christians to a certain degree, as we have seen above) lamented the rise in the rabble of monks that plagued major cities of the Empire. Gregory, in constructing such a learned display where Virginity embodies the values of *paideia*, must have such opponents in mind when he constructs his own defence of and encomium for the Christian ascetic life. The choice of poetry over prose, therefore, is not one made out of personal or aesthetic preference – especially when his close contemporary, Gregory Nyssen, clearly condemns learned exhortations in praise of virginity – but rather a choice that is made both to counter the claims of figures such as Libanius and to garner support amongst the *pepaideumenoi*, the powerful elite of the empire, for the ascetic movement. Gregory's ultimate goal, I believe, may not have been to encourage (elite) young men to become monks – even though Virginity explicitly does this in the poem – but rather to create an air of acceptance of this movement amongst the movers and shakers of elite, Roman society. Asceticism is not to be a threat to the society of the *pepaideumenoi* and can even be compatible with *paideia*.

[355] See particularly Kantorowicz (1960) and Perkins (2009:64-66).

Chapter 4: The Battle for the Trinity and *Paideia* in the *Theological Orations* and *Poemata Arcana*

Thus far in this thesis we have established the following: In my opening chapter, I have shown through Gregory's epigrams that *paideia* (traditional Greek education, literature, and culture) is something quite dear to him, for Gregory portrays his deceased friends positively as embodiments of *paideia*, irrespective of their actual (or potential) religious outlook. Often, the *paideia* of the deceased is the subject of Gregory's praise – even if they were Christian. In the case of bishops such as himself and Basil, the bishop is portrayed as the embodiment and leader of both sacred and profane learning. Therefore, we would do well to see Gregory not only as a "Christian" writer, but as a writer from a much similar background as any non-Christian member of the Roman elite who is writing for a broad audience (Christian and non-Christian alike). In the following two chapters, we looked at two groups of poems which have been the subject of much criticism by scholars in the last two centuries. In these chapters I sought to rehabilitate the various scholarly perceptions of these poems, and to show how these poems have been misconceived by recent readers. In chapter 2, I demonstrated that the biblical poems (*Carmina* 1.1.12-28) have a clear educatory function, that would encourage Gregory's fellow *pepaideumenoi* to engage with Scripture. They are not, however, intended for the classroom or merely written to be a textbook for schoolboys to learn their Scripture and scansion at the same time, but they are auxiliary (or para-) texts that encourage (as well as help) its reader to engage more thoroughly with the primary text of the Bible. In chapter 3, I discussed *Carm.* 1.2.1 *On Virginity*. We showed how scholarship on this poem to date had failed to grasp the fullness of Gregory's erudite display here, an exhortation in praise of Virginity composed of a classical hymn and *agon* between two personifications, Marriage and Virginity, that invoked a wide range of Greek literature – from hymns, Epic, Tragedy, and various philosophical works. Furthermore, we saw that a virgin/ascetic could also be one well-versed in *paideia*; that Nazianzen – contra Nyssen and others – thought that there was a need for an 'elaborate laudation' of Virginity, and that Gregory's poetry was a unique way of educating the reader on the ascetic life through its great erudition, as well as its portrayal of Virginity as one who creates her identity through the of communication which Greek literary culture provided. We come now to the final group of poems to be discussed in this thesis, the *Poemata Arcana* (*Carm.* 1.1.1-5, 7-9).[356] Unlike the poems discussed above, the *PA* have recently been the subject of a full critical edition, commentary, and translation (Moreschini and Sykes, 1997).[357]

This group of eight poems outlines Gregory's theology of the Trinity, the creation of the Cosmos, the rejection of astrology, and Gregory's account of the creation of man, his Fall, and

[356] From here on the poems will be referred to as the *PA*.
[357] See also Daley (2012) and Norris (2012), whose conclusion (p. 73) that these poems could be song to 'tunes you enjoy' – elsewhere he says 'youthful tunes' – seems to me quite absurd. It is difficult to ascertain if they were ever sung, but the idea of Homeric hexameters fitting contemporary, fourth Century music seems too farfetched to me.

salvation through Christ. What has been left out of the discussion of these poems thus far, however, is the clear presence of Orphic hymnody in the style of these poems. Sykes and Moreschini only ever discuss Orphism briefly within their commentary when they discuss some of the ideas present in the seventh poem of the *PA* (particularly their comments on lines 8b-9 and 32-52, *passim*).[358] No mention is made of the way in which Orphic hymnody in particular has influenced the way in which Gregory structures parts of these poems – especially in discussing the divine – or how imagery and language drawn from Orphic hymnody is also present here. Meinel (2009:82, 92) makes brief mention of this feature of the poems, but a much more detailed analysis of these hymns on the *PA* will help us better understand Gregory's utilisation of *paideia*. Furthermore, Gregory recounts the creation of the Universe, man, his Fall and redemption through the lens of (middle/neo) Platonic demonology, creating a *mythos* in which Scriptural narratives play little part in Gregory's portrayal of his subject. In this chapter, I will show the full extent of the influence that Orphic hymnody and Platonic demonology have on the *PA*. From there we must discuss why exactly Gregory used these hymns and this area of philosophy as a model for these poems, and why he drew upon the imagery of Orphic hymns and Platonic demonology in this work.

But before we discuss the *Poemata*, it is necessary for us to understand another series of works, five orations delivered by Gregory during the height of his career, and which led to one of his greatest moments – and greatest downfalls. These orations are now known as the *Theological Orations* (Ors. 27-31), delivered by Gregory in the church of the Anastasia soon before the arrival of Theodosius in the capital and the beginning of the Council of Constantinople.[359] In 380 Gregory had begun his ministry in Constantinople and faced a particularly difficult task. The city had long been an Arian stronghold, and Gregory's base of operations was nothing more than the little church of the Anastasia, the home of the small Nicene congregation that was still present in the city. Such was the animosity of the Arians to his presence that during the Easter vigil of 380 a group of rabble rousers broke into the church and let fly a hail of stones at Gregory. Nevertheless, it was perhaps this overwhelming opposition which the city imposed that led Gregory to produce some of the most eloquent expositions of his Nicene faith found in his orations.

Through an in-depth analysis of these orations, we will see the way in which Gregory employs his *paideia* to counter the arguments of his main opponent, Eunomius of Cyzicus. I will argue that Gregory in his *Theological Orations* – unlike Eunomius and Gregory's contemporary critics – does not only attempt to do theology with a high level of philosophical and logical precision (as does Eunomius), but also seeks to create a narrative through which he can entice his audience to enter into the divine mystery that begins with the Old Testament prophets and culminates in the current age in which, he believes, God the Holy Spirit has chosen to first manifest

[358] Sykes (1979:14) also mentions the *Orphic Hymns* in relation to Gregory's metrical preferences, but nothing else. See also Faulkner's (2010) article on the hymnic style of *PA* 1-3, which does not discuss at all the resonances of Orphic hymnody in these poems.
[359] On the date and location of these orations, see Norris (1991) and McGuckin (2001:277-278).

His divinity; and to show that Gregory is in fact the true inheritor of not only Greek *paideia* in every aspect, but also of true, apostolic Judaeo-Christianity. The ultimate aim, therefore, of these orations is to discredit his opponents by pointing out their inability to truly grasp the workings and meanings of Aristotelian logic and rhetoric, thus diminishing their status as *pepaideumenoi*. In so doing this, Gregory also seeks to enhance his own reputation through a successful and much broader display of *paideia*, that seeks to incorporate the identity of Moses (who is, as we have seen in the introduction, an exemplar of sacred and profane learning) and – to a certain extent – Jesus (the very originator of *Mythoi* - culture) to that of himself, the speaker.

Soon after Gregory delivered these speeches, he reached both the pinnacle and the pit of his career. Appointed Archbishop of the city and president of the Council in 380, his insistence on the divinity of the Spirit (and his involvement in a disputation over the succession of the Bishop of Antioch)[360] quickly lead to him being sidelined and sent packing, the legitimacy of his Archiepiscopacy brought into question. I will argue that the *PA*, far from being the late musings of the retired and disgruntled bishop of Nazianzus, are in fact an attempt by Gregory to open up a new avenue for engagement in the world of ecclesiastical politics that takes up directly from the *Theological Orations* that he delivered during his ministry at Constantinople.[361] In other words, Gregory seeks to re-present his theology by tapping into a different area of *paideia*. Not the world of Aristotelian logic and rhetoric, but the mystical and esoteric world of the Orphic hymns and Platonic demonology. Here Gregory presents himself not as a Moses, but as an Orpheus-figure, a divine bard who is inspired, not by the Muses, but by the Spirit. This strategy not only allows Gregory to display other aspects of his *paideia* that may only be open to him through the poetic medium, but also to tap into the mystical and esoteric nature of these hymns in particular to highlight and legitimise the centrality of divine incomprehensibility and the paradoxical nature of his theology, which are exemplified in the Orphic hymns and Platonic demonology.

The Battle for *Paideia* in the *Theological Orations*

Gregory makes clear in his first *Theological Oration* to whom his words are addressed: Πρὸς τοὺς ἐν λόγῳ κομψοὺς ('To those eloquent in words') (27.1) - κομψοὺς having pejorative undertones.[362] Gregory specifies his addressees even more clearly when he says (27.2):

> μὴ θαυμάσητε δέ, εἰ παράδοξον ἐρῶ λόγον, καὶ παρὰ τὸν ὑμέτερον νόμον, οἳ πάντα εἰδέναι τε καὶ διδάσκειν ὑπισχνεῖσθε λίαν νεανικῶς καὶ γενναίως, ἵνα μὴ λυπῶ λέγων ἀμαθῶς καὶ θρασέως.
> Do not marvel, if I speak paradoxically and alien to your custom, you who profess to know and teach everything in quite a preposterous and high-born manner – lest I cause grievance by saying "in an ignorant and rash manner".[363]

[360] See McGuckin (2001:350-369) for an account of the Council and Gregory's departure.
[361] As we shall see below, the link between the *PA* and the *Theological Orations* (Ors. 27-31) has already been well established by scholars.
[362] See *LSJ* s.v. κομψός.
[363] All translations are my own. Translations can also be found in Williams and Wickham (2002) – which is also found in Norris (1990) - and Reynolds' (2011) translation available at the following link: https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/handle/1807/36303.

Gregory is addressing the Eunomians who believed that one could know God as well as God knows Himself, for all one had to know about God was that He was unbegotten.[364] Furthermore, Gregory makes it clear that he is about to speak about the divine in a way quite different from his enemies. It must also be emphasised that we have here not only a clash of theological positions, but also a difference between the Eunomians' and Gregory's understanding of *paideia*. Norris' introduction to his commentary on the *Theological Orations* (1991:17-39) outlines in great detail the rhetorical framework in which Gregory (and his opponents worked within). The Arians 'prided themselves on and had the reputation of being masters in logical debates' (p.26). What survives of Eunomius' works would certainly evidence this claim,[365] and demonstrate just how familiar they were with the rhetorical works of Aristiotle. But, as Norris has shown, so too was Gregory. As we shall see, although Gregory was indeed familiar with and capable of using the rhetorical style of the Eunomians against them - a style that was defined by the use of tightly constructed enthymemes and syllogisms - it is this "alien" and "paradoxical" style with which Gregory imbues these orations that ultimately defines his theology, as well as displaying his much broader grasp and understanding of *paideia*.[366] It must be emphasised here, therefore, that what we have is not only a contrast between those who are orthodox or heretical, but also between those who are *honestiores* or *humiliores*, πεπαιδευμένοι or ἀπαίδευτοι. Gregory is fighting this battle on sophistic, as well as religious, grounds.[367]

Gregory goes on to state that it is not the place of everyone or anyone to philosophise (φιλοσοφεῖν) about God (27.3):

> οὐ πάντων μέν, ὅτι τῶν ἐξητασμένων καὶ διαβεβηκότων ἐν θεωρίᾳ, καὶ πρὸ τούτων καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα κεκαθαρμένων, ἢ καθαιρομένων, τὸ μετριώτατον.
>
> It is not for everyone, but most appropriate for those who have closely examined themselves, and have advanced in contemplation, and for those who are purified in soul and body or are in the process of purification

Engaging in such philosophising when one is not in a sufficient mental and physical state is akin to fixing weak eyes upon the sun's rays (a Platonic analogy which we discussed briefly in Ch. 3). In order to obtain this state one must be at leisure (σχολάσαι) in order to know God (something which only the elite could afford); and, when the right time comes, κρίνειν θεολογίας εὐθύτητα ('[it is necessary] to discern the straight way of theology') (27.3). I have translated *theoria* here as "contemplation", thus emphasising the spiritual dimension of the word. But Norris (1990:89) rightly points out that the word "study" is just as appropriate, and that Gregory has in mind here not

[364] See Kopecek (1979:299-359) for his summary of the argument of Eunomius' *Apologia*, especially pp. 311-312, and Norris (1990:54) for the sources of this Eunomian idea.
[365] For which, see Vaggione (1987).
[366] See particularly Norris (1990:87-88) where he discusses this passage in particular and highlights the 'concern for the larger problem of *paideia* itself', and pp.26-29, where he discusses the dissertation of Focken (1912) *passim*, which makes clear Gregory's understanding of Aristotelian logic, and highlights clear relations between Gregory's rhetorical structure (not only in his orations but his poetry as well) and Aristotle's work. See, also, Av. Cameron (2014) who points out the wide spread use of Aristotelian logic in debates and its prominence in the school curriculum.
[367] See Anderson (1989:105 ff.) for the sophistic polarisation of society into the "learned" and "unlearned."

only spiritual but also educational aptitude. Although there is little indication of it here, we will see below (as we have already seen in previous chapters) that a Greek cultural and literary education can often go hand in hand with one's spiritual advancement.

Gregory ends this opening oration in the style of a diatribe, engaging in a (one-sided) conversation with his opponent (27.8-10). Gregory begins (27.8):

> Καίτοιγε, ὦ διαλεκτικὲ καὶ λάλε, ἐρωτήσω σέ τι μικρόν· Σὺ δὲ ἀπόκριναί, φησι τῷ Ἰὼβ ὁ διὰ λαίλαπος καὶ νεφῶν χρηματίζων.
>
> And I, O dialectician, O prattler, will ask you a small question; and you will answer, just as He spoke to Job, making his utterances through storm and clouds.

Gregory makes here a reference to the book of Job 40.7, where God says the following to Job:

> μή, ἀλλὰ ζῶσαι ὥσπερ ἀνὴρ τὴν ὀσφύν σου, ἐρωτήσω δέ σε, σὺ δέ μοι ἀπόκριναι·[368]
>
> No! But gird your loins like a man. I will ask you and you will answer me

Gregory clearly echoes in his speech the second half of this verse. The Eunomian is cast in the role of Job, prattling about things they do not know and unable to defend themselves against an opponent as mighty as God. They spend their time rushing down the way of, what they call, reason and speculation (τὴν διὰ λόγου καὶ θεωρίας), but what Gregory calls the way of verbosity and fantasy (ἀδολεσχίας καὶ τερατείας) (27.8). Norris' translation of ἀδολεσχίας καὶ τερατείας as 'gossip and sensationalism' (1990:96) would further emphasise the low-brow credentials of the Enomians, and we see again that Gregory is at pains to stress the lack of education found in his opponents. Gregory mockingly compares the Eunomians to Moses, Paul, and Elijah: perhaps they have been raised up to the heights, seeing the back of God like Moses or going after Elijah to heaven, or, like Paul, raised up into the third heaven. Clearly, they have not. All they have achieved, says Gregory, is the corruption of the faithful, and the worldwide division of the Church in their war of words. They should attack instead the philosophical schools of Pythagoras, Plato, or Epicurus, or refute the practices of the pagan cults.[369] Gregory even goes so far as to say that they should feel free to discuss metaphysics, or the nature of resurrection, judgement and the passion of Christ (27.10):

> ἐν τούτοις γὰρ καὶ τὸ ἐπιτυγχάνειν οὐκ ἄχρηστον, καὶ τὸ διαμαρτάνειν ἀκίνδυνον. θεῷ δὲ ἐντευξόμεθα, νῦν μὲν ὀλίγα, μικρὸν δὲ ὕστερον ἴσως τελεώτερον, ἐν αὐτῷ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν.
> For in these things it is not useless when we hit the mark, and there's no peril in failing hopelessly. But we converse now with God only a little - and perhaps a little latter on more perfectly – in the same Christ Jesus, our Lord, to whom belongs the glory throughout the ages. Amen.

[368] The edition of the LXX used prefers the reading ἀποκρίθητι with ἀπόκριναί a possible variant, but since Gregory here uses ἀπόκριναί, I have preferred this in my rendering of the text of Job.
[369] Perhaps this is a subtle hint by Gregory that the Eunomians had benefitted under the reign of the Pagan philosopher-emperor Julian (see Elm, 2012:238-239).

It is puzzling why Gregory would think that theology proper was inappropriate for his opponents to discuss, but the resurrection or Christ's passion fair game. Norris (1990:98) points out that this may be a reference to rhetorical school exercises in which students set about learning and memorising speeches on frivolous topics. In other words, his opponents should concern themselves with things that would have a more innocuous effect on its listeners. Whatever the meaning, it is clear once more that Gregory is disparaging the limited education of his opponents, despite their own view of themselves as rhetorical masters. Gregory in this opening oration makes clear before he outlines his doctrine of the Trinity why the Eunomian doctrine is false. To claim to know God as fully as He knows Himself is unscriptural, not even Moses, Elijah, or St. Paul could claim such a thing. The Eunomians' fault lies not in their use of reason, logic and argumentation, but in their lack of reverence for the ineffable mysteries of the Christian faith. It is in Christ, the narrow way from which Gregory accuses the Eunomians of straying, that we come to the knowledge of God; and this short doxology which closes the oration makes quite clear to Gregory's listeners the Nicene faith in the Son's consubstantiality with the Father which Gregory holds and seeks to defend here.

Gregory, after recapping what was said in his first oration, begins his second by invoking yet another biblical image of the mysterious nature of God, Exodus 19.[370] Gregory, like Moses, ascends the mountain wreathed in smoke eager in his desire to know God but anxious in the knowledge of his own weakness. In accordance with their purification the audience ascends with him; those like Aaron, the priest, can come with him by his side, those like the elders can ascend but stand far off, and the impure can simply stand at the bottom of the mountain to hear the voice and trumpet blast which comes down from the mountain. But for those who, like wild beasts, cannot comprehend Gregory's theology, they are not to lurk in wait to tear to shreds his sound words (τοὺς ὑγιαίνοντας λόγους – a reference to 1 Tim 6.3; 2 Tim 1.13) (28.2). Gregory displays here a tour de force in scriptural knowledge, invoking not only various passages of scripture, but also animals that were considered unclean in Jewish tradition – thus showing an in-depth familiarity with the Torah. Gregory makes quite clear here that, contra Eunomian theology, true theology can only be done if one is pure and fit to ascend the mount upon which God reveals Himself.[371] And even then Gregory, as Moses, could only see the back of God, which for Gregory is the glory of God that is manifested among His creatures (28.3). Gregory reinforces the point made in his first oration: that God is ineffable and true knowledge of Him can only be obtained by those who are pure.[372] The sophisticated and heavy use of scripture in the opening of this oration also shows that Gregory is deeply familiar with scripture and unlikely to pedal ideas contrary to the Bible – a common objection of the Eunomians against the Nicene party being that their idea of the

[370] Some uncertainty about the position of oration 28 arises from the manuscript tradition. McGuckin (2001:278) and Behr (2004: 332-333) seem to have little problem with placing the oration here in the sequence. It certainly does little to disrupt the flow of Gregory's argument.
[371] See Vaggione's article (1993) on Arianism and monasticism, which suggests that Eunomians were far less concerned with rigorous ascetical practices than their Nicene counterparts.
[372] Norris (1990:109) gives a brief summary of other Christian writers who held such a belief in the incomprehensibility of the divine.

Trinity was not founded in scripture.[373] Furthermore, we must remember, as discussed in our introduction, that Moses is a figure who embodies both sacred and profane *paideia*. And so, Gregory is further emphasising not only his claims to holiness and to be a true prophet of God, but also his self-created identity as *prytanis* of sacred and profane learning.

Gregory here begins a very lengthy philosophical discourse on man's limits of reason and knowledge. Although we cannot know fully the nature of God, that does not mean to say that our reason cannot sufficiently tell us that God exists (28.5). Gregory offers a sort of 'Divine watchmaker' argument, saying that anyone who sets eyes on a most beautiful lute (κιθάρα) or hears it can only think of the player or its makers – even if one does not know them by sight. So too we can see from creation that there is a creator, even though we have no knowledge of him; for philosophical enquiry can tell us very little about God without posing many problematic questions itself (28.7-8). All that can be confirmed about God is that He is ἀσώματος, and even then (28.9):

> οὔπω μὲν οὐδὲ τοῦτο τῆς οὐσίας παραστατικόν τε καὶ περιεκτικόν, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὸ ἀγέννητον, καὶ τὸ ἄναρχον, καὶ τὸ ἀναλλοίωτον, καὶ τὸ ἄφθαρτον, καὶ ὅσα περὶ θεοῦ ἢ περὶ θεὸν εἶναι λέγεται.
>
> This term is neither indicative nor comprehensive as regards God's being, just like "unoriginated" and "without cause" and "immutable" and "immortal", and so many other terms that are used about God or in reference to Him.

Such philosophical wrangling (especially the term ἀγέννητον, of which the Eunomians were so fond) get us nowhere in discerning more clearly what God is. In short, '[n]ames do not reveal nature' (Norris, 1990:33). The use of such apophatic terms, according to Gregory, in trying to get to the bottom of what God is, is like answering the question "what is 2x5" by saying what 2x5 is not rather than just simply saying "10". For Gregory to comprehend God is to circumscribe the uncircumscribable – for to comprehend God is, in a way, to circumscribe Him.[374] Norris (1990:114) has noted that this difference in understanding on the theory of language – and the use of names in particular – is one of the crucial differences in *paideia* between the Eunomians and Gregory. Although, as Norris notes, the two sides differ, in that the Eunomian would say that a given adjective or predicate denotes what something essentially is (God *is agennetos*, and is, therefore, not *gennetos*) and Gregory would say that such terms can be used of two or more essences, what we shall see more clearly in the *PA* is how Gregory will use other aspects of his *paideia* (especially his wider reading and use of Greek literature) in order to make his point in a much less philosophical (but rather, poetic) but equally learned way.

---

[373] For Eunomius' view on divine incomprehensibility see Vaggione (2000:167-9). See also Hofer (2013: 35-45) which looks at the rhetorical use of scripture throughout Gregory's corpus, looking at examples from his Orations and *PA* 8.

[374] Gregory here is not only dealing with a recent theological dispute over the nature of God but also a much more ancient philosophical discussion on the relation of names to essences, which was important to Eunomius' theology. For Gregory, these words cannot tell us about God's incomprehensible essence. See Norris (1990:33,61-63) and Elm (2012:245-255) for a summary of this ancient debate, Gregory and Eunomius' position on it, and the implications that this has for their theology.

Man cannot know God too easily, for, if he were able to do so, he would not value the knowledge as of any worth at all (28.12):

> φιλεῖ γὰρ τὸ μὲν πόνῳ κτηθὲν μᾶλλον κρατεῖσθαι, τὸ δὲ ῥᾳδίως κτηθὲν καὶ ἀποπτύεσθαι τάχιστα, ὡς πάλιν ληφθῆναι δυνάμενον·
>
> For a man loves more to grasp on to what he has acquired through hard work, but what he acquires easily he tosses out, as he can easily acquire it again.

Gregory's argument thus far – despite his display of his own philosophical acumen – has been quite simple: God cannot be easily known as the Eunomians claim, nor does it make sense that God would make Himself easily known; for, if He were to do that, knowledge of Him would be valued by no one. In chs. 13-15 Gregory makes quite clear where man's clear failure to reason his way to the divine has lead him: either he has set up created objects as gods and deified the sun and stars so that astral bodies are made responsible for the goings on of this world, or he has decided to worship his own lust and passions and deified them so as to justify them.[375] Gregory outlines the Christian way: reason is good and an aid in discerning the existence of God, but it cannot lead us to further discern his nature and essence (φύσις καὶ οὐσία) (ch.16-17). In Gregory's opinion, we will only have full knowledge of God's nature and essence (17):

> ἐπειδὰν τὸ θεοειδὲς τοῦτο καὶ θεῖον, λέγω δὲ τὸν ἡμέτερον νοῦν τε καὶ λόγον, τῷ οἰκείῳ προσμίξῃ, καὶ ἡ εἰκὼν ἀνέλθῃ πρὸς τὸ ἀρχέτυπον, οὗ νῦν ἔχει τὴν ἔφεσιν. καὶ τοῦτο εἶναί μοι δοκεῖ τὸ πάνυ φιλοσοφούμενον, ἐπιγνώσεσθαι ποτε ἡμᾶς,ὅσον ἐγνώσμεθα.
>
> When that which is godlike and divine – that is our mind and reason - is mixed with its like, and the image ascends to the Archetype, for which it longs. This, it seems to me, is the sum of the philosophical life: "That we will know as we are known" (1 Cor 13:12).

Nothing short of the glory and bliss promised to us by Christ in the final resurrection will allow us to fully know God; anyone who has knowledge of God only has it relatively speaking and not absolutely. We must also keep in mind the centrality of Christ in Gregory's conception of *paideia*. As we have seen in our introductory discussion of the epistolary letters exchanged between Nicoboulus jr. and sr., Christ is the one who gives the gift of *mythoi* (culture) to man; and it is only in making Christ as the κλείς (the key) of our *paideia* - as Nicoboulus' uncle Gregory does – that it finds its use and perfection. In this oration, already, Gregory has quoted Plato and another unknown, Pagan author.[376] Gregory is not afraid to harness his knowledge of non-Christian literature, as long as its aim is to mingle that which is godlike and divine, not only our soul, but *paideia* with its Archetype, God.

Gregory then gives a string of biblical proofs, citing characters from the bible as early as Enosh and Elijah up to Peter and Paul who have had knowledge of God that cannot be conveyed by

[375] Subjects which are found (and further discussed below) in the *PA*.
[376] Plato's *Timaeus* 28C is quoted at 28.4, and the unknown author who is explicitly called "non-Christian" at 28.16.

human speech or reason (chs. 18-22). Even Solomon, the wisest of men, to whom God had given a broad heart and an abundance of contemplation more ample than the sands declared that the fulfilment of wisdom is εὑρεῖν ὅσον διέφυγεν ('to discover just how far it flees from you' [Qo7:23]). Chs. 23-30 shows just how far even the comprehension of physical nature is from human wisdom, going through all the creatures of creation, plants, and astronomical phenomena – something which we see Marriage and Virginity do in Ch. 3 to display their *paideia*. Gregory closes this oration by ascending finally to incorporeal (angelic) natures, going beyond the tabernacle of Moses (τὴν Μωυσέως σκηνὴν) – symbol of the created and visible order. The contemplation of such angelic beings makes us dizzy (ἰλιγγιῶμεν) and all we can know are their various names as Angels, Archangels, Thrones, Dominions, and so on.[377] If we cannot even comprehend them, how can we begin to claim that we know God fully, if at all? It is on this basis of mystery and unknowing, which has, as Gregory has displayed, a firm rooting throughout all of scripture, that Gregory tentatively launches into his discussion of the Son. As we shall see, it is this mystical aspect of Gregory's theology which he seeks to amplify and propagate through his utilisation of *paideia* in the *PA* in particular.

It is here that Gregory finally begins to answer the objections of Eunomian theology and proposes in detail the Nicene homoousian position on questions surrounding God's essence. For the Eunomian God's essence was synonymous with ungeneratedness, and so the idea that God could be both the ungenerated Father and the begotten Son was unthinkable in a Eunomian theology. For Eunomius, the unbegotten and the begotten cannot be the same thing, otherwise, the Son is the same as the Father (29.10). Gregory says that such thinking inevitably excludes one of the persons from divinity. The question, more specifically, is not between uncreated and created – for then there would be a difference between the two – but between unbegotten and begotten. Furthermore, it is necessary that the unbegotten and the begotten share the same essence, for so too do offspring in the natural world share the same nature/essence with their parents (humans do not give birth to pigs, and so on). Unbegottennes and begotenness do not in any way define the divine essence but are simply attributes of it – just as wisdom and lack of wisdom are attributes of the essence "humanity" despite not being the same things in and of themselves (29.10). Indeed, there are other attributes apart from ungeneratedness that even the Eunomian could apply to God, such as immortal, good, innocent and so on – and Gregory will hammer home this point in the *PA* through his invocation of Orphic hymnody. This does not mean that God has multiple essences or even that God shares an essence similar to humans or other natures – since other natures can be good, innocent and so on - for God's essence is unique to Himself alone; rather it means that these attributes – ungeneratedness included – can in no way encapsulate the essence of God in its entirety. Gregory also points out the difficulty of making ungeneratedness synonymous with God and His essence. For, if we were to make God synonymous with ungeneratedness, '[i]t would be absolutely necessary that, since God is the God of certain things, that He be the unbegotten of

[377] Gregory will go on to try and comprehend these angelic being in the *PA*.

certain things' (29.12). But since this is not the case (it has never been said in scripture that God is the unbegotten of X) God's essence cannot be synonymous with ungeneratedness. In other words, it is not essential to His nature that God be unbegotten.

Gregory then goes on to define further the relationship between the unbegotten Father and His only begotten Son. The Father is greater than the Son only in respects to his being the cause of the Son, and not by nature. In other words, being the cause of the Son is not intrinsic to the nature of the Father – and so to say the Father is greater as regards causation does not imply that his nature is in anyway greater than that of the Son's (29.15). One could elaborate further by saying that just because each person within the triune Godhead has certain attributes (God the Father as Cause of Son and Spirit; God the Son as redeemer; God the Spirit as sanctifier) it does not necessarily follow that their nature or essence (φύσις or οὐσία) is in any way different from or greater than the other persons in the Trinity. It is here that another question is posed by his opponents: is the Father an essence or an action (οὐσία ἢ ἐνεργεία)? For, if He is an essence, then it must follow that the Son is of a different essence, for the Father has taken possession of it first; but, if they say the Father designates an action, then they must admit that the Son is created and not begotten – in the same way that a carpenter who, by his actions, creates a chair does not create something which shares his essence (for one is a human and the other a chair). Gregory proposes a third way: Father does not designate an essence or an action but a relation (σχέσις)[378] (29.16). Just as a human son is no less human than his father, so too is the divine Son no less God than the divine Father. The way that Gregory frames the question and answer here is quite interesting. His opponent poses a question which seems to have only two outcomes, both of which unfavourable to Gregory's position and designed ultimately to catch him out. But Gregory, nevertheless, devises a third way to answer the question. Gregory, therefore, is casting his opponent as a sort of Pharisee in the Gospel, formulating question on marriage and divorce, or paying tax to Caesar that are designed to catch out Christ, but which Christ manages to turn on its head and thus show up the Pharisees.

Gregory briefly ends this oration by going through the arguments for and against his position from scripture. The basic rule of thumb is that those passages which seem to deny Christ's divinity should be attributed to his human nature, and the passages which confirm His divinity to his divine nature. He then elaborates upon these passages in detail in the following oration. Putting aside the strength or weakness of Gregory's argument, he has successfully accomplished one thing thus far through his orations: he has caricatured his opponents as irreverent, blasphemous, and unchristian; they are Pharisees who pose questions framed to catch its answerer out, forcing him no matter how he answers to concede to their position (such as the ones cited above). Gregory, however, like Christ, has always posed a third solution to confound the Eunomians. Whether or not Gregory's audience fully agreed with or understood his arguments, it would have been clear that Gregory seems to possess the Christ-like ability of escaping the

[378] As Norris (1990:151) points out that Gregory is not the only one to talk of the relationship between Father and Son. *The Dialogue of the Trinity* – attributed either to Athanasius or Didymus the Blind – also uses the term σχέσις (and Norris suggests that Gregory may well have been taught by Didymus).

sophistic questions posed by his opponents and proposing a solution of which they themselves had not thought. This in itself could have helped to sway Gregory's audience to his side.

Skipping over *Ors.* 30-31 for brevity's sake, we can discern three main strategies used by Gregory to refute his opponents and portray his own theology. Firstly, he casts his opponents as mere Pharisees, creating conundrums that seem sophisticated and learned but which Gregory (like Christ) dismantles with ease. He creates a subtle self-portrayal, in which he plays the roles of Christ and the Eunomians as the enemies of Christ. Secondly, he fights fire with fire by engaging with the philosophical nature of his opponents claims and further backs up his argument with Scriptural proofs. Finally, although he is willing and able to engage with the Eunomians on a philosophical level and to fight strict logic with strict logic, he is also trying to create a narrative of salvation history. A narrative that begins with the Old Testament, where Christ and the Trinity are faintly present, only to become more fully present in the New Testament, and finally revealed to mankind most fully in the present day. Gregory shares with his audience the true nature of God not only through his rhetorical or philosophical acumen (great though it may be) but also through his self-portrayal as a sort of Christ refuting the Pharisees, or a Moses high upon the mountain seeing the hind parts of God. However, just as we have seen throughout this thesis that Christ, the Logos, is the source and summit of *paideia*, so too does Gregory portray himself as one properly schooled in the many facets of Greek education and culture, while the Eunomian possesses a mere shadow of Gregory's *paideia*. Therefore, we see that Gregory in constructing his orthodox Christian identity needs not only to negotiate his authority through claiming to be a true interpreter and lineage holder to the teaching of the apostles, but also as a sound authority on Greek *paideia* – particularly its philosophical aspects here,[379] and so Gregory becomes the *pepaideumenos* and Eunomius the *idiotes* (the non-expert, as Eshleman would translate it). Therefore, this oration is not only about denouncing (and creating) a heresy (and heretics), but also about cementing Gregory's image as a true embodiment of philosophical *paideia* and Eunomius' image as a mere imitator. Such contests for recognition of one's identity is a thing in which the elite men of the Second Sophistic repeatedly engaged.[380]

Norris (1990:61) has already pointed out that these orations highlight not only a difference between Gregory and the Eunomians in theology, but of *paideia* also. However, he focuses more on the rhetorical, logical, linguistic, and epistemological differences between the two (highlighted above in our discussion). But it must be added that this "third strategy" – the creation of a narrative in which Gregory is a sort of Moses/Jesus figure – also highlights a difference of each side's grasp of *paideia*. For Gregory shows himself to have a much broader understanding of *paideia* - that is, he shows himself to be not only more widely educated but more fully immersed in the culture and literature that has shaped Greek thought and religious practice. The incomprehensibility of the

[379] See especially Lyman's article (2003a) in which she discusses Justin Martyr in particular and his creation of heresy and the heretic depending on negotiating the cultural traditions of Hellenism as well as Christian Scripture and tradition.
[380] On which see especially Eshleman (2012:67-90).

divine is well demonstrated by this "third strategy", but it is also easily understandable for the reader who can see the parallels which Gregory creates between his (theological) narrative and those of earlier Greek writers.[381] Furthermore, it is an idea that is much less novel than the Eunomian belief that one can know God as well as He knows Himself;[382] and, as we shall see in our discussion of the *PA*, Gregory is not afraid to use his wider knowledge of Greek (Pagan) literature to further emphasise and communicate the main tenets of his theology. It is this third strategy that is unique to Gregory in comparison to his Eunomian opponent, and which – as we shall see – is further developed in the *Poemata Arcana*.

Once we have established a clear link between the *Theological Orations* and the *PA* – as already widely noted by scholars – we shall see how Gregory uses his *paideia* in a different way from the orations discussed above, one that emphasises Gregory's Greek culture and education over (but not exclusive of) Scripture. This is accomplished by invoking different sources of Greek literature and philosophy from the ones invoked in the orations above. This change is not so much dictated by the use of the poetic medium, but is a deliberate choice, as the *PA* emphasises much more clearly parts of Gregory's doctrine that are not so emphasised in the *Theological Orations*. It also further exemplifies the self-honed image of Gregory as the *prytanis* of both kinds of *sophia* and provides further insight into Gregory's conception of *paideia*.

The *PA*: A New Front in the Battle for *Paideia*

The *Poemata Arcana* are a collection of eight didactic-hymnic, hexameter poems traditionally put together that were most likely written after the council of Constantinople in the year 381 or early 382.[383] The series begins with three poems that lay out Gregory's doctrine of the Trinity. From here he moves onto an explanation of the natural world mostly aimed against Manicheans (*PA* 4). *PA* 5 deals with the topic of God's providence and is aimed against the belief in astrology. *PA* 6 discusses the angelic natures; *PA* 7 is on the soul, how it incarnates in the flesh, and the incarnation of Christ; and, finally, *PA* 8 discusses the Old and New Testaments and the history of salvation for men. There is a general scholarly consensus on the issue of dating the *PA*. *PA* 1.14-15, in which the Word drives out wicked men from Gregory's congregation because their hearts were set against God, is thought to be a reference to Theodosius' expulsion of the Arian clergy from Constantinople after 27 November 380. The outspokenness of Gregory on the divinity of the Holy Spirit has also been taken as evidence for its dating late in Gregory's life. Sykes (1970:37-38) suggests that the soundest evidence for dating the *PA* is found in his stance on Apollinariansim. He believes that the Christological rhetoric of the *PA* is clearly anti-Eunomian as opposed to anti-Apollinarian. We

[381] See Halfwassen (2014:197-199) who discusses the ideas of incomprehensibility of and transcendence towards the One in Plotinus, and Smith (2004:95-98).
[382] As we noted above, Gregory in *Or*. 28.4 quotes Plato's *Timaeus* (28C) to support his claim that it is (at most) difficult to know God, contra the Eunomian claim.
[383] Sykes and Moreschini (1997:57-59) emphasise the didactic nature of these poems, and I agree that they certainly fit well into this tradition. But see also Faulkner (2010) who emphasises the hymnic elements of this poem – as well as our own analysis of the poem below.

know that Gregory will later in *Ep.* 101 (dated to the summer of 382) and *Ep.* 125 (dated to 383) make a stronger polemic against Apollinariansim (see also *Carm.* I.I.10).

The *PA* opens with a simile that describes the mind's journey towards the divine (*PA* 1.1-5):

> Οἶδα μὲν ὡς σχεδίῃσι μακρὸν πλόον ἐκπερόωμεν,
> Ἢ τυτθαῖς πτερύγεσσι πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα
> Σπεύδομεν, οἷσιν ὄρωρε νόος Θεότητ' ἀναφαίνειν,
> Ἣν οὐδ' οὐρανίοισι σέβειν σθένος, ὅσσον ἐοικὸς,
> Ἢ μεγάλης Θεότητος ὅρους, καὶ οἴακα παντός.
>
> I know that we set out upon a great voyage in a skiff, or hasten upon hatchling's wings towards the starry sky, by which the mind stirs to shed light upon the divinity which not even the angels have strength to worship fittingly, or the bounds of the great Divinity and His governance of all things.

Just as in the *Theological Orations* Gregory makes it clear that full knowledge and understanding of God is impossible for mortals in this life, for not even the angels can worship Him fittingly. What is different in the *PA* is the simile that Gregory uses. It is not the image of Moses ascending Mount Sinai with the various ranks of the Israelites ascending in as much as their purity allowed, but rather images that are drawn from non-Christian literature. Here Gregory seems to invoke the long-suffering Odysseus, who travelled, in the end, alone and at the mercy of the gods (the great voyage in a skiff),[384] and Daedalus who with his son flew on man-made wings to escape prison – and Gregory's readers would all know what happened to his unfortunate son who attempted to fly too close to the sun. A little further on and we see that Gregory is not addressing his poems Πρὸς τοὺς ἐν λόγῳ κομψοὺς ('to those eloquent in words'), i.e. the Eunomians (*Or*.27.1), but to καθαροῖσιν/ Ἠὲ καθαιρομένοισιν ('those who are purified or in the process of being purified') (1.9-10). The sinner is to flee far off (ἀπὸ τῆλε / Φεύγετε, ὅστις ἀλιτρός) (1.8-9) – perhaps a subtle reference to Callimachus' hymn to Apollo.[385] These purified ones are set in contrast to the wicked men whom the Word had cast out of Gregory's congregation since they had θεμάχον ἦτορ ('a heart battling against God') (1.15). Although Gregory is invoking here various poets who do not feature on the *Theological Orations*, we also see that he is using a similar image to the one discussed above and found at *Or*.28.1-3, in which Gregory portrays himself as a type of Moses, with the profane compared to wild beasts, far off, away from the holy mountain. Furthermore, it should be noted that Gregory in inviting the unworthy to flee or stop up their ears (as he does in the

[384] See Lorenz (1979), Freise (1983), and Kuhn (2014:72-76) on the use of seafaring imagery in Gregory's poetry.

[385] Kambylis (1982) suggests that Gregory has in mind here Callimachus' hymn to Apollo. Kambylis provides as evidence some similarities in phrasing and vocabulary within a motif of a warning to sinners to not approach the divinity; the difference between the two is that Callimachus uses by and large visual imagery whereas Gregory has more emphasis upon speech/sound in his imagery. The connection, in my opinion, is tentative at best, but it is clear in this prologue opening the *PA* that Gregory has been influenced by earlier Pagan literature and imagery drawn from it. Furthermore, Keydell (1951:315) suggests that the first verse of *PA* 3 (θυμέ, τί δηθύνεις; καῖ πνεύματος εὔχος ἀειδε) is similar to that of Callimachus' Hymn to Delos (Τήν ἱερήν, ὡ θυμέ, τίνα χρόνον, εἶπον, ἀτίσσεις Δήλον). Similar formulae of repulsing sinners/the impure can be found throughout Orphic poetry, as West notes (1983:34). See also Bassi (1989) on Callimachus' hymn to Apollo.

poem to Virginity discussed in Ch.3), leaving only the pure who understand to listen, can be seen not only as the act of a mystagogue about to initiate his disciples, but also as an act of a teacher about to teach his students. Ballard (2017) notes how writers such as Plutarch and Dionysius of Halicarnassus would use 'mystery metaphor[s]' to describe their relationship with their students and the *paideia* which they sought to impart upon them. Therefore, we must keep in mind that Gregory, by invoking such mystical, ritual imagery, is not only casting himself as a *theologos* in communion with the Divine, but also as a teacher of a sacred *paideia*. In initiating his readers into the mysteries held within the *PA*, Gregory becomes our teacher and we his pupils, and thus he becomes a figure of authority which is earned – as we shall see more clearly – through the display of his *paideia*, of knowledge both sacred and profane.

This prologue that outlines the fate of the purified and the downfall of the wicked is likened to the words of Moses and Isaiah, Λαῷ τάρβος ἄγοντες ἀπηνέϊ μάρτυρε μύθων ('The two witnesses to holy sayings who brought fear [of the Lord] to an obstinate people') (1.18). The dual form μάρτυρε gives Isaiah and Moses an almost Homeric heroic status. They are the witnesses of the true myths of scripture, a piece of literature that only the ἐπιστάμενοι ('those who understand') would know fully (1.19). Οὐρανὸς εἰσαΐοι, χθὼν δέχνυσο ῥήματ' ἐμοῖο ('Let heaven hear and earth receive my word.') (1.21). This is a line that only the ἐπιστάμενοι would know to be from both the book of Deuteronomy (and, therefore, of Moses) and the book of Isaiah, a prophet.[386] Gregory finishes his prologue by invoking God the Holy Spirit (1.22):

> Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, σὺ δ' ἔμοιγε νόον καὶ γλῶσσαν ἐγείροις
> Ἀτρεκίης σάλπιγγα ἐρίβρομον, ὥς κεν ἅπαντες
> Τέρπωνται κατὰ θυμὸν ὅλῃ Θεότητι μιγέντες.
>
> Spirit of God, rouse my mind and tongue to be a booming fanfare, so that all who have mingled with the fullness of divinity may have delight in their hearts.

Sykes and Moreschini (1997:84) notes that the normal invocation of the Muses found in the prologues of Pagan poetry is replaced here with an invocation of the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, the word ἐρίβρομον is often used of Bacchus, such as in the *Homeric Hymns* and – more pertinently – of various deities in the *OH*.[387] From the very beginning of the *PA* Gregory makes it very clear that the audience which he is addressing (the pure (*katharoi*) and the learned (*epistamenoi*)) are both familiar with the Bible and Hellenic culture. Thus, it is made clear here – as is emphasised in our discussion on the *Poem to Virginity* (Chapter 3) – that one can be both *katharos* and *pepaideumenos*; in fact, to be both is almost essential to fully comprehending and enjoying these poems and to embodying their ideal.

In the *PA*, we can discern a theology that is not only in line with that espoused by Gregory in his *Theological Orations*, but also dependent upon these speeches. That is, one must be familiar with the speeches in order to understand the theology of the *PA*, which is a summation of Gregory's theology. Keydell (1951:315-316) has already pointed out the parallels in thought

[386] Dt. 32:1 and Is. 1.2. See Sykes and Moreschini (1997:84).
[387] See *LSJ* s.v. ἐρί-βρομος. The word is found in the *OH* 21.3,30.1, 45.4, 48.2, 69.1.

between the *PA* and the *Theological Orations*.[388] But what we have further emphasised here is that there is also a certain continuation in polemic. We have seen in the *Theological Orations* that Gregory casts himself, the speaker, as a sort of Moses at the top of Mount Sinai, receiving directly from God his commandments and seeing his 'hind parts'. His enemies, on the other hand, are further down the mountain, if not the wild, unclean animals that wander aimlessly at the very bottom. Gregory, furthermore, portrays himself as a sort of Christ answering expertly the cunning and impious riddles posed by the Pharisees (the Eunomians), confining them to infamy and silence.

However, what we shall see in our discussion of the *PA* is that Gregory does not don these Biblical mantles, but rather, a Hellenic one. Throughout the *PA* Gregory re-frames (and re-phrases) the Biblical episodes alluded to in the lines by invoking various authors of ancient Greek literature – most prominently the Orphic hymns as we shall see. But this re-framing makes it quite clear that Gregory has a slightly different audience in mind from the orations. His *Theological Orations* could be heard – and most likely understood – by most educated elites, but the *PA*, with its poetic metre and various allusions to earlier Greek literature, is clearly aimed at those who would consider themselves to be true *pepaideumenoi* who could understand the archaic Greek of Homer. We can say, therefore, from the outset that Gregory, in re-visiting many of the points already made in the above orations, is seeking to further cement his identity as a *pepaideumenos* and further integrate himself in to those who would consider themselves part of that community, thus making his theology (contra that of Eunomius) synonymous with *paideia*.

The *Orphic Hymns* in the *PA*

There is no time or space here to discuss the figure of Orpheus or Orphic poetry and religion as a whole.[389] Instead we must focus particularly on the Orphic hymns. As Athanassakis has noted (2013:x): 'A few ancient sources make direct or oblique reference to Orphic hymns, but they need not refer to our *Hymns*.' The vocabulary of these hymns provides little help in dating, for, as Rudhardt points out, the language used in these poems can trace their origins from the Hellenistic period through to the fifth Century AD (2008:171). Athanassakis gives some evidence for a *terminus post quem* of 200 AD, but as for a *terminus ante quem*, it would seem the middle of the third century AD is 'as good a guess as any' for Athanassakis (2013:x). As for the hymns' geographical origins, there is much stronger evidence for this. Some of the lesser known gods in

[388] See, also the more recently published articles by Nardi (1990), which draws parallels between *PA* 1 and the *Theological Orations* (Passim), and D-Vasilescu (2017), which focuses in particular on the similarities between *PA* 2, *On the Son* and *Ors.* 29-30.

[389] Maass (1895) provides some thoughts on Orphic religion and its influence on Christianity – though see Macler (1896) for his criticisms of the monograph. Guthrie (1952) provides further research on the place of Orpheus in Greek religion, with a concluding study on its influence within Christianity. Böhme (1980) focuses more on restoring Orpheus' place in Greek literature – but again, see Crahay (1971) for his scathing criticisms of Böhme. West's monograph (1983) on the Orphic poems provides a thorough introduction to various *Orphica*, from the Jewish poems to the various theogonies found attributed to Orpheus. There is not, however, an extended discussion of the hymns. Segal's work (1989) focuses much more on the man and they myth of Orpheus and its influence on literature both in antiquity and in the works of the German poet Rilke. Of much more interest to our current study is Schelske's study and commentary on the *Orphic Argonautica* (2011), which provides some insight into the reception of Orpheus in late antiquity (and discussed further below).

the hymns can also be found in inscriptional evidence from Asia Minor. Kern (1911) has argued more specifically for the hymns' origins in Pergamon. Although there is some debate as to whether or not the hymns truly originated in Pergamon, it seems safe to say that their origins (if not their wide use, given the inscriptional evidence) in Asia Minor is almost certain. It would follow then that Gregory, a well-read man from Cappadocia, would have heard of and read these poems. Our discussion of the *PA* will make this point much stronger.

Although I have discussed above already the form and structure of Greek hymnody (see Ch. 3), I have not discussed at all the peculiar collection of the *Orphic Hymns* that have come down to us.[390] As we have seen above, Greek hymns tend to take a three-part formula: (1) invocation – summoning the god to hear the speaker; (2) *pars epica/media* – in which the speaker recounts the deeds of the god; and (3) concluding prayer – in which the speaker makes their petition. For Orphic hymns, however, it is best to see the hymns formed in a slightly different three-part formula, which Morand (2001:40) terms: invocation, development, and demand. It is this middle section – the "development" – with which we will be primarily concerned. The "development" comes after the initial invocation of the god and can be seen as an extension of it. Here the singer further defines the god through further listing their epithets or through the insertion of relative or participial clauses that provide more detail of the god being invoked – perhaps alluding to their realm of influence or referring to a myth in which the god features (Morand 2013:58-59). What defines this section of the hymn most of all is its paratactical structure. Rudhardt (1991:265-268) has shed some light on how these paratactical sections work, and the difficulty of seeing where certain sense-units begin and end.[391] Nevertheless, it can be said that it is this development of the invocation that defines a hymn as particularly Orphic.

We can see in *PA* 1-3 many examples of epithets (or short phrases) being strung together much like in Orphic hymns. When Gregory begins to speak of God in *PA 1* he says (1. 25-28):

> Εἷς Θεός ἐστιν ἄναρχος, ἀναίτιος, οὐ περίγραπτος
> Ἤ τινι πρόσθεν ἐόντι, ἢ ἐσσομένῳ μετέπειτα,
> Αἰῶν' ἀμφὶς ἔχων, καὶ ἀπείριτος, Υἱέος ἐσθλοῦ
> Μουνογενοῦς μεγάλοιο Πατὴρ μέγας …
>
> The one God is without beginning, without cause, not circumscribed by anything existing before or in the time to come. He encompasses eternity, he is infinite, the great Father of the great and excellent Son, his only-begotten …

This list goes on until the end of the poem (28-39).[392] A similar list to the one found here can be found in *PA* 3. 1-9 on the Holy Spirit. Keydell (1951:316) notes that *PA* 4.14 has a resonance with an Orphic verse, fr. 297 b where Zeus is described as Ζεύς δέ τε πάντων έστί θεός πάντων τε κεραστής (Zeus is the God of all and the one that mixes all). In 4.14-15, Gregory says ει δ' ὁ

[390] See Athanassakis (2013:ix) and Morand (2001:33) for the manuscript origins of the *OH*.
[391] See, also, Rudhardt (2008:197-205) where he further develops his thoughts on this particular problem.
[392] See Nardi (1990:160) who points out that the phrase οἵακα παντός in *PA* 1.5 is also found in *OH* 58.8 of Eros (τούτων πάντων οἵηκα) and 87.1 of Thanatos (πάντων θνητῶν οἵηκα).

κεραστὴς / εστι Θεός (If God is the one who mixes, [then accept him as the creator of all]).[393] Apart from here, this word is only attested in the above Orphic fragment and would strongly suggest that Gregory was familiar with Orphic texts.[394]

There is yet another such list in *PA* 2.62-77, but what is interesting here is that the list is used by Gregory to contrast the human and divine life of the Son, as he does in the *Theological Orations*, in which he argues that anything that is human (such as crying, eating, being weak, etc.) should be attributed to Christ's humanity, and anything divine (such as raising the dead, healing people, and rising from the dead Himself) should be attributed to His divinity. This ultimately creates a set of seemingly contradictory statements (2.62-64):

> Ἦν βροτὸς, ἀλλὰ Θεός. Δαβὶδ γένος, ἀλλ' Ἀδάμοιο
> Πλάστης. Σαρκοφόρος μὲν, ἀτὰρ καὶ σώματος ἐκτός.
> Μητρὸς, παρθενικῆς δέ· περίγραφος, ἀλλ' ἀμέτρητος.
>
> He was a mortal, yet God; the offspring of David, but moulder of Adam; bearing flesh, but also outside of a body. Born of a Mother who was a virgin; circumscribed, yet without bounds.

Such joining together of contradictory or paradoxical statements are found throughout the Orphic corpus.[395] In the hymn to Hecate, she is described as both εραννήν (lovely) (1.1) and ἀμπρόσμαχον εἶδος ἔχουσαν (1.6), which Athanassakis and Wolkow translate as 'repulsive' (2013:5). Night enjoys rest and slumber-filled peace, but also the night-long revel (3.4, 6). The Moon is both masculine and feminine (9.4). It is clear, therefore, that there is a similarity in style between the Orphic hymns and the *PA*, especially in the way that they speak of/praise the divine.[396] Morand (2015: 209-223) has noted that, although the *OH* may seem dry and uninteresting to scholars today compared to the more interesting narratives of the Homeric and Callimachean hymns, the epithets and phrases found in the *OH* would have called to the initiate's mind the various myths and narratives surrounding the god – possibly only known to those initiated. The same is true for Gregory's use of epithets or short phrases here. Only the catechised Christian would know well that the Christ was to come from the House of David and be a new Adam; that His mother was a (perpetual) virgin, and so on; and the invocation of these names no doubt calls to mind for the

---

[393] Although not strictly Orphic, it is interesting to note that *anax* is only used in the *PA* of God, whereas *basileus* is used for man. *Anax* is used throughout the Orphic Hymns of various gods (see Fayant, 2014:725).
[394] Jauregui (2015:229) also points out that Gregory quotes a line of Orphic hymn in *Or*. 4.115 concerning Zeus, which is found only here and in Philostratus. We can add to this some linguistic similarities found between Orphic poetry and Gregory's work. Take, for example, the *hapax* ἄλλογένεθλος (*PA* 5.2) which bears a resemblance to παντογένεθλος, which only appears at *OH* 15.7, 16.4, and 58.6 (Rudhardt 2008:227); at *PA* 4.25 ἀντίθρονος (a word only used by Gregory [see Sykes & Moreschini, 1997:153]) and ἀντιθόωκος (a *hapax* at *PA* 6.44) bear a resemblance to the *hapax* περιθρόνιος in the *OH* (Rudhardt, p.227); ἀρτιγένεθλος (*PA* 7.88) appears only elsewhere at *Orph. A.* 388 (Sykes & Moreschini, p.243); and πολύσεπτος (*PA* 3.59,73) appears only in the *OH* and Prophyry (Rudhardt, p.223). It could be argued, therefore, that Gregory was building his own vocabulary for the *PA* and other works from his reading of Orphic texts. See also Jauregui (2010) where he notes how Orphism could be used as a vehicle for monotheism.
[395] Such paradox can also be found in the Orphic bone plates found in Olbia (see West, 1983:19, fig.2).
[396] It should also be noted that, just before this very Orphic list, Gregory says of Christ (*PA* 2.61-62): καὶ μ' ἐσάωσεν, ἰητὴρ (He, the Surgeon, saved me) just as Ascelpius is called ἰητὴρ πάντων (Surgeon of all) in *OH* 67.1 and also σωτήρ (saviour) at 67.8. It should also be noted that the 1st person singular that is used throughout the *PA* is also characteristic of the *OH* (see Morand, 2001:42). One familiar with the Orphic hymns who reads these poems of Gregory would unlikely miss this parallel.

initiate the biblical stories with which these characters are associated. The reader, therefore, of these poems is one not only well versed in Greek (Orphic) poetry, but the Scriptures as well.

Furthermore, some of the imagery which Gregory uses seems to be quite similar to that of the Orphic Hymns. *PA* 5.5 opens with an image of the creation of the universe (*kosmos*) which Gregory compares to a *rhombus* urged on by the whirl of a blow (Πληγῆς ὡς ὕπο ῥόμβον ἐπειγόμενον στροφάλιγξι). *OH* 4.4 says that *Ouranos* moves with the whirls of a *rhombus* (ῥόμβου δίναισιν ὀδεύων); and *OH* 8.7 speaks of the sun driving its course with the whirling of the boundless *rhombus* (ῥόμβου ἀπειρεσίου δινεύμασιν οἶμον ἐλαύνων). *PA* 6. 24-25 on rational natures (Περὶ λογικῶν φύσεων) has the angels watching over men and nations; where *OH* 10. 25 has *Physis* watching over sceptred kings. *PA* 6 opens with a comparison of the heavenly natures to the natural occurrence of the rainbow in which the whole ether is resplendent with compact circles (Κύκλοισιν πυκινοῖσι [6.5]); *Physis* in *OH* 10.23 is also described as circular (κυκλοτερής). Where Physis is 'fire-breathing' (πυρίπνους [OH 10.26]) the angels for Gregory run through the air as fire and divine spirits (πῦρ καὶ πνεύματα θεῖα [PA 6.15]). It is clear, therefore, that Gregory is influenced by the *OH* in his imagery to describe beings that are (more or less) invisible.

Certainly the style of parts of the *PA* are quite similar to the *OH*, and the mysticism surrounding the Orphic religion would suit Gregory's style of mystical theology and the doctrine of divine incomprehensibility which he espouses.[397] If Gregory is drawing from Orphic poetry for his inspiration – as I am arguing here – then I believe he does it in order to imbue his poetry with a sense of mystery and perhaps antiquity which these Orphic hymns would have held. The shear plethora of titles and names attributed to the divine also stands in stark contrast to the theology of his main opponents, the Eunomians, who hold that Christ is, above all else, *agennetos*. The learned reader who was familiar with the Orphic hymns – as well as the renowned figure of Orpheus himself – might not only draw literary parallels between the hymns and the *PA*, but also find in the parallel a means both of understanding and of believing Gregory's arguments, as well as the identity which Gregory is forging for himself: not the logician and rhetorician that was Eunomius, but the *prytannis* of sacred and profane wisdom, a figure who was both a Moses who saw the hind parts of God and an Orpheus with the eloquence to sing of these mysteries. It might seem strange that Gregory clearly invokes the vocabulary of Pagan hymnody to describe the Christian, Triune God. But as we have seen, Gregory is not as skittish as his Cappadocian contemporaries in using his *paideia* freely. It should not surprise us, then, if Gregory here is quite freely invoking non-

[397] Apart from the edition of the *Orphic Hymns* that has come down to us. The only other example of such a type of hymn that I could found is in *GA* 8.15 (discussed below). As for other Christian models which Gregory may have had in mind, see Sykes (1970:38): 'There appears to be little in earlier Christian Greek verse which can be claimed to foreshadow the *Arcana*. There are a few lines of angry polemic verse recorded by Irenaeus in *Haer*. 1. 8. 17 (Migne, *PG*. 7. 628A), but we have nothing to indicate that they are part of any tradition. The same is true of the polemic hymn in the *Paedagogus* of Clement of Alexandria and the verse in Methodius is far removed from the *Arcana*.' Sykes does go on, however, to sight some parallels between the *PA* and the *Oracula Sibyllina* and *Metaphrases in Psalmos* (pp.38-39).

Christian hymnody to his own ends. Afterall, as we have discussed below and will further emphasise here, *paideia* for Gregory ultimately comes as a gift from the *Logos*, Jesus Christ.

As regards the paradoxical statements which Gregory makes of the Son (discussed above), by invoking Orphic poetry he shows that when it comes to matters of the divine, contradiction or paradox has not been nor should be a problem when speaking of the divine. Gregory's answer to the problem of the Trinity was to not confuse the *hypostases* like Sabellius or to separate the natures like Arius (*Or.* 31.30). In other words, it was Gregory's intention not to dispel the paradox that was inherent in his conception of the Trinity or the scriptural descriptions of the incarnate Christ where he displays both divine power and human frailty, but rather to embrace them; and in order to do that convincingly, Gregory has appealed not only to the philosophical argument so dear to Eunomius but also to draw from a different source of Greek *paideia* (the *Orphica*) which would have given his ideas both authority and weight to his learned Greek audience.[398] Finally, the *Orphica* also provide Gregory with an imagery and style that would prevent him from relying on the anthropomorphism of other Pagan hymnody by Hesiod, Homer, or Callimachus – as can be seen in our discussion of the depiction of the Universe, and of *Physis* in the *OH* and of the angels in the *PA* – thus providing a literary parallel which would integrate more easily with Christian theology.

Finally, we must note the significance that the invocation of Orphic hymnody has on the role of Gregory as narrator in this poem. The poet is certainly front and centre in the *PA*, and Gregory often invokes himself in the first-person *passim*, making this narrative incredibly personal, as well as making it quite clear that there is no distinction between the narrator and the poet, Gregory himself. Schelske in his study and commentary of the Orphic *Argonautica* notes the significance of the identification of the narrator as Orpheus, with its true author remaining anonymous (2011:12-17), as well as the wider significance of Orpheus *in der Spätantike*. Firstly, Schelske points out that Orpheus is the epitome of the ideal singer or poet (p.16). But he is, also, the image of the ideal teacher (p.17), as can be seen in the pedagogical relationship between Orpheus and Musaeus established in the Orphic *Argonautica* – as well as the prologue of the *Orphic Hymns* (p.17). I am certainly not arguing here that Gregory, like the author of the Orphic *Argonautica*, is hiding behind the persona of Orpheus himself. Rather, I am pointing out another way in which Gregory freely harnesses the *paideia* shared between his contemporaries, both Pagan and Christian, to further his own ends, and create a self-identity that is communicated through his utilisation of a wide range of Greek literary sources – in other words, a display of his *paideia* that sought to legitimise his status as a *pepaideumenos* and as a sound teacher.

[398] Although little is said of the *OH* in antiquity, see Athanassakis' introduction to his translation of the *OH* in which he states (2013:xxi): 'The old faith [Paganism], especially as expressed in documents like the *Hymns*, possessed a liturgical language ready to be used. Echoes of the compositional mode of the *Hymns*, especially of the effect of clustering epithets, can occasionally be heard in the great devotional … Hymns of the Orthodox Church …'

A (Middle-)Platonic Reading of Creation and Salvation

Now that Gregory has established his theology in the first three poems, the rest of the *PA* is devoted to outlining his views on the creation of the world, God's primacy within it, and the true means of our salvation and ascent to the Divine. However, just as Gregory relies more on the Orphic persona to communicate his theology than rhetoric and logic (as he does in his orations), so too will Gregory focus less on the scriptural account of his understanding of the divine economy (as he does on the orations) and emphasise more his understanding of creation and salvation through the lens of Platonic thought. In so doing this, Gregory makes clear not only the importance of his understanding of the Triune God to how men must live their lives in a pure way to obtain salvation (something which seems not to play a huge part in Eunomian theology), but he also discredits the practices and beliefs of prominent Pagans at his time around the issues of purification and ascent to the One (namely through theurgical rites).[399] This is not done directly, but rather through the emphasis on Baptism to ascending again to the divine.

PA 4 (on the *Kosmos*) opens with a call to hymn God's creation (Θεοῦ κτίσιν ὑμνείμωνεν) so as to oppose false doctrines with arguments to the contrary (vv. 1-2). He quickly dismisses the widely held belief in the eternity of the universe, arguing that matter came into existence complete with their forms (vv. 3-23). He then goes on to dismiss the Manichean belief that matter is an equal and opposite force opposed to God and is the source of evil (vv.23-31).[400] Gregory makes it quite clear that Evil (or darkness [σκότος]) is not something that has always existed and is not φύσις ἑστηκυῖα περίγραφος (a nature in its own right with its own place) (vv.41-42). Rather, it is something that comes with breaking the commandments (v.43). Gregory then goes on to give us his own account of the origin of Evil (vv.46-48, 51-52). Evil does not have a nature per se, but it does have its origin in Satan and came to be practised among humans when Satan tricked the first man (Adam) into doing evil. From a philosophical point of view, Gregory does not believe (as Plotinus or the Manicheans) that evil is a real essence among us that is opposed to God who is Good. However, it is not clear that he sees evil purely as a lack or privation of goodness.[401] Evil is not a substance, but it does have its origins in Satan, who is a force that is opposed to God, though not in the same way that the physical world and its creator are evil contra God – as in Manicheanism. Noticeably absent from Gregory's argument thus far is the use of Scripture to support his claims. Rather, as we shall see, Gregory is looking to portray his theology of the cosmos' creation, man's fall, and redemption in a philosophical – and broadly Platonic – manner.

[399] On theurgy, see Lewy (1978) and Smith (2004:79-80).
[400] A similar idea can be found in Plotinus though not as extreme as the dualism of the Manicheans. See Narbonne (2014:233-239) for a summary of Plotinus' view on Matter as evil. On Manichaeism, see Lieu (1985).
[401] Such a view of evil was held by Proclus and many Christians. For Proclus' view of evil, see Narbonne (2014:239-242). On evil in the Greek fathers more generally, see Young (1973); and in the Cappadocian fathers, see Ludlow (2012). Young sums up the view of Gregory Nazianzen as (p.124): 'God is ultimately responsible for everything; the devil is responsible for Evil.'

Once Gregory has established that the world/matter is not evil per se, and that evil in fact comes from the Devil, he then addresses the cosmos with a rhetorical question (4.55-59):

> Κόσμε, σὺ δ' εἰ μὲν ἔης τῆμος Τριὰς, ἐγγὺς ἀνάρχου
> Κύδεϊ. πῶς δέ σε τόσσον ἀπόπροθι φῶτες ἔθηκαν
> Χριστοφόροι, θείων τε δαήμονες, ὥστε μετρεῖσθαι
> Οὐ μάλα πολλὸν ἀριθμὸν ἑλισσομένων ἐνιαυτῶν,
> Ἐξότε πῆξε μέγας σε Θεοῦ Λόγος;
>
> Cosmos, if you existed at the same time as the Trinity, being near to the glory of the timeless One, how is it that Christ-bearing men, and those knowledgeable in things divine hold you so far distant from It, that there is no measuring the great number of circling years since the great Word of God established you?

Gregory suggests here that, if the world and God are co-eternal, then why is the world put at such a great distance from God not only by Christian thinkers, but also non-Christian philosophers. Although Gregory is making clear here the difference between (orthodox) Christian and non-Christian thinkers, he is also emphasising here a point of agreement between the two sides about the structure of the cosmos.

Before creation, God contemplated Himself and the forms of the world which He would create (vv.59-73). Then, once the Logos has created the world, the hierarchy of the universe takes shape. In order to avoid anyone desiring unlawfully a glory rivalling god's, the Logos has set creation at a distance from the divine throne (vv.84-85). The angels He has set at a lesser distance so that they can assist the divine, mortals at a greater distance due to their composite and earthly nature. The heavenly world is the older one, the one to which mortals journey to be with God as god once they have purified their mind and flesh (vv.93-96). The world in which mortals exist, however, is mortal itself (v.97). Notice thus far that Gregory has yet to refer to any scriptural evidence for his argument, or to even invoke the images of creation found in the Bible. Sykes and Moreschini note that Basil in discussing the creation of the universe uses the authority of Scripture to bolster his arguments, whereas Gregory basis his assumptions of the creation and form of the universe 'entirely on authority' (1997:161). In a sense, this is true. Gregory provides little evidence for his views, or at least, he provides nothing in the way of logical argumentation to prove his point. But if Gregory does rely on his authority to get his view across, it is not simply an authority that he has as a bishop of the Church, but also a certain poetic authority - the authority that comes with the quasi-Orphic persona that he has built in the opening of the *PA*. Furthermore, it must be emphasised that, for every point the (Platonic) philosopher might disagree with – such as creation *ex nihilo* – there is also a clear structure to Gregory's cosmology that is heavily influenced by middle/neo Platonic thought.[402] This is namely the idea of a cosmological hierarchy with God (the One) at the top, man at the bottom, and angels (or daemons) in the middle. Gregory again is tapping into a vein of *paideia* that is outwith the rigours of Aristotelian logic and forensic rhetoric, but still incredibly important (and relevant) to his contemporaries. It is, we might say, a more

[402] Rist, (1996:398-399) seems to think that Gregory was very unfamiliar with Plotinus and Neo-Platonism. However, see Moreschini (1996) who cites various possible influences of Plotinus on Gregory's thought.

esoteric and mystical philosophy, but one, nonetheless, that appealed to the *pepaideumenoi* of Gregory's time.

Once Gregory dismisses the idea that the stars have any sway over human existence and asserts that the star that the Magi saw was not an astral, but supernatural, phenomenon (*PA* 5), Gregory moves on in *PA* 6 to discuss the angelic/demonic world.[403] PA 6 opens with a simile that evokes much of the language similar to the Platonic language of Apuleius and other middle/neo-Platonists (PA 6.1-5):

> Οἵη δ' ὑετίοιο κατ' ἠέρος εὐδιόωντος,
> Ἀντομένη νεφέεσσιν ἀποκρούστοις περιωγαῖς,
> Ἀκτὶς ἠελίοιο πολύχροον ἶριν ἐλίσσει,
> Ἀμφὶ δέ μιν πάντη σελαγίζεται ἐγγύθεν αἰθὴρ,
> Κύκλοισιν πυκινοῖσι καὶ ἔκτοθε λυομένοισι·
>
> Just like a sunbeam that, with refracted, circular motion, meets with clouds through the moist, clear aer and creates the many-coloured rainbow, the whole aether shines brightly around it, with many circles dissolving towards the edges.

Here we see that the two Platonic terms *aer* and *aether* are used in this description of the rainbow. Although the rainbow might have resonated more with those familiar with Judaeo-Christian literature as opposed to Hellenistic literature, Iris in Greek literature would indicate first and foremost the messenger of the gods, who was closely associated with the rainbow. Therefore, we see here that Gregory is playing with the various Pagan and Judaeo-Christian traditions quite freely. For the rainbow not only signifies God's promise to Noah not to destroy mankind, but also the messenger of the gods which, in Christian theology, is delegated to the realm of the angels. This playfulness with *paideia* should not go unnoticed. What Gregory is about to do is to portray to his reader the angelic realm through a Platonic lens. In other words, he is going to put a very Hellenic bent upon Judeo-Christian tradition. This subtle reference to the rainbow - sign of God's covenant and symbol of the messenger goddess Iris (thus fulfilling the role of the philosophical angel/*daimon*) – provides Gregory a means of bringing together the two traditions through *paideia*.

Like Apuleius' supreme God, God is the source of lights, unnameable and escaping the grasp of human intellects (6. 8-10). As fire and spirit the angels travel through the *aer* (6.15). This is similar to Apuleius' *daimones* in that they are made of a composite, one closer to the aether and the other to the aer. Sykes (1997:198) notes that there is a reference here to Ps 103.4 (*LXX*),[404]

---

[403] Apuleius' *De Deo Socrati*s is certainly the most comprehensive discussion of demonology that is extant. I do not think that Gregory was familiar with his works. However, it is not far-fetched to believe that Apuleius' philosophy is based on the ideas found in Greek philosophers. Dillon (1977) and his comprehensive work on Middle Platonism covers succinctly the various manifestations of demonology found in Greek philosophers. Brenk (1986) discusses thoroughly the various manifestations of demonology in philosophical treatise, Jewish, and Christian writers in the early Imperial period. See also Trisoglio (1990) who deals specifically with demonology in Gregory Nazianzen but does not look so much to the Platonic tradition as to Scripture in his analysis of Gregory. Moreschini (1995) looks at demonology throughout the 1st-3rd centuries AD from the perspective of the middle/neo-Platonic philosophers, whilst Castagno (1995) focuses on Christian conceptions of and responses to demonology up to the third century. Turcan (2003) deals with demonology and its developments in Pagan religion, including its use by the emperor Julian. See also Thomas (2016) on the devil and Platonic cosmology in Gregory's orations.

[404] ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλέγον (You make your messengers as the winds and your servants as burning flame).

which the letter to the Hebrews (1.7) takes up in order to show the instability of the angelic natures when contrasted with that of the Son. Sykes thinks here that the reference to spirit (*pneuma*) and fire (*pur*) is rather a reference to the intelligent and purifying power of the angels. However, if we were to consider the Apuleian outline of the *daimones* (who can experience emotions and weigh themselves down closer to the earth) and the fall of the angels which Gregory discusses below, it would make sense that Gregory wants to highlight here the instability of the angelic nature – however much he might try to downplay it – due to the angels composite (but not fleshly) nature.[405] Furthermore, the angels travel through the *aer*, the substance which the *daimones* inhabit to act as mediators between the gods and men. They are attendants of the throne of God, overseers of cities of men, and familiar with the sacrifices which are reasonable for men to make (6. 23-26), a function which the philosophical *daimones* often fulfilled.[406]

Once Gregory has concluded his initial excursus on the nature and functions of the angelic beings, he tells us of his hesitation to go further on the topic in a passage that is among one of the finer moments in Gregory's poetry. (6.27-35):

> Θυμὲ, τί καὶ ῥέξεις; τρομέει λόγος οὐρανίοισι
> Κάλλεσιν ἐμβεβαώς· ἀχλὺς δέ μοι ἀντεβόλησεν,
> Οὐδ' ἔχω ἢ προτέρω θεῖναι λόγον ἢ ἀναδῦναι.
> Ὡς δ' ὅτε τρηχαλέῳ ποταμῷ περάων τις ὁδίτης
> Ἐξαπίνης ἀνέπαλτο, καὶ ἴσχεται ἱέμενός περ,
> Πολλὰ δέ οἱ κραδίη πορφύρεται ἀμφὶ ῥεέθρῳ·
> Χρειὼ θάρσος ἔπηξε, φόβος δ' ἐπέδησεν ἐρωήν·
> Πολλάκι ταρσὸν ἄειρεν ἐφ' ὕδατι, πολλάκι δ' αὖτε
> Χάσσατο, μαρναμένων δὲ, φόβον νίκησεν ἀνάγκη.
>
> What will you do, my heart? Reason trembles as it enters into the beauties of heaven. A mist comes to meet me, and I do not know whether to continue my speech or retire. Like when a traveller is traversing a ragged river, he is suddenly swung to and fro and restrained despite being eager, and his heart is much astir because of the current. Necessity stiffens his resolve. Fear impedes his advance. Often, he raises a foot in the water, often it is pushed back. Joined in battle, necessity conquers fear.

The beauty of the simile lies in its relevance to the topic in a number of ways. The line Πολλὰ δέ οἱ κραδίη πορφύρεται ἀμφὶ ῥεέθρῳ is a clear reference to Homer, and, as Sykes and Moreschini note, πορφύρεται 'denotes equally well the swelling emotion of the heart … and the swelling rush of the stream' (p.202). The connection with Homer becomes significant when we see that Homer uses these lines to describe the experiences of mortals once they have had an encounter with (or help from) the divine in the *Odyssey*, and in the *Iliad* when Agenor holds converse with himself and is confronted by a rampaging Achilles – much like the speaker here who converses with

[405] As Sykes and Moreschini (1997:199) points out, their lack of flesh - οὔτ' απὸ σαρκῶν (*PA* 6.17) – does not mean they lack a body (ἀσώματοι).

[406] I do not believe Gregory would have read Apuleius. However, Apuleius does sum up succinctly a middle-Platonic position on demonology. For Greek authors who wrote on this subject, see Plutarch, *Moralia*, 417B, and *Epinomis*, 984 E-985 B, though there is some disagreement among scholars about what exactly refers to the *daimones* here (see Tarán, 1975:*passim*); and Lewy (1978:497-508) who discusses the demonology of Porphyry – mainly discussed by him in *De Abstinentia* 2.36-43.

himself when confronted with the river's torrent.[407] We can say, therefore, that this allusion to Homer is not at all haphazard, or a simple borrowing for the sake of making a learned allusion. For the learned reader would no doubt make the comparison between Gregory and the Homeric heroes who experience this swirling of the heart when confronted with the divine – or with great danger. Gregory places great emphasis upon himself here as the first-person narrator. He is faced with a conundrum: how can the angels be forever sinless servants of God when the Devil and his demons exist? How is it possible for angels to become evil? As we shall see (and is made apparent here with the clear resonance with Homer), Gregory will tackle this question as the leader in both kinds of wisdom (σοφίης ἀμφοτέρης πρύτανιν) as he terms himself in *AP* 8.15.4. In other words, it is not only through the νόοςthat God has given him, but also through his *paideia* that the following explanation is provided.

Gregory begins his argument by outlining the heavenly hierarchy (6. 47, 50-52):

> πρώτη μὲν Θεότητος ἀγνὴ φύσις ἄτροπος αἰεὶ,
> Δεύτερον ἀκροτάτοιο φάους μεγάλοι θεράποντες,
> Τόσσον πρωτοτύποιο καλοῦ πέλας, ὁσσάτιόν περ
> Αἰθὴρ ἠελίοιο. Τὸ δὲ τρίτον ἠέρες ἡμεῖς.
>
> First comes the pure nature of Godhead, ever unchanging … Second are the great servants of the most-high Light, as close to the first Good as the *aether* is to the sun. Humans are in third place, the *aer*.

What Gregory has outlined here is a very middle-Platonic hierarchy, in which God exists at the greatest distance from man who dwells in the lower, denser air (*aer*), and in between God and men are the angelic beings who dwell in the *aether*, the finer, more fiery air.[408] Lucifer was the highest of angels but in his pride fell to the earth, and although he was of light composition (*kouphos*) he fell to the lower earth with his angels, tempting mankind into joining him in his fate (7.60-62).[409] Again, we can see how Gregory is trying to explain his answer not through Scripture, but through the Greek philosophical tradition, which can have a world of *daimones* that rise and fall through the *aether*, can be both good and evil, and can change from one to another.[410]

After this description Gregory provides a list of all the evils introduced to the world after this fall of Satan and his followers: alcoholism, soothsaying, divination, lying, and so on (6. 73-81). Indeed, many of the words used by Gregory do have associations with certain deities such as φιλομειδέες ('Laughter loving' – used of Aphrodite)[411] ἐγρεσίκωμοι ('Stirring up revelry' – used of

[407] *Il.* 21.551: πολλὰ δέ οἱ κραδίη πόρφυρε μένοντι (the book in which Achilles does battle in [and against] the river Scamander); *Od.* 4.427, 572, 10.309: πολλὰ δέ μοι κραδίη πόρφυρε κιόντι.
[408] See Dillon (1977:318) for the various ancient authors who argued that the *daimones* were made of air.
[409] Again, see Dillon (1977:46-47) for the theories that demons can/cannot vacillate in the cosmic hierarchy.
[410] Although modern, orthodox Christianity would not allow for the redemption of Satan, Gregory seems to leave the door open for Satan's purification and redemption (*PA* 6.92-95), taking a less firm line than Origen in the redemption of Satan, and Basil in the Devil's eternal punishment (Sykes and Moreschini, 1997:213). See also Farrar (2018:544) who notes that a Greco-Roman audience would be 'familiar with demons but not Satan.'
[411] See *LSJ* s.v. φιλομμειδής for the various places that this is used of an epithet of Aphrodite and also Dionysus.

Dionysus)[412] χρησμολόγοι ('Oracle monger' – which invokes Apollo and the Delphic oracle). Given the clear reference to Greek deities in this list, I also wonder if the line ψεῦσταί θ' ὑβρισταί τε,διδάσκαλοι ἀμπλακιάων (Liars, full of pride, teachers of falsehoods [6.76]) might also be a reference to the Muses as in Hesiod's *Theogony*, 27: ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα (We know how to say many false things as if they were true).[413] What is more, φιλομειδέες and χρησμολόγοι and ψεύστης appear in a hymn to Dionysus at *AP* 9.524 that is incredibly Orphic in its style. This list, also, apes the Orphic style of hymns discussed above, and provides an example of Gregory using this tradition not only in a way that incorporates its style to his theology (as in *PA* 1-3), but also mocks it in order to cast the religious ideas (and gods) of the Orphic movement into ill repute, a religion that worships the *daimones* and not the one true God.[414] Given that Gregory begins these poems by using the models of the Orphic hymns to describe the Christian God, only to go on to use this very same style to highlight the disreputable nature of the Greek gods, we can see, yet again, a certain ambivalence in Gregory's use of this literary model. On the one hand, Gregory is quite ready to use the Greek literary tradition to further his arguments and uses his *paideia* (held in common with his readers) as a means of giving his theology a level of respectability and credence. On the other hand, he uses these models to depreciate an embodiment of (non-Christian) Greek religion that would also have been known in varying degrees to his reader. It would seem, therefore, that Gregory was less concerned about facilitating every aspect of Greek *paideia*, despite the possible connotations it might have with non-Christian religion. It also goes some way in turning Julian's conception of *paideia* (discussed in our Introduction) on its head. For, if Gregory, the Christian bishop, can use the model of the Orphic hymns in such an ambivalent way, then Julian's belief, that Greek literature can only be taught and held by those who believe in it, seems preposterous.

Thus far in the *PA*, Gregory has painted for his audience a vivid picture. Invoking various authors, such as Homer, Callimachus, and the Orphic hymns, Gregory has portrayed his theology in a way that is both learned and esoteric, understandable to the *pepaideumenoi* irrespective of his creed. Then he has outlined the creation and ordering of the cosmos in a way that is by far more Platonic than scriptural. Terse creedal statements, tightly constructed arguments, and Scripture lacking in Greek eloquence has given way to the beauty found in Greek poetry throughout the ages and a conception of the universe that would be slightly less alien to his readership than the *mythos* of Genesis. All of this has set the stage for the final two poems, in which Gregory tells us of the creation of man, the Fall, and the way of redemption that is open to him through Christ.

[412] See Sykes and Moreschini (1997:210), Lampe has this poem as the only use of the word in Greek Patristic literature.
[413] Dionysus is also called a liar ψσεύστην at *AP* 9.525.24. See also Justin Martyr's first *Apology* (23.3) in which he claims that evil demons through the poets spread myths and falsehoods about Christianity. It is interesting, then, that Gregory now chooses the poetic medium to spread the "truth" of Christianity.
[414] See also Plut.*Moralia*, 417 C-D in which he discusses the delight of demons in the more sordid rites of Pagan religion. Of course, not all non-Christian Greeks were particularly comfortable with this more scandalous side of mythology.

Once Gregory has outlined and refuted various conceptions of the soul and the idea of reincarnation (7.1-52), he then goes on to outline his own *mythos* of the creation of man (vv.53-54). The reader is openly called to *listen* to Gregory's account of the soul, and Gregory, in return, offers his readers 'enjoyment' (τέρψις). One wonders exactly what this τέρψις would be. But, thus far, we can certainly see that much of the enjoyment that the reader would take from these poems is found in the way in which Gregory has weaved various literary traditions into a fine display of not only Christian doctrine, but also *paideia*.[415] Indeed the power of *logoi* (not only 'words' but 'eloquence') becomes even more apparent in the following lines. The Logos of the Mind, that is, the Son of the Father, creates the universe, bringing it into existence (vv.55-60). This is done, according to Gregory, through the Logos speaking the world into existence (v.57): Εἶπεν ὅδ', ἐκτετέλεστο ὅσον θέλεν (He spoke and accomplished all that he willed). Gregory here highlights, firstly, the power of the Word, but he also highlights the power of His words. Given that man has some share in the divine image and in the ability to speak, Gregory is not only emphasising the power of the Logos' words, but also the potential power which man's *logoi* can have.

If it is true that the words of Christ can have such great power as to bring the world into existence, then surely all men should pay heed to Christ's words and teachings. However, what is more, Gregory, the bard inspired by the Spirit, goes on to communicate directly to his audience the very words that Christ spoke when he created man (vv.61-69):

> "Ἤδη μὲν καθαροὶ καὶ ἀείζωοι θεράποντες
> Οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν ἁγνοὶ νόες, ἄγγελοι ἐσθλοὶ,
> Ὑμνοπόλοι μέλποντες ἐμὸν κλέος οὔποτε λῆγον·
> Γαῖα δ' ἔτι ζώοισιν ἀγάλλεται ἀφραδέεσσι.
> Ξυνὸν δ' ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐμοὶ γένος εὔαδε πῆξαι
> Θνητῶν τ' ἀθανάτων τε νοήμονα φῶτα μεσηγὺ,
> Τερπόμενόν τ' ἔργοισιν ἐμοῖς, καὶ ἐχέφρονα μύστην
> Οὐρανίων, γαίης τε μέγα κράτος, ἄγγελον ἄλλον
> Ἐκ χθονὸς, ὑμνητῆρα ἐμῶν μενέων τε, νόου τε."
>
> Already pure and eternal servants inhabit the broad heaven, holy minds, noble messengers, singers that never cease singing my glory. But earth still only takes pleasure in senseless creatures. It please me to compact from both sides a race partaking alike of things mortal and immortal, a man endowed with a mind set between the two worlds, taking pleasure in my works, an intelligent initiate of the heavenly realm, a great power on earth, another messenger coming from earth, to sing the praise of my mighty purpose and my Mind. (Trans, adapted from Sykes & Moreschini, [1997:37])

Firstly, Gregory has legitimised with the very words of the Son the cosmology which he has outlined thus far. Man is to be an embodied (or perhaps 'fleshly' to be more precise) angel, who – like the angels – hymns the praise of God. However, it must be pointed out that there are some

[415] Sykes and Moreschini (1997:237) points out that 'the idea of making more pleasurable a didactic theme is familiar from Lucretius … [Lucretius] goes on to use the picture of children who are persuaded to drink healing wormwood by the honey smeared on the rim of the cup.' This idea of sweetening a bitter pill is central to Gregory's poetic manifesto in the poem *On His Own Verse*.

subtle differences between the angels and men. The angels are Ὑμνοπόλοι[416] who sing of God's glory (κλέος) whereas man is a ὑμνητήρ of God's purpose and Mind. In patristic literature, this word only appears in Gregory (see Lampe, s.v. ὑμνητήρ). It is also found in *AP* 7.19.1 to describe the poet Alcman, and in Oppian, *Halieutica*, 3.7 of the poet himself, two poets who are known for singing of more earthly matters, such as wedding hymns (Alcman) and fishing (Oppian). Given that man is to hymn God's *menos* as well as his Mind, I believe that Gregory makes a clear distinction between the angels, who hymn God's glory alone, and man who sings of both God and His creation – or rather the things that are not God but from God. After all, man is to take pleasure in God's works (Τερπόμενόν τ' ἔργοισιν ἐμοῖς). It seems, then, that it is a duty for man to take delight in things both sacred and profane.

Gregory goes on to describe how exactly man was made (vv.70-77). God takes a portion of the earth, creates the shape of man, and breathes into him the Spirit. Man is, therefore, part earth and part divine (vv.76-77):

> Τοὔνεκα καὶ βιότων τὸν μὲν στέργω διὰ γαῖαν,
> Τοῦ δ' ἔρον ἐν στήθεσσιν ἔχω θείαν διὰ μοῖραν.
>
> Therefore, I have affection for one kind of life through my earthly part and have a desire for the other in my heart through my divine part.

Sykes and Moreschini (p.241) suggest that Gregory is creating an internal struggle within man, in which the Spirit fights against the flesh. However, I do not believe Gregory is making a pessimistic statement about man or saying that the desire for the earthly part is in any way inherently sinful. Rather, Gregory is trying to highlight the dual purpose of man, to take delight in things *both* earthly *and* heavenly. This is something that is made explicit in the direct speech of the Word (discussed above). It may seem like a moot point, but it is actually essential to Gregory's conception of mankind and the role which *paideia* plays in his anthropology. As we have seen in Chapter one on the *Epitaphia*, Gregory sees himself as a leader (*prytanis*) of both kinds of wisdom, sacred and profane. Therefore, the ability to engage in matters not only divine, but earthly, is central to Gregory's image of man, and makes quite clear that a holistic (and orthodox) anthropology does not disparage out of hand the parts of life that are not explicitly divine.[417] Gregory goes on, setting his recounting of the Genesis myth in the Platonic cosmos that he has created. When God places man in Paradise, which is for Gregory the heavenly life (v.105), He waits to see just how he will incline. Once he is tempted by Satan and eats the fruit, man leaves the garden and enters onto the earth from which he came, clothing his now heavy flesh in coats of skin (v.115). Man is barred from Paradise until the new Adam comes to redeem him (vv.120-122). Here Gregory concludes his Platonising account of the creation of the Universe, man, and the Fall.

---

[416] ὑμνοπόλος only appears in Gregory and later in Synesius in patristic literature according to Lampe (see s.v. ὑμνοπόλος).

[417] See the dissertation of Thomas (2016 and 2017) which provides a comprehensive overview and discussion of scholarship on Gregory's anthropology. See also Behr (2000) which discusses the anthropology of two figures – Irenaeus and Clement – who may have shaped Gregory's anthropology.

Weighed down to the earth by his fleshliness, becoming a corpse-bearer (νεκροφόρος) through his sin (v.116), man is now as far as one can be from God; and so, he must make the arduous journey back to Him.

Up to this point Gregory has portrayed his understanding of the divine economy to his reader by imbuing the (Hebrew) Scriptures with Greek *paideia*. By portraying the creation of the world and the Fall of man as a Platonic *mythos*, Gregory shows us just how his readers' shared culture and education can be a means of promoting and understanding the Christian faith, as well as providing some credibility to the poems' narrator, Gregory, who takes on an Orphicesque persona as the bard inspired by the Spirit, immersed not only in the world of the Divine, but also the realms of *paideia*.[418] In this final poem, Gregory will tell us how the old covenant fades away to give place to Christ. But what is more pertinent to our thesis is that Gregory includes certain images and motifs that shed some light upon his conception of *paideia*. It should be noted that my reading of *PA* 8 will include the 60 lines of MS *L*, that has not been included in the edition of Sykes and Moreschini[419] but printed in Wyss (1946). There is not space to give great detail here on my reasons for including this, but it suffices to say that I believe these lines to be integral to understanding the poem properly, and – most importantly – to understanding Gregory's conception and use of *paideia* in his poetry.[420]

To summarise this final poem, Gregory aims to give a reason for the two *nomoi* – that of the Hebrews, and the new Christian law (perhaps to be identified with Christ Himself) (*L*. 1-4)[421]. Once Adam and Eve are driven from Paradise, the Devil tricks man into focussing on the stars and the spirits of dead men as something to be worshipped (*L*. 9-18), and so man looks no further than that which dwells in the *aer* and *aether*, ignoring the true God that lays beyond it. It is here that the lines of *L* begin and to which we must devote some attention. Man begins to worship other gods, and the example of faithful Aaron (πιστὸς Ἀαρών – a somewhat ironic epithet) setting up the calf in the desert is the prime example of idolatry. The Israelites, therefore, worship that which is a creation of the Mind - (that is, God) (*L*. 5). Sinful inventions (*techne*) follow, and wealth that rejoices in evil (πλοῦτος κακόχαρτος) (*L*. 6).[422] Although a few remain faithful to God, God allows

[418] It should be noted that Gregory is, by no means, the first or only person to Hellenise/Platonise Hebrew Scriptures. He is, however, unique in his poetic and versified recasting of Scripture that is not a mere *paraphrasis* of the Biblical text, but rather a Platonic mythologization of Scripture.
[419] These lines would appear between *PA* 8.18-19 in Sykes and Moreschini's edition.
[420] Sykes (1970 and 1979) agrees with Wyss (1946) that these lines are genuinely a part of this poem. In the 1997 edition of these poems (p.251), however, he has changed his mind. He does not question that the lines found in *L* are genuinely Gregorian but believes that the 'MS evidence is not strong and the subject-matter could well be thought an encouragement to interpolation.' Furthermore, he notes that 'the poem can proceed quite easily from v.18 to v.19 without their [the lines from *L*] intervention.' I disagree with Sykes. Firstly, if the lines are genuinely those of Gregory, then where do they belong, if not here? Secondly, I believe that the inclusion of the lines help balance the poems better (such as the appearance of Moses in *L* with the coming of Christ at the end of the poem), and that there are various lines in *L* which help us make sense of the rest of the poem (as I will discuss below).
[421] The line numbers here are those given by Wyss (1946:161-163).
[422] κακόχαρτος is only found in Hesiod's *Works and Days* to describe Strife (v.28) and Jealousy (v.196), according to the *LSJ*. *Lampe* notes its use in this poem and Clem. *Paed*. 3.11 where Clemet uses the word to describe lust.

this to happen, so that the law may take the lead, the law that lies unwritten within man, a self-taught discrimination of good and evil (ἐσθλοῦ τ' ἠδὲ κακοῖο διάκρισις αὐτοδίδακτος) (*L.*13) . It should be noted that this line bears a striking resemblance to a line found in 7.108 (ἐσθλοῦ τ' ἠδὲ κακοῖο διάκρισιν ἐντὸς ἔχοντος) to describe the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. It would seem, then, that Gregory is suggesting that the Hebraic law is linked to the punishment of man at the Fall. Once the earth had been filled with idolatry and the follies of man, then God sends Moses, his servant, to give to the Israelites the law of God, come down from heaven, on tablets, thus cutting his people off from the most wicked of laws and peoples (*L*. 22-33).

This care which God has for His people is compared to the care of a good father for his son. At first, he takes gentle care of him, speaks soothingly to him, before sending his son out on his way (*L*. 34-39). So too does Christ treat mortals, by permitting sacrifices (of the Hebraic law) but then discontinuing this practice once his people have been tamed (*L*. 40-44). The law, then, protects man, just as a good father protects his son. But when the time comes for the son to grow up, the best sons receive their inheritances at the right time (*L*. 45-47). This is how God treats man, like a physician who gradually treats his patient's ills, so as not to kill them, making a man better with the pleasant crafts of art; or as in the building of a temple dome that is supported by props until the cornerstone (λᾶας) is in place and the props can be removed (*L*. 50-59). Therefore, the *nomos* is the prop of the more perfect *nomos* (*L*. 60). Given that Christ is the cornerstone in Scripture, Gregory must be here talking of how the law is replaced by Christ Himself. Even in the wider context of this poem, Christ is the corner stone (ἀκρόγωνος λᾶας) who joins together the Jews and Gentiles (*PA*. 8.76-77). The final point of this poem is that Christ is He who brings salvation to all men, both through His Passion, and through man's acceptance of Baptism. The law, of course, fades away, but it does not entirely disappear, there are many props which God provides, the most important being baptism (8.86-87). But we might ask what these other "props" might be when we read these poems in the wider context of Gregory's poetry. I would argue that one of these props is most definitely Greek education and culture, the practice of *paideia*.

We have already seen above Gregory's extensive knowledge of and familiarity with Greek literature, from the various echoes of Homer and Callimachus, to the extensive use of the style and vocabulary of Orphic hymnody and (middle) Platonic demonology. In this final poem we see hints of Hesiod (such as the use of κακόχαρτος discussed above, *L*. 6), and a more than subtle reference at 8.21 to *Il*.1.1.[423] It is quite apparent, therefore, that Gregory is putting his *paideia* on full display here. And so, when it comes to the final poem and the figure of Moses who is counterpoised with Jesus, we must remember that Moses (as discussed in our introduction) was an embodiment of sacred and profane *paideia* for Christians and non-Christians alike. God as described in *L* 22-39 is a father guiding his child in the way of virtue and perfection, towards the heights from the earth (*L*. 36). It is this father-son relationship that is brought to the fore in Gregory's discussion of the

[423] *PA* 8.21 opens with Μῆνιν ἀεὶ προφέρουσι, which is very similar to the opening of the *Iliad:* Μῆνιν ἄειδε … This is also picked up by Sykes and Moreschini (1997:254).

merits of *paideia* in the letters exchanged between Nicoboulus jr. and sr. (as also discussed in our introduction). Indeed, here we see that Christ did not only give to mankind (through Moses) the tablets of the law, but also *mythoi* (culture) a gift to man from heaven from the God who prefers the name *Logos* above all others (*Carm*. 2.2.5.2-6). So when Christ in *PA* 8, (*L*. 40-53) is also, like Moses, seen as a father to his creation (mankind) gently leading them towards salvation and healing them like a doctor who gradually relieves the pain of his patient,[424] we begin to get a clearer understanding of not only the place of the God of the Bible and the coming of Christ in the history of the world, but also the place of *paideia*. Christ, as the source of *mythoi*, of *paideia*, has not come to replace, rebuke or diminish the culture and education that was so dear to the Greek upper-classes, but rather to fulfil it as its originator. Or rather, as Nicoboulus jr. says of his uncle Gregory's education, once he had completed it, he put Christ as the key of his eloquence (κληῖδα λόγων) (*Carm* 2.2.4.92).

This is not to say that what these poems are actually about is *paideia*, far from it. Rather, what we see in Gregory's invocation and use of the various Greek literary traditions is the putting into action of the belief, made explicit elsewhere, that Christ is the creator of *paideia*. In invoking Homer, Callimachus, the Orphic hymns, and the Platonic philosophers, Gregory sees no need to apologise for his display of learning or for closely associating his God, Christ, the *Logos*, with the literature of the "Pagans". For he is simply putting at the service of Christ the *paideia* of which he is the originator; *paideia*, *mythoi*, that is the light of life, a unique gift from the heavenly vault (βίου φάος, οἷον ἀπ' ἄλλων δῶρον ἐπουρανίης ἐξ ἄντυγος) (*Carm*. 2.2.5.3-4). In a sense, then, Gregory sees the embodiment of *paideia* not so much as the practice of displaying one's knowledge of Greek culture and literature, but as an expression of Christ's gift to man – not the gift that saves (that is, baptism), but a gift, nevertheless, that is of divine origins, that soothes the soul, and acts as a prop to fallen man that might help him to rise yet again to the life of the Divine, to be god with God.

Conclusion

It was clear to Gregory after he had left the council in 381 that he had failed in his efforts to have the full and co-equal divinity of the Spirit recognised. The Creedal statement of the council does not apply the term *homoousion* to the Spirit but simply states that He is glorified with the Father and the Son. McGuckin writes (2001:367):

> [The creedal statement] deliberately does not ascribe the title God to the Holy Spirit. It does not apply the notion of the Homoousion to the Holy Spirit. It studiously avoids any theology explicating the mystery of Trinitarian Perichoresis. It makes only two statements to elucidate its positive confession: that the Spirit is "conglorifed" with the Father and the Son, and that the Spirit "spoke through the prophets".

[424] We must keep in mind here, also, that Gregory's poetry is supposed to be a medicine to induce its young readers to better things, and to sweeten the harshness of the commandments (*Carm.* 2.1.39.39-41), as we discussed in our analysis of the poem *Own His Own Verses* in our introduction.

Such a creedal statement fails to capture the dynamically clear – yet still reverently mysterious – conception of the Trinity which Gregory has laboured over for so long. That Gregory was disparaged by his contemporaries and not recognised by the Emperor – unlike Gregory of Nyssa and Helladios of Caesarea – McGuckin claims to be Gregory's own fault, since he refused repeatedly Theodosius' request that he come to serve as a theological expert to the council (p.375).[425] Yet Gregory makes clear in his farewell oration to his congregation at Constantinople and the bishops gathered for the council (*Or*. 42.26) that he would, more or less, turn from speech to fighting with 'hand and ink'.[426] The *PA* is a prime example of this change, as these poems show that Gregory was not so much giving up the fight by refusing to re-enter the public sphere, as opening up a new front in the battle for Nicene orthodoxy. In other words, it was not that Gregory refused to engage any more in the public displays of *paideia* that had characterised the debate thus far – public orations that sought to define God in strict accordance to logic – but rather he was going to engage in a different way, through poetry – *paideia* in its most concentrated form (Al. Cameron, 2007:31). This not only allowed Gregory to tap into a different vain of Greek culture and education that would appeal to his audience, but the medium also allowed him to access a different literary tradition (namely Orphism) that could only be invoked through a poetic medium and that could emphasise more clearly – and convincingly – certain aspects of his doctrine, such as the incomprehensible and paradoxical nature of the divine and Christ's incarnation. From the above, we can see that Gregory used his orations to eloquently convince his opponents of the Nicene cause, and that he can articulate it in such a way that he can both be faithful to the Trinity which he holds dear and formulate his ideas in such a way that an Arian or homoian might think that he can join the Nicene party whilst still holding onto the central tenant of these two parties that the Father is greater than the Son (even if that greatness is relegated to the realm of divine causality).[427]

Vaggione (2000: 285-288) in his biography of Eunomius points out that the difference between the theological approaches of Aetius and Eunomius and of other theological groupings (both homoian and homoousian) could be categorised as precision theology (ἀκρίβεια) and narrative theology. Eunomius would represent the precision school of theology, arguing for a very precise and well though-out definition of God and the Trinity. Eunomius attempted to influence society in the same way the anhomian historian Philostorgius' family came to support the

[425] See also McLynn (2018) who shows how Nyssen's star ascends as Nazianzen's descends, for as Nazianzen ends his life residing at Nazianzus, Nyssen then takes his homonymous colleague's place as a mover in shaker in Constantinople, even delivering the funeral oration for the emperor Theodosius' daughter.
[426] Translation is the one found in Kennedy (1983:228). See also Storin (2011) on Gregory's turn to silence after Constantinople. On this speech, see Elm (1999 and 2000).
[427] Norris (1990:56-57) has already pointed out that the 'popular character' of the *Theological Orations* (and we can add here the *PA* too) implies that 'later Arians were not merely a small cadre of highly polished dialecticians' but formed 'a religious community that had wider interests than purely philosophical argumentation.' McGuckin says much the same when speaking about Gregory's ministry in Constantinople (2001:241): 'He was there merely to signal to the most powerful classes, how it was that they could slowly shift allegiance without loss of face or intellectual credibility'. He was to use his rhetorical skill to show that the Nicene cause should command their allegiance 'not merely out of political necessity but also because … it could stand up both intellectually, and culturally, as the true *religio romanorum*.'

Eunomian cause: by gaining the support of court and palace officials who could then disseminate the faith to other aristocrats (brought together by blood or marriage) and, by extension, the people as a whole through the upper-class' preference for Eunomian clerics and officials (pp. 286-287). Such an approach could never work because the political situation of the fourth century was so unstable that the frequent change of emperors entailed also frequent changes in the state-sponsored religious policy. Our discussion of the orations above shows that Gregory could certainly hold his own against Eunomius' *akribeia* and formulate a consistent and systematic Trinitarian theology – even if Gregory does not produce the precision which recent scholars such as Meijering and others find lacking in Gregory's work.[428] But it is not to this school of precision theology to which Gregory belongs, but rather the narrative school's way of doing theology. Even in the *Theological Orations* (perhaps Gregory's most precise work) we see that there is an over-arching narrative in which the Eunomian is cast as the Pharisee and in which Gregory invites his listeners to join the one true faith – the faith of Moses, Elijah, and the Apostles. His refutation of Eunomius is done not only through reputing Eunomius' theology, but also his credentials as a *pepaideumenos*, as we have seen in our discussion of the *Theological Orations*.

It is in the *PA* that precision gives way entirely to narrative and narrator, and Scriptural proofs give way to the use and embodiment of Greek literary models. Gregory is not a Moses, seeing the hind parts of God on the Mount, but an Orphic narrator, inspired by the Spirit (not the Muses), who gazes into the depths of the cosmos and beyond to the throne of God. God is hymned in Orphic fashion, the creation of the world and man, and his Fall from Paradise is recounted with little recourse to Scripture. It is less a paraphrase of the Bible and more of a Platonic *mythos*, where God dwells beyond the *aether*, and in the *aer* dwell his servants – and the spirits that rebelled against him. Man has come to earth through Adam's folly, but through the new Adam, Christ, man can rise again. Baptism is the means of making this ascent possible, but, as we have seen, there are other props to help us rise again to Adam's initial glory. Although it is not explicit, we can clearly see from this poem – and the others examined in this thesis (especially *Carm.* 2.2.4-5) – that one of these props is *paideia*. Gregory, unlike his Cappadocian contemporaries, is much less concerned about making clear an ambivalent view of profane culture, displaying his education on the one hand, but sounding a warning of *paideia*'s potential perils on the other. Instead what we see is a writer and a poet who unabashedly uses terms for the divine that can be associated with Pagan gods, who whole-heartedly adopts the persona of the Orphic bard (inspired by the Spirit, nonetheless) and the demonology of his non-Christian contemporaries to portray the true means of ascent to the One, the true mediator between man and God, Christ. A firm grounding in Greek culture and education may not be as indispensable as Baptism is to the Christian, but, if it is a prop, then it is only needed for as long as it takes for one to ascend higher to God;[429] it guides the learned

[428] We have not had the space here to discuss the Trinitarian theology of Gregory. However, a plethora of scholarship already exists on this matter. See Meijering (1975), Kopecek (1979), Barnes and Williams (1993), Egan (1993, 1997), McGuckin (1994, 1997), Noble (1993), Golitzin (2001), Ayres (2004), Behr (2004), Cross (2006), Anderson (2007), Beeley (2007), Giulea (2010), and Meesters (2012).
[429] Though, as we have seen in Ch. 1, Carterius is still writing hymns for the angels in heaven.

Christian, sweetens the harsh letters of the Scriptures, and shows him (via Gregory's poetry) that the Christian can match (if not surpass) the learned displays of the non-Christian authors.

Therefore, *paideia* was certainly vital to Gregory's identity as a bishop whose duty it was to propagate and defend the Faith. For Gregory, this could only be done by one who was a leader of both sacred and profane learning. In writing these poems he was certainly not attempting to reach a wide audience, but a very specific one: those who thought themselves to be *pepaideumenoi*, experts in the vast field of Greek *paideia*. As we saw in our analysis of the *Theological Orations*, Gregory sought to solidify his credentials not only as a true inheritor of the Faith of Christ and His Apostles, but also as a true inheritor of Greek (philosophical) *paideia*. By writing poetry, this latter inheritance is greatly emphasised – though not at expense of the former. Thus, we can see that Gregory, unlike his contemporaries who sought to distance themselves from *paideia*, felt the need to properly cultivate an image and identity that incorporated both sacred and profane learning, in order for his particular ecclesiastical party (Nicene Christianity) to find acceptance and legitimacy amongst the elites of the Roman world. Therefore, these poems (and perhaps any other poems that could be safely assigned to the end of Gregory's life) should not be seen as the poetic scribblings of a bishop completely shut out of the secular and religious politics of his day, the swan song of his old age – as Gregory himself terms his poetry in the poem *On His Own Verses*. Instead, we must see this as an innovative and conscious use of his *paideia* to open up a new front in the battle for the religious heart of the Roman Empire.[430] Side-lined, Gregory may have been at the end of his career, but the impact that Gregory would have on the Byzantine mind is made manifest in the manuscripts and commentaries left behind on his works, as well as the honorific title given to so few saints throughout the ages: *theologos*. And it should be noted that Gregory shares this title not only with the likes of St. John the Evangelist, but Homer as well.[431]

[430] On this see also Storin (2011), who argues that Gregory advertises his ascetic practice of silence through his poems and other works after his ejection from Constantinople in order to salvage his ecclesiastical power.
[431] On which, see Lamberton (1989).

Conclusions

At the beginning of this thesis, we placed Gregory within the context of his close contemporaries, Julian, Basil, and Gregory Nyssen. In Julian we see how Gregory seeks to refute the idea that *paideia* was the exclusive domain of non-Christian Hellenists, and that one could, therefore, be Christian and Greek. In our brief excursus on the outlook of Basil and Nyssen on *paideia*, we see that the brothers tend to be much more sceptical of the value of a profane education. They never outright deny this to the Christian (even Tertullian, who makes clear his disparagement of the wisdom of Athens, did not go so far as to bar Christians from it), but they make it clear that this is something which the Christian should one day leave behind - as the Israelites leave Egypt behind - perhaps even to follow in the ascetic footsteps of Basil. Once we come to Gregory, however, and our exploration of his programmatic poem *On His Own Verse* and the verse epistles between the Nicobouli, we see a view of *mythoi* (culture) that rejects the religious Hellenism of Julian and the tacit disparagement of profane *paideia* in Basil and Nyssen. For Gregory, *mythoi* are a gift from Christ, and *logoi* originates from the *Logos*. Gregory himself is the exemplar for the young Nicoboulus: for Gregory, after he travelled the world for his education, then crowned it with Christ and put it at His service.

In chapter 1, we establish just how immersed Gregory is in the world of Greek literature and the (Sophistic) culture of those who cherished it. Far from holding Greek *paideia* at arm's length, Gregory finds no problem in praising unreservedly the outstanding embodiments of *paideia* that the deceased commemorated in his epitaphs were. We also saw that Gregory's poetry, as opposed to his prose or epistles – provided a literary space for Gregory where he could more freely display his *paideia* without the need to worry about the sort of Christians who gossiped about his brother Caesarius' high-flying career in the service of heterodox (and a Pagan) emperors. We conclude by discussing the ideal bishop which Gregory creates in the epitaphs for Basil, his father, and himself. The bishop is to be a *prytanis* of both kinds of wisdom, sacred and profane, and from here we find the focus of the rest of the chapters of this thesis as we explore how Gregory weaves these two kinds of wisdom together to display his (Christian) *paideia*.

Chapter 2 provides a fresh take on the biblical poems of the *Carmina Dogmatica* and rehabilitates the image of these poems generated by scholarship thus far as a curious mixture of metres, shoddily put together as a schoolroom exercise so that the young reader might learn his Scripture and scansion at the same time. Rather we make clear that the polymetry of these poems make them entirely unsuitable for the classroom and are much more likely to be for a sophisticated audience who have already went through their elementary education. We also note that the metrical peculiarities of this poem reflect Gregory's attempt to modernise the ancient Greek metres to reflect the developments that had occurred in the Greek language. These poems, moreover, not only show Gregory attempting to meet the challenge which the developments in the Greek language posed for Greek metre, but also the growing relevance of the Judaeo-Christian Scriptures in Greco-Roman society. I argue that these poems, dull and uninteresting as they might be for the

modern reader, would have been a handy tool for Gregory's reader, as they provide an auxiliary (or para-) text to the Bible - thus providing for his readers an entry point into the vast and complex world of Holy Writ, which was becoming more and more essential to the life and spirituality of Roman citizens.

We explore Gregory's laudation for the virgin life in Chapter 3. We see here that a sound understanding of the structure of this poem is integral to understanding Gregory's conception of the ascetic life, and we understand just how different it is from his homonymous associate, Nyssen. Where Nyssen believes that there is no place for eloquent displays in praise of virginity, Nazianzen praises virginity in anything but plain or simple terms. This poem begins with a traditional Greek hymn, like those of Homer or Callimachus before going into a learned oratorical competition between Marriage and Virginity personified. Through this poem we see much more clearly how Gregory sets himself against his Cappadocian contemporary in his views on how one could use and express their *paideia*. Far from thinking that learned displays were inappropriate to praise the ascetic life, Gregory's ascetic in Virginity personified is one who is clearly well versed in profane, as well as sacred, wisdom.

Finally, chapter 4 discusses the *Poemata Arcana*, eight poems on the Trinity, the creation of the cosmos, of man, and the Fall. In our opening discussion of the *Theological Orations* to which these poems are closely related, we see that Gregory's refutation of the Eunomian Christians who held sway in Constantinople at the time is an attempt not only to dismiss Eunomius' theology, but also to diminish his credentials as a *pepaideumenos*, which was largely displayed through his rhetoric and tightly constructed arguments based on Aristotelian logic. Gregory in these poems takes a different route, tapping into different veins of Greek literary culture, not the logic of Aristotle, but the esoteric/mystical writings of the *Orphica* and Middle-/Neo-Platonism. This change in tact provides Gregory with a learned means of displaying his theology, which is more suited to the paradoxical nature of his thought, and provides an explanation of the Christian account of creation, human nature, and the way to salvation that has more in common with Platonism in its middle-form – as espoused by Apuleius or Plutarch - than with the narratives of Scripture. In this way, Gregory solidifies his position as one who is a *pepaideumenos*, learned in every facet of Greek culture. We see Gregory put into action his self-professed identity as leader in both sacred and profane wisdom.

At the beginning of this thesis, I outlined four areas of Greek *paideia* which would provide the main focus of these chapters. As each chapter often dealt with one or more of these areas, I will outline below some of the conclusions to which I have come on these areas, and what they can tell us about Gregory's conception and use of *paideia* in his poetry.

(1) Gregory's knowledge of, familiarity with, and utilisation/manipulation of the literary tradition:

The poems examined in this thesis make clear that Gregory's knowledge of Greek literature – especially poetry – is vast. In chapter one, we see that Gregory was very familiar with the epigrammatic tradition, invoking themes and vocabulary that are found throughout the *Palatine Anthology*. Indeed, many of these epitaphs for his illustrious contemporaries have little about them that could identify them as explicitly Christian, such is their faithfulness to the tradition of literary epitaphs. Epitaphs, such as those for Euphemius, invoke pathetically the Erotes, Muses, and Graces, for the deceased groom-to-be, much in the same way that certain poems of *AP* 7 do in lamenting the deaths of brides-to-be who die soon before their wedding day. Therefore, we should note that previous scholars who have written upon these epitaphs have often overstated the innovation, which they attribute to Gregory, of Christianising the epigrammatic/epitaphic tradition. Of course, Gregory does invoke Christ in his epitaphs, but it is also of interest to note that often he does not, and in fact he innovates little upon the received, literary tradition.

Chapter two perhaps sees Gregory at his most innovative. These biblical poems would have been unlike any poems Gregory's contemporary reader would have read. Not only the biblical subject matter contained within these poems, but Gregory's polymetric rendering of his biblical *topos* would have been quite new (and strange) to his readers – as well as to the scholars of our time. Yet even here Gregory is writing within a received tradition of auxiliary literature that grew in popularity in the Imperial period. It is through this lens that we can begin to make sense of these poems and their possible appeal to his audience. For auxiliary literature was a means of helping primary texts (in this case, the Bible) survive and find a readership. Furthermore, given the sheer size of the Bible and its lack of appeal to the learned men of Gregory's time due to its unpolished rendering in Greek and its barbarian origin, these poems provide Gregory's readers an epitome and paratext of the most important parts of Scripture; and so, we have here a clear example of Gregory using Greek *paideia* to further serve the needs of his learned (Christian) audience, for whom the Bible was taking on an increasing amount of relevance to their society.

If the biblical poems of Gregory are his most innovative, they are certainly not his most elegant or polished innovation on the Greek literary tradition. *Carm*. 1.2.1, on the other hand, could well lay claim to being one of Gregory's most elegant and interesting weavings of Greek literary traditions. As we have seen, this poem opens with a hymn to Virginity, that evokes the hexameter hymns of writers such as Callimachus, the Orphic hymns, and those attributed to Homer. The *agon* provides two, rhetorically well structured, speeches in defence of married and then virginal life. Sundermann was right to see that the opening 214 lines made up a hymn with the rest making up a *Rangstreit* between Marriage and Virginity personified. But he was wrong to separate the two, as if they had little connection or relevance to each other whatsoever. For in weaving together a hymn to Virginity followed by an *agon* between Marriage and Virginity, Gregory was not simply choosing two arbitrary literary forms to mesh together to make one poem. It shows just how aware Gregory was of the way in which literary practices reflect lived, cultural practices, even within his own, elite society. For hymns often preceded agonistic performances.

Finally, in chapter four we saw how familiar Gregory was with the esoteric tradition of the Orphic hymns. What becomes quickly clear here, however, is that the influence of this tradition goes well beyond a simple imitation of the hymns paratactical syntax structure. For in invoking these hymns, Gregory is taking on an Orphic persona of sorts and is imbuing his theology with the mysticism so prevalent in the Orphic hymns. Or rather, perhaps it is better to say that Gregory is trying to show that his controversial doctrine of the Trinity is in fact more traditional and less innovative (something which is frowned upon in ancient discourses on the divine) than it looks. Instead of engaging in a dialogue shaped by the rigours of Aristotelian logic, the kind that was so prevalent in his day and in which he engaged in his *Theological Orations*, Gregory instead goes down a literary route which embraced the paradoxical and mysterious nature of his doctrine of the Divine.

So, to conclude this section, we see that Gregory is not necessarily concerned with innovating or radically changing the Greek literary tradition which he inherited, and that provided the very foundations of Greek *paideia*. Furthermore, he does not seem of a necessity to be hyper-concerned with "plucking the roses and leaving the thorns" in his poetry, although it can be argued that such a concern is more prevalent in his orations – such as in the case of his portrayal of his brother Caesarius in his funeral oration and in his epitaphs. Gregory has no qualms in invoking the Muses and Graces, in portraying Virginity like a deity worthy to be hymned in the style of the Greek gods of the Homeric or Callimachean hymns, or clearly alluding to the Orphic Hymns or lines (at times more or less copied) of Homer. His drive to write in these literary/cultural traditions and to innovate upon them stems not from his need to distance himself, as a Christian, from the Pagan past that he has inherited, but rather from a desire inbred from his youth, a desire that was nurtured in all elite boys of Greco-Roman society: to be the best, the first among his peers. Furthermore, we can say with Bouffartigue (1992:589-590), who is concerned particularly with Julian's *paideia*, that there is a certain *connivence* between Gregory and his audience. Gregory, in essence, demands of his audience that they be well read and educated in order to fully appreciate his poetic art. It is a demand on his audience that is not as readily apparent in his orations, but often invoked – as with Julian – in his epistles, especially the epistolary poems discussed at the beginning of this thesis.

(2) <u>His use of *paideia* as a communication code for self-fashioning, as well as for fashioning his friends and enemies:</u>

The epitaphs of chapter one show most clearly Gregory's use of *paideia* in portraying himself and his contemporaries. We cannot say for certain how dear the ideals of Greek culture and education were to the deceased portrayed here, but it is certainly clear that it was incredibly important for Gregory that his close friends, family, and teachers were seen to be fine examples of *paideia*. What is most interesting here is that a comparison between Gregory's orations and these epitaphs clearly show Gregory's sensitivity to his audience's notions of *paideia* (or rather, his perception of his audience's notions). For we see in *Or*. 4 against Julian that the term "sophist" is all but derogatory;

yet he praises his teacher at Athens, Prohaeresius, for being the sophist par excellence in the epitaph dedicated to him. Gregory's letters to his brother Caesarius reveal the rumblings amongst the Christians at Nazianzus that the bishop's son thought it better to pursue fame and riches at the Imperial court as the emperor's physician (one of them an apostate) than to pursue riches that will never die. His funeral oration – delivered to an audience, no doubt, made up of a mixture of Caesarius' fellow *pepaideumenoi* and men of the court, as well as the Christian gossip-mongers of Nazianzus, is a clear example of Gregory downplaying his brother's vast learning and the many worldly benefits which this – and his career at court – obtained for him. Rather, Gregory portrays his brother as a sort of confessor (a martyr without spilling his blood) for the faith, suffering at the hands of Julian, who was so desperate to be covered in the glory of Caesairus' *paideia*. Caesarius in Gregory's speech for him becomes the image of the ideal Christian in time of persecution. But in the epitaphs, Gregory has no qualms in relaying the vast glory and honour which his *paideia w*on for him, a man adept in all aspects of learning. Even if such learning cannot make man immortal, his glory (*kleos*) does live on. But what becomes of greater relevance to this thesis, is the way in which Gregory portrays himself and his fellow bishops – his father and Basil. The bishop, for Gregory, rather than being a man set firmly against the profane learning of the world, is in fact an embodiment (and *prytanis*) of sacred *and* profane learning – and so Gregory in the poems in which he adheres most to the literary tradition (in which he even invokes non-Christian divinities!) lays out his ideal for how the bishop should embody *paideia*. Gregory, therefore, not only in his epitaphs but in the portrayal of himself in the epistolary poems between Nicobulus jr. and sr., is the ideal bishop. Not only is Gregory a faithful follower of Christ and his true doctrines, but also an embodiment of *paideia*, something which he loved and cared for deeply, and which ultimately, I believe, lead him to such an endeavour as to write poetry, the medium in which Gregory is – at times – at his most profane, but also the literary medium in which Gregory embodies most fully the ideal of the bishop as master of sacred and profane learning.

Chapter two provides a prime example of this. For even if it is difficult for us to ascertain the appeal of these rather dry and repetitive poems, our study of the metre of these poems have shown that they were far from a shoddy mish mash of metres, poorly used, and badly strung together, but rather a fine example of the evolution of Greek metre. Just like, for example, Nonnus, Gregory too is keen to use the metres of the great poets of the Greek canon. Nevertheless, it is clear that he is re-regulating them to reflect more closely the developments in spoken Greek. Far from being mere school exercises to help those just beginning their foray into the world of Greek grammar and literature to learn their scansion and Bible at the same time, these poems are an example of the Christian litterateur at work. For such a work showed Gregory's expertise not only in poetic composition - as the poems use various metres and deal with a subject matter that does not readily yield to the rules of Greek metre – but also in biblical knowledge. And so, these poems clearly embodied Gregory's ideal of the bishop as one who is fully immersed in *paideia* and the Christian faith.

In chapter three, we are less concerned with the fashioning of real individuals than with the representation of Marriage and Virginity personified. It should be noted, first of all, that Gregory seems to act as the moderator in this debate, the one who sings the opening hymn to Virginity and summons Marriage and Virginity. This in itself casts Gregory in the role of inspired bard, summoning these deities of sorts to the contest. What is more important, however, is the way in which Gregory portrays both of these lifestyles, which - for some - lived in contention with each other. Gregory, like most of his Christian contemporaries discussed in Ch. 3, favours Virginity over Marriage, but more uniquely he gives both of them a place by the throne of Christ and calls ultimately for a cease to the strife between these two ways of life, which are portrayed here as mother (Marriage) and daughter (Virginity). Both are legitimate paths to heaven, both have their pitfalls, even if virginity is the safer means to salvation – although the more difficult. Both, furthermore, are versed in the ways of *paideia*, especially Greek rhetoric, even if Virginity rejects the *kleos* that comes with *paideia* and shuns the society in which one practices and displays one's excellence in education and culture. Finally, it must be noted that the very context and space within which this poetic dialogue takes place is one that was central to elite society, an *agon* with a very clear allusion to an audience (some of whom are hostile to Virginity) and to judges who decide the winner of this war of words. Therefore, the space in which this poem (and its speeches) is performed is one that was central to the elites' desire to contend with their peers for first place, it is the very context in which one can and must display one's *paideia*, and one's superiority amongst one's contemporaries.

Chapter four shows through its exploration of the *Theological Orations* how the debate surrounding the Trinity was concerned not only with what is true doctrine, but also with what is true *paideia*. Thus Eunomius' errors stem not so much from his heterodoxy, but his poor grasp of the Aristotelian logic so dear to him – thus making him *apaideutos*. In the *PA*, however, rather than engaging the Eunomians on their favoured ground (forming arguments in accordance with Aristotelian logic), he instead shows the breadth of his *paideia* by invoking the mystical and paradoxical nature of the divine found in the Orphic hymns. As mentioned above, Gregory takes on an Orphic persona of sorts, or rather, the persona of any Greek poet who speaks of the divine. For Gregory, recounts the very speech of God at the creation of the world, making him one who communes directly with the Divine. Thus, the *PA* provide for us a fine example of Gregory's ideal bishop in action, using his vast knowledge of sacred and profane literature to rebuff his opponents and to convince his readers that he is in fact the true *pepaideumenos* and *theologos*.

Finally, it is worth making a brief comment on the significance of neologisms (and perhaps we could add the metrical experimentation which we found in Ch. 2) that appear throughout Gregory's poetry – and mentioned above *passim*. Eshleman (2012:7-9) discusses an episode found in Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophist* (578) in which the sophist, Philagrius, is caught using an 'alien word'. When challenged to name a classical author in which this word appears, he cites himself. Eshleman goes on to say (p.8):

> If successful, this assertion would enshrine Philagrius among the standard-setting classics … in which case his language and conduct *ipso facto* meet sophistic standards; if not, he stands accused of deviating from a model embodied by others.

It is clear that Gregory wants to be considered amongst the former group, once we consider his reasons for writing poetry given in *Carm*. 2.1.39 *On His Own Verse* (discussed above). Nevertheless, there is a clear tension in Gregory. For, on the one hand, he clearly wants to be seen to associate and be on par with the sophists and their (literary) models. In praising the like of Thespesius, Prohaeresius, and Martinianus, he seeks to share in their *paideia* by association, and he lauds them in a way that is thoroughly imbued with the literary models and *topoi* of Greek epigrammatic poetry. On the other hand, however, our comparison with the orations and the poems shows that he can at times embody a desire for the latter option outlined by Eshleman above - not so much deviating from the sophistic community of *pepaideumenoi* as distancing himself from it. There is, therefore, throughout Gregory's works clear signs of a constant (re-)negotiation of identity – not just his own, but of others as well such as Caesarius and Basil; and Gregory's conception and use of *paideia* is at the centre of this re-negotiation.

(3) Gregory's pedagogy, the didactic methods used to teach biblical knowledge and theological doctrine

The poems discussed in chapter 1 offer little in the way of didactic,[432] but the biblical poems discussed in chapter two provide a unique insight into Gregory's understanding of the Bible. This is largely due to the fact that it is almost totally lacking in the traditional kinds of exegesis which one comes to expect from a Church father, where the Scriptures are expounded either in the allegorical school of thought (such as that of Origen) or more in line with the Antiochian, historical approach. Yet Gregory does little here to elucidate upon the Scripture he deals with, seeking rather to repackage and epitomise certain parts of the biblical text – such as the miracles and parables of the Gospels, the plagues of Egypt, or the genealogies of Christ (the poem which comes closest to traditional exegesis). The rather rudimentary information provided here has led scholars to believe that these poems were, therefore, made for a younger (schoolroom) audience for whom these poems would provide a chance for them to learn the ABCs of Scripture and Greek scansion – a conclusion which we have shown emphatically to be erroneous. But given that Gregory's learned audience, both Christian and Pagan alike, may not have been incredibly familiar with Scripture – at least not from their schooling which would have focussed on the (non-Christian) Classics – such a paratext in metre may have been quite handy as an introduction (or gateway) to the Scriptures. The poems, then, provide a highlight reel of sorts, picking out important parts of, for example, the Gospels, Jesus' miracles and parables, and giving a brief (often cryptic) line or two on these subjects in chronological order as they appear in each of the Gospels. Either these brief "content pages" might have given enough information for the Christian who had heard or read these stories

[432] This is not to say that the collected epigrams, as a whole, lack any didactic element. Rather, the poems discussed in this thesis do not.

before to recall the whole, or it encouraged the curious to delve into the Scriptures themselves and see what exactly it is that Gregory is referring to in these often cryptic and allusive lines. We can say, therefore, that this is an example of Gregory enticing the reader to delve more deeply into a collection of texts that had taken on a great amount of significance in the fourth-century, Roman world – as well as imbuing the Scriptures, often shunned or denounced for their lack of eloquence, with the eloquence of Greek literature.[433] Thus, Gregory yet again weaves together the strands of sacred and profane learning.

Chapter three shows Gregory again in a didactic mode but employing a slightly more traditional means of communicating his knowledge, this time on the merits (and faults) of the married and virginal life. In the opening hymn to Virginity, Gregory's aim is not only to sing the praises of the ascetic life, but also to show its ancient and divine origins. It provides an aetiology for Virginity, and so Gregory engages in a literary tradition often used by the Hellenistic poets (such as Apollonius and Callimachus) to display their *paideia*, as well as to support their own ideological outlooks, something which Gregory clearly does here too. Once we come to the dialogue of the *agon*, the reader is in no doubt about the outcome of this contest, though he may be surprised that Marriage too is given a seat at the side of Christ, and thus Marriage and Virginity share the victory – even if Virginity is a little higher up than Marriage. This *agon* also provides an example of dialogue that further supports Av. Cameron's (2014) position contra Lim's (1995 and 2008) that dialogue is all but dead in Late Antiquity, giving way to Imperial and Ecclesiastical diktats. For Gregory clearly is not interested in taking a robust stance on either of these ways of life – although he clearly favours Virginity. He lays out the advantages and pitfalls of both ways of life and gives both a victory of sorts at the end. Furthermore, Gregory's other main objective here is an end to strife and a call to concord, which can only exist under the rule of Christ. The poem taken as a whole, therefore, helps Gregory to solidify the legitimacy of the ascetic/virginal way of life in revealing its ancient and divine origins, and to give Virginity a place in society, as it exists in a reciprocal, mother-daughter relationship with Marriage. It takes a middle way, not favouring one way of life to the exclusion of the other and shows that practitioners of both ways of life can come into dialogue (contest) and communicate with each other *through* a shared *paideia*. For not all ascetics are like the rustic hordes described by Libanius or Eunapius, but many, like Gregory and his contemporaries, are trained in the ways of Greek culture.

Chapter four yet again shows Gregory weaving the strands of sacred and profane learning as he presents his vision of the Trinity and the world Christ the *Logos* creates in the *PA*. A prime example of this is how Gregory uses both the Orphic hymns and (neo-)Platonic philosophy to create his poetic, biblical narrative. Indeed, little reference is made to Scripture explicitly, but Gregory gives us his own *mythos* which is to provide a little pleasure (τέρψις) to his learned readers. In fact, Gregory's depiction of the Trinity, the creation of the angelic host, the *kosmos* and

[433] A similar point is made by O'Connell (2019:8). Indeed, the conclusions of O'Connell (p.21), an article that focusses on *Carm.* 2.1.1, are very similar to my own - an indication of how scholars are only just beginning to appreciate Gregory's poetry and his unique conception of *paideia*.

man who is made up of both earthly and heavenly components, and his subsequent fall, owe more to middle and neo-Platonic thinking than to faithfulness to the Scriptural narratives of Genesis. Much like in chapter two, we have a more sophisticated rendering of the Scriptures, much more attuned to the tastes and education of his readers.

(4) The place of classical culture in the Christian (ascetic) life - Gregory's conception of (a Christian) *paideia*:

Our opening chapter makes it quite clear that Gregory has what one might call a "broad church" conception of *paideia*. That is, he shows very little interest in trying to limit and define what parts of Greek literature, through which one gains an elite education and inculturation, one should avoid or prefer. Gregory, in fact, shows his knowledge of some of the seedier/erotic aspects of Greek literature in his choice of words and themes – whether that be how he portrays Euphemius in his epitaphs, or the work already done by scholars on erotic language in his oration for Basil (as discussed above). *Paideia*, rather than being something of which a Christian should be wary, is a useful tool in the cause of evangelisation, as well as a source of solace and comfort in times of distress. At times, he may echo the concerns of his fellow Cappadocian fathers even using the phrase which Basil uses in his *Letter to Young Men*: pluck the roses and avoid the thorns (*Carm.* 2.2.8.61, *Ad Adulescentes*, 4.9). But as we have seen, this is often a sign of Gregory's attentiveness to his intended audience, who might have their reservations about eloquent displays of one's *paideia* – as we have seen in Gregory's various portrayals of Caesarius. As we see in the epitaphs for himself and his fellow bishops (and more clearly stated in the epistolary poems discussed in the introduction), *paideia* is portrayed less as a thing that is ἔξωθεν (foreign) – as Nyssen often characterises secular learning in his *Life of Moses* – and more of an integral part of the good bishop's identity. After all, *paideia* comes from Christ, and Gregory has crowned his learning with Christ and put it at the service of Him who gave it to mortals.

Chapter 2 provides a clear example of the synthesis of classical, literary culture with Scripture. The work of Prudhomme has made clear the various intertextual references to earlier Greek poets that exist within these poems. But, as we have noted, Gregory's biblical poems are more than a mere Hellenisation of Judaeo-Christian Scripture; for Gregory's engagement with Greek literature goes beyond a surface level similarity to Greek literature through his use of metre and intertextual references. At the heart of these poems is a utilisation of a literary culture of producing secondary/auxiliary literature that was of interest to writers and readers alike. One is not sure if this could necessarily be termed a "Christian" *paideia*, as the only thing that makes it Christian is the subject matter, whereas relatively little is different in the way Gregory utilises Greek literature and culture in comparison to non-Christian writers.

I made a similar point in chapter three that the hymn to Virginity could as well be termed a "Pagan" hymn but for the mention of Christ; and, as innovative as this poem might be in its weaving together of a hymn with an *agon*, there is little to make Gregory's *paideia* "Christian" other than the Christian subject matter. The same could be said for the epitaphs discussed in

chapter 1, the *PA* in chapter 4, and perhaps even in the Biblical poems of chapter 2 – since the elements of "auxiliary literature" discussed typify a common practice of epitomising and condensing knowledge starting from the Second Sophistic. However, I should make it clear here that I am not trying to overemphasise the profane elements of Gregory's poetry over the sacred – thus going the other way of some scholars who tend to emphasise Gregory's Christianisation of Greek literature – but rather trying to make clear that Gregory's conception of *paideia* might not necessarily have to be so radically different from his non-Christian contemporaries. It would be easy to lump Gregory in with other "orthodox", Christian writers such as Gregory Nyssen, Basil, and Jerome, who are so ready to distance themselves from their past education. But this brief excursus into Gregory's poetry (even the fact that he wrote poetry!) is enough to show us that Gregory is not entirely of the same thought as his contemporaries. This becomes clearer in our third chapter when we compare Gregory's view of virginity – and how one should discuss and promote the ascetic life – to those of Jerome and Nyssen. Gregory is quite happy to "pull out all the stops" of his *paideia* in order to praise virginity, not taking heed of Nyssen's scolding of those who create lavish exhortations of the ascetic life. Even Gregory's personification of Virginity – though she might look like the ideal ascetic and live outside the *polis* – can more than hold her own in the war of words in which she engages with her mother Marriage. It is also clear that she is quite familiar with Greek literature and thought in her speech, and in such an *agon* as the one Gregory has here created, it is the successful display of one's *paideia* and rhetorical prowess that wins the day – as it does for Virginity. The good ascetic might reject the *kleos* that comes with great learning and culture, but that does not make her *apaideutos*.

Finally, Gregory's utilisation of classical culture in the Christian life of the Church is fully on display in our discussion of the *PA* in chapter 4. As I have argued, the *PA* is far from being the work of a retiring and downtrodden Gregory, who fled Constantinople with his tail between his legs, writing poetry for his own amusement and comfort; rather it is Gregory's attempt at opening up a new front in the war of words that engulfed the ecclesiastical community as waring cliques of clerics fought to shape the future of Christ's Church and the very understanding of the Divine itself. Therefore, we see how important classical culture was for Gregory in the life of the Church, and why the good bishop must be a *prytanis* of both sacred and profane learning. For Gregory's various weavings of sacred and profane found in these poems (especially those in chapters 2-4) are his attempts to influence his elite contemporaries to recognise *his* power and standing and agree with *his* interpretation of the Christian faith. Since *paideia* was, for the elites, the only sure way of being able to communicate successfully with (and dominate) their peers, Gregory's desire to display the whole breadths and depths of his great learning through his poetry (but also, of course, through his orations and letters) was of paramount importance for one who wished to shape the very future of society and the Church; and given Gregory's healthy afterlife in Byzantine society (his works producing an amount of manuscripts second only to Holy Writ itself) and his subsequent honorary title 'the Theologian',[434] it is clear that Gregory had an immense impact on society and

[434] See Elm (2012:7). See also Karavites (1993) for Gregory's influence over later Byzantine hymnography.

religion. I echo the sentiments of Elm (2012:8) that such a man as this could not be further from the 'loser' (as she says) that Anglophonic scholarship has created,[435] and whose poetry has often been used to support such an image, especially Gregory's line in the poem *On His Own Verses* where he says that one of the reasons he writes poetry is to bring some comfort to his ailing, old age. This is not to say that Gregory was being duplicitous when he says this, but we cannot base so much on one line of poetry out of a vast 18,000 lines (and that is only what is extant) – only a fraction of which has been discussed in this thesis.

Concluding Remarks and Areas for Future Research

This thesis has (and can) only provide a brief sketch of how Gregory conceived and used *paideia* in his literary output in comparison to his contemporaries, especially the Cappadocian fathers, and the rest of his works. Nevertheless, an exploration of Gregory's poetry - which still awaits, for the most part, a critical edition and in-depth exploration from the scholarly community – provides a worthy beginning into the exploration of this field of great interest to scholars; for Gregory is unique amongst his closest contemporaries for writing poetry at all. Furthermore, as our exploration of these poems have shown (especially as regards the poems considered in chapters 2-3) even the work that has been published on Gregory's poetry is not without its problems, and – as I have shown – a better understanding of *paideia* (that is, the cultural and literary society which Gregory inhabited) is key to a fuller understanding of these poems. Future research will need to consider Gregory's oeuvre as a whole – along with that of Basil and Nyssen – to build a much more detailed and colourful picture of how these various Christian writers struggled with (or perhaps relished in) exploring how they might take their profane learning to put it at the service of Christ.[436] From my own research, I have come to the conclusion that the fundamental difference between Nazianzen and his two, Cappadocian contemporaries, is that, for Basil and Nyssen, profane *paideia* was something that was to be left behind in the pursuit for the higher things. But, for Gregory, it is not simply a stepping stone that one could skip entirely in order to reach one's goal; rather it becomes an integral part of the Christian's identity, it weaves with his sacred learning and stays with him/her throughout their pursuit of union with the Divine – and so Gregory is less hesitant in affirming the value of *paideia* for the Christian.[437] We see here, therefore, that *paideia* is a process towards increasing one's perfection in matters both earthly and divine –

[435] See, for example, Sterk (1988:239) who talks about Gregory's 'volatile and sensitive temperament' and Bernardi (1995:312) who sees Gregory's poetry as the outlet of *un homme hypersensible et solitaire*.
[436] Although there is not the space to explore this in this thesis in great detail, I believe that *paideia* was perhaps a bone of contention amongst the three Church fathers. Take, for example, Nazianzen's *Ep.* 11 where he rebukes Nyssen, most likely (as McLynn [2018] interprets), for giving a rhetorical display at the invitation of a prominent sophist to his pupils. Although I broadly agree with McLynn's interpretation of this letter, I wonder if there is in fact a subtle reference to Basil's *Ad Adulescentes* at the end with the reference to Hesiod's *Works and Days* concerning the first and second orders of men. In short, perhaps Nazianzen is sarcastically attacking Nyssen for engaging in such sophistic display despite his brother's disregard for such things in his speech delivered at an earlier point in the city of Caesarea (again I follow the interpretation of McLynn [2010] on the *Ad Adulescentes* – see my introduction). Nazianzen, then, would unsurprisingly be taking the side of those who value – within reason - secular education and its goals (glory, wealth, and personal prestige in the *polis*) and do not appreciate Basil's depreciation of the *paideia* in which all these men and their peers were inevitably formed.
[437] On which see also Eshleman (2012:108).

something which scholars on the emperor Julian have noted in his conception of *paideia* (Athanassiadi 1981b and Bouffartigue 1992). Elm (2005 and 2012), then, was right to point out just how close (despite how far) Gregory and Julian's visions were of Rome, her culture, and her purpose – hence my hesitance to qualify Gregory's *paideia* as "Christian".

Furthermore, we must come to grips with the fact that particular figures within Late Antiquity did not necessarily have a unified and consistent view of the culture and literature of the society in which they lived and thought. This thesis has made clear that how Gregory portrays his *paideia* can change depending on factors such as his audience or his subject matter. It may well have developed over time, no doubt shaped by the reign and mission of Julian. Therefore, scholars must be careful in aligning particular figures with particular views or groups of people who share x or y view on Greek education and culture. As is often the case in the discipline of Classics, things are often much more complex – or perhaps we should say vibrant and interesting – than they seem.

Considering the above, we must conclude by addressing our original research question: What can Gregory Nazianzen's poetry tell us about his conception of *paideia*? How does he make use of *paideia*? What role does it play in the formation of his Christian identity? In many ways, the position that I take is one that has been extensively elaborated upon through the many works of Susanna Elm (all referred to *passim* in this thesis but especially her monograph on Gregory and Julian [2012]): that Gregory was highly indebted to (non-Christian) Classical education and culture in forming and conveying his ideas on God, man, and society. Even the basis of much of this thesis – the identity of the ideal bishop (as *prytanis* of sacred and profane wisdom) – has been discussed in Elm's work, who sums up Gregory's ideal bishop thus (2000:420):

> The candidate should be baptized, and he should be leading the "philosophical life." He should be a man who has received advanced training in rhetoric and philosophy, and who has spent significant portions of his life in *otium* or retirement devoted solely towards reaching a better understanding of Scripture. Only such a man, who had received the professional training that permits him to grasp the intellectual nuances of Scriptural exegesis (his own as well as those of his opponents), has the wherewithal to then lead the congregation appropriately and safely towards God. Only he will be able to act with dignity, as demanded by the prescriptions of political theory … In short, he must be a man like Gregory … or … Basil …

Yet our discussion has made quite clear that there is not a total harmony of thought between Gregory and Basil or his brother, Nyssen. Indeed, what is not extensively discussed in the works of Elm are Gregory's poetry, the very thing which distinguishes him form most of his contemporaries. In other words, in considering the poetry of Gregory of Nazianzus, we have both been able to note some distinct differences between these poems and Gregory's non-poetical work on similar topics and made clear that Gregory's understanding of *paideia* went far beyond mere rhetorical and philosophical accomplishment. A Mastery of rhetoric and philosophy may have – as Elm has extensively argued – played a major role in consolidating Gregory's image and authority as the bishop's bishop, but his poetry does so too in many different and interesting ways, as we have seen above.

For Gregory's poetry provides a unique example of a bishop who sought to use the immensity of his education, acquired over decades from the major centres of learning in the eastern Mediterranean world. Though he may at times seem to echo his contemporaries' desires to downplay the secular education that they received - to pick the roses and leave the thorns - a brief exploration of Gregory's poetry has shown that the echoing of such sentiments does not necessarily entail a uniformity of thought. For, at times, Gregory might seem closer to a Nonnus or Synesius than a Tertullian or Jerome when it comes to views on how a Christian could use his secular education. However, Gregory's use of *paideia* as expressed in his poetry is much more than mere window dressing for his Christian ministry, a pretty bow tied around his theology to attract the *pepaideumenoi*. Gregory actually uses his vast education and culture in interesting ways that significantly shape his thought. In other words, there is a reciprocal relationship between his secular and sacred education. One is not abandoned in favour of the other, but the secular is taken up and transformed by the sacred, or rather the secular is shown to always have belonged to the sacred, the true *Logos*, Christ. As regards (Christian) identity, the poetry in itself might show Gregory to be an (overly) erudite bishop, one who was not as ready to abandon his "past life" in Athens as Basil. However, it is in bringing the poetry into a conversation with Gregory's other forms of literary output (letters and orations) that helps us to form a much more complicated and nuanced picture. Caesarius provides the prime example. In his funeral oration, Caesarius is a martyr of sorts, adamantly asserting his Christian identity, but in the epitaphs, we see him rather as a *pepaideumenos* par excellence. We can see, therefore, in Gregory's written works a desire to live out that maxim of St. Paul, of which Gregory speaks in Or. 2.51, to become all things to all men – that is, to bring all to Christ, regardless of one's social status or (lack/suspicion of) education. This, however, was no straightforward things, as Nimmo Smith (2016b) points out. Such a desire to please all could be seen as duplicitous, chameleon (or octopus)-like, and even sophistic in a pejorative sense of the word – not only by people such as Julian but (contradictorily) also Gregory himself.

Nevertheless, this idea of being "all things to all men" has as its aim to bring all men to Christ - that is, to convert people. Now is not the place to dive into the plethora of works conducted on conversion theory in antiquity.[438] It would suffice to say that conversion, generally speaking, does not occur through "Road to Damascus" experiences or simple (rational) assent to a group's religio-philosophical doctrines, but occurs primarily through social networks. We rarely change our mind through a visit from cold callers or listening to street preachers, but rather we are influenced by our network of friends and family- the people with whom we establish regular and cordial communication.[439] If there is one thing that united the Roman empire, according to scholars such as Brown (*passim*, but especially *Power and Persuasion*), it was *paideia*; and as we have seen

[438] On conversion theory see James (1982) and Nock (1933) which looks at the ancient world more particularly. There are works that deal with the conversions of more particular individuals and their works such as Dio Chrysostom (Moles [1978]), and Apuleius (Shumate [1988, 1996], Bradley [1998]). There is the potential, I believe, to explore conversion much more in relation to Gregory, since his autobiographical poems provide a parallel to Augustine's *Confessions*, which is clearly a conversion narrative.
[439] On this, see Eshleman (2007) and Av. Cameron (2015:17-18).

in our study of Gregory, there was as much at stake in establishing oneself as a *pepaideumenos*, as well as a Christian. For the former identity legitimised the latter in the eyes of the social elite and gave Gregory access (and dominance) to a social network that reached far and wide – indeed to the very top of the social ladder, as Gregory's appointment to the See of Constantinople by Theodosius himself makes clear. This thesis has only scratched the surface in answering these questions. Further close analysis of the whole of Gregory's poetry alongside the rest of his works will only help us paint a clearer picture of one of the most influential men in shaping Christendom both East and West.

Bibliography

Editions and Translations of Authors Cited in Thesis

- Amphilochius of Iconium, *Iambi ad Seleucum*, E. Oberg (ed.), (Berlin, 1969)
- *Anthologie Palatine, Livre X*, J. Irigoin, F. Maltomini, and P. Laurens (eds.), (Paris, 2017)
- Apollonius of Rhodes, *Argonautica*, H. Fraenkel, (ed.), (Oxford, 1961)
- Apollonius of Rhodes, *Argonautica*, R. Hunter (trans.), (Oxford, 1993)
- Athanassakis, A.N. (trans. And ed.), *The Orphic Hymns* (Missoula, 1977)
- Athanassakis, A.N. and Wolkow, B.M. (trans.), *The Orphic Hymns*, (Baltimore, 2013)
- Basil, *The Letters*, vol. 2, R.J. Deferrari (trans. and ed.) (London, 1928)
- Bergk, T. (ed.), *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* (Leipzig, 1866)
- Campbell, D.A. (ed.) *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Bristol, 1982)
- Diehl, E. (1936), *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*, vol.1 (Leipzig)
- Diodore of Tarsus, *Commentary on Psalms 1-51*, R.C. Hill (trans.) (Atlanta, 2005)

- Dionysius of Halicarnasus (Ps.-), *Ars Rhetorica*, W.H. Race (trans. and ed.) (London, 2019)
- Eunapius, *Lives of the Philosophers*, W.C. Wright (trans. and ed.) (London,1922)
- Eunomius, *The Extant Works*, R. Vaggione (trans. and ed.), (Oxford, 1987)
- *Greek Anthology*, Vol.2, W.R. Paton (trans. and ed.) (London, 1917)
- Gregory Nazianzen, *Lettres* vols. 1-2, P. Gallay (trans. and ed.) (Paris, 1964 and 1967)
- Gregory Nazianzen, *Discours 4-5 Contre Julien*, J. Bernardi (ed. and trans.) (Paris, 1983)
- Gregory Nazianzen, *Ad Olimpiade*, L. Bacci (ed.), (Florence, 1996)
- Gregory Nazianzen, *Autobiographical Poems*, C. White (ed.) (Cambridge, 1996)
- Gregory Nazianzen, *On God and Man: The Theological Poetry of St. Gregory of Nazianzus* (P. Gilbert, trans.) (New York, 2001)
- Gregory Nazianzen, *Oeuvres Poetiques: Poemes Personnels - II, 1, 1-11*, A. Tuilier and G. Bady (eds.), (Paris, 2004)
- Gregory Nazianzen, *Poems on Scripture*, B. Dunkle (ed.) (New York, 2012)
- Gregory Nazianzen, *Poemata Arcana*, D. Sykes and C. Moreschini (ed. and Trans.) (Oxford, 1997)
- Gregory Nazianzen, *Gregorii Nazianzeni* ΣΥΓΚΡΙΣΙΣ ΒΙΩΝ, H.M. Werhahn (ed.), (Wiesbaden, 1953)
- Gregory Nazianzen, *Sulla Virtu, carme giambico*, C. Crimi (ed.), (Florence, 1995)
- Gregory Nyssen, *Traité de la Virginité*, M. Aubineau (Trans. and ed.) (Paris, 1966)
- Gregory Nyssen, *The Life of Macrina*, Anna M. Silvas (trans. and ed.) (Turnhout, 2008)
- Iamblichus, *De Mysteriis*, E.C. Clarke, J.M. Dillon, J.P. Hershbell (trans. And eds.), (Leiden, 2004)
- Jerome, *Chronicon*, R. Helm (ed.) (Leipzig, 1913)
- Justin Martyr, *Apologia*, D. Minns and P. Parvis (trans. and eds.) (Oxford, 2009)
- Lobel, E. and Page, D. (1955), *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta* (Oxford)
- Menander Rhetor, *Treatises*, D.A. Russell and N.G. Wilson (trans. and eds.) (Oxford, 1981)
- Lucian, *Lucian*, Vol. 3, A.M. Harmon (trans. and ed.) (London, 1921)
- Lucian, *Selected Dialogues*, D. Costa (Trans.) (Oxford, 2005)
- Nestle, E. et al. (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graece*[27] (Stuttgart, 1993)
- Philo, *Opera Quae Supersunt*, vols. 1-6 (L. Cohn, ed.) (1896-1915, Berlin)
- Rahlfs, A. (ed.), *Septuaginta*, revised ed. by R. Hanhart (Stuttgart, 2006)
- Synesius of Cyrene, *The Essays and Hymns*, A. Fitzgerald (trans.), (London, 1930)
- T.W. Allen (ed.) (1912), *Homeri Opera* (Oxford)
- West, M.L. (ed.) *Delectus ex Iambis et Elegis Graecis* (Oxford, 1980)
- West, M.L. (trans.) *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford, 1993)

Secondary Sources

- Adkin, N. (1991),'Gregory of Nazianzus and Jerome: Some Remarks', in *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, vol.37, pp. 13-24
- Adkin, N. (1999), 'Jerome's Vow "Never to Read the Classics": Some Observations', in *Revue des Études Anciennes*, vol.101, pp. 161-167
- Agosti, G. (2001), 'Late Antique Iambics and *Iambike Idea*' in Cavarzere, A, Alonis, A., and Barchiesi, A. (eds.) *Iambic Ideas* (Oxford), pp. 219-255
- Agosti, G. (2008), 'Literariness and Levels of Style in Epigraphical Poetry of Late Antiquity', in *Ramus*, vol. 37, pp. 191-213
- Agosti, G. (2013), 'Sulle Immagini Bucoliche nell'Epigramma Greco Tardoantico." In F. Garambois-Vasquez and D. Vallat (eds.), *La Lierre et la Statue. La Nature et son Espace Littéraire dans l' Épigramme Gréco-Latine Tardive* (Saint-Étienne), pp. 237–50.
- Agosti, G. and Gonnelli, F. (1995), 'Materiali per la storia dell'esametro nei poeti cristiani greci' in G. Agosti and F. Gonnelli (eds.) *Struttura e Storia dell'Esametro Greco*, vol. 1, pp. 289-409 (Rome)
- Anderson, G. (1989) 'Sophist and their Outlook in the Early Empire', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen,* Part II, vol.33.1, pp.79-208
- Anderson, G. (1993), *The Second Sophistic: A cultural phenomenon in the Roman Empire* (London)
- Anderson, G. (1994), *Sage, saint, and sophist: holy men and their associates in the early Roman Empire* (London)
- Anderson, J. (2007), *Paradox in Christian Theology* (Eugene, Oregon)
- Andrew, E. (1983), 'Descent to the Cave', in *The Review of Politics*, vol. 45, pp. 510-535
- Arena, G. (2019), 'Martyrs, Monks, and Heretics in Rocky Cappadocia', in S. Mitchell and P. Pilhofer (eds.) *Early Christianity in Asia Minor and Cyprus: From the Margins to the Mainstream* (Leiden), pp. 78-108
- Asmus, R. (1991). 'Gregorius von Nazianz und sein Verhältnis zum Kynismus. Eine patristisch-philosophische Studie', In M. Billerbeck (Ed.), *Die Kyniker in der modernen Forschung* (pp. 185–205). Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner.
- Athanassiadi, P. (1981b), *Julian and Hellenism: an intellectual biography* (Oxford)
- Ayres, L. (2004), Nicaea and its Legacy (Oxford)
- Bacci, L. (1996), *Gregorio Nazianzeno: Ad Olimpiade* (Florence)
- Bakke, O.M. (2005), *When Children Became People*, (Minneapolis)
- Ballard, C.A. (2017), 'The Mysteries of *Paideia*: "Mystery" and Education in Plato's *Symposium*, 4QInstruction, and 1 Corinthians', in K.M. Hogan, M. Goff, and E. Wasserman (ed.) *Pedagogy in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Atlanta), pp. 243-281
- Barker, E.T.E (2009), *Entering the Agon* (Oxford)

- Barnes, M.R., Williams, D.H. (eds.) (1993), *Arianism After Arius* (Edinburgh)
- Barnes, T.D. (1981), 'Himerius and the Fourth Century', in *Classical Philology*, vol.82, pp. 206-225
- Bassi, K. (1989), 'The Poetics of Exclusion in Callimachus' Hymn to Apollo', Vol. 119, pp. 219-231
- Beagon, P.M. (1997), 'Some Cultural Contacts of St. Basil at Antioch', in *Studia Patristica*, vol. 32, pp. 67-71
- Beck, H. G. (1977), *Rede als Kunstwerk und Bekenntnis: Gregor von Nazianz* (Munich)
- Becker, A.H. (2011), 'Christian Society', in M. Peachin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World* (Oxford), pp. 567-586
- Beeley, C.A. (2007), 'Divine Causality and the Monarchy of God the Father in St. Gregory of Nazianzus', in *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 100, pp. 199-214
- Beeley, C.A. (2009), 'Cyril of Alexandria and Gregory Nazianzen: Tradition and Complexity in Patristic Christology', in *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, vol. 17, pp. 381-149
- Beeley, C.A. (2011), 'The Early Christological Controversy: Apollinarius, Diodore, and Gregory Nazianzen', in *Vigiliae Christianae*, vol. 65, pp. 376-407
- Behr, J. (2000), *Asceticism and Anthropology in Irenaeus and Clement* (Oxford)
- Behr, J. (2004), *The Nicene Faith*, vol.2 (New York)
- Bellini, E. (I971), 'La Posizione dei Monachi e dei Vergini nella Chiesa Secondo Gregorio Nazianzeno', in *Scuola Cattolica*, vol. 99, pp. 452-66.
- Beneker, J. (2011), 'Plutarch and Saint Basil as Readers of Greek Literature', in *Syllecta Classica*, Vol. 22, pp. 95-111
- Bergman, J. (1982), *Synesius of Cyrene* (London)
- Bernardi, J. (1995), *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze: Le Théologien et son Temps* (Paris)
- Bing, P. (2009), *The Scroll and the Marble* (Michigan)
- Bingham, D.J. (2017), 'Paideia and Polemic in Second-Century Lyons: Irenaeus on Education', in K.M. Hogan, M. Goff, and E. Wasserman (ed.) *Pedagogy in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Atlanta), pp. 323-358
- Blair, A.M. (2010), *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (London)
- Bloomer, W.M. (ed.) (2015), *A Companion to Ancient Education* (Oxford)
- Böhme, R. (1980), *Der Sänger der Vorzeit: drei Kapitel zur Orpheusfrage* (Bern)
- Borret, M. (1997), 'A Pagan Perspective on Scripture', in P. Blowers (ed.) *The Bible in Greek Christian Antiquity*, (Notre Dame), pp. 259-288
- Børtnes, J. (2000) 'Eros Transformed: Same-Sex Love and Divine Desire: Reflections on the Erotic Vocabulary in St. Gregory of Nazianzus' Speech on St. Basil the Great, in T.

Hägg and P Rousseau (eds.) *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (London), pp. 180-193

- Bouffartigue, J. (1992) *L'Empereur Julian et la Culture de son Temps* (Paris)
- Bowersock, G.W. (1969), *Greek Sophist in the Roman Empire* (Oxford)
- Bowersock, G.W. (1978), *Julian the Apostate* (Cambridge, MA)
- Bowersock, G.W. (1990), *Hellenism in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge)
- Bowie, E.L. (1989), 'Greek Sophists and Greek Poetry in the Second Sophistic', in W. Haase (ed.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt,* Part II, vol.2.33.1, pp.209-258
- Bradley, K. (1998), 'Contending with Conversion: Reflections on the Reformation of Lucius the Ass', in *Phoenix*, Vol. 52, pp. 315-334
- Brakke, D. (1995), *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism* (Oxford)
- Branham, R.B. and Goulet-Cazé, M.-O. (1996) *The Cynics* (Berkeley)
- Breitenbach, A. (2003), *Das "wahrhaft goldene Athen": Die Auseinandersetzung griechischer Kirchenväter mit der Metropole heidnisch-antiker Kultur* (Berlin)
- Bremer, J.M. (1981), 'Greek Hymns', in H.S. Versnel (ed.), *Faith, hope and worship*, pp. 193-215
- Brenk, F.E. (1986), 'Demonology in the Early Imperial Period', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt,* Part II, vol. 16.3, pp.2068-2145
- Brent, A. (2006), *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic* (Tübingen)
- Breytenbach, C. and Zimmermann, C. (2018), *Early Christianity in Lycaonia and Adjacent Areas: From Paul to Amphilochius of Iconium* (Leiden)
- Brodňanská, E. (2012), 'Verse Letter from Gregory of Nazianzus to Vitalianus', in *Parekbolai*, vol. 2, pp. 109-127
- Brodňanská, E. (2016), '*Paideia* [Education] through the Lens of the Words in the Poetry of Gregory of Nazianzus', in *Graeco-Latina Brunensia*, vol. 21, pp. 5-19
- Brown, P. (1971a) 'The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity', in *Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. 6I, pp. 80-101
- Brown, P. (1971b), *The World of Late Antiquity, A.D. I50-750* (New York)
- Brown, P. (1978), *The Making of Late Antiquity* (Harvard)
- Brown, P. (1981), *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago).
- Brown, P. (1983), 'The Saint as Exemplar in Late Antiquity', *Representations*, No. 2, pp. 1-25
- Brown, P (1988), *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York)
- Brown, P. (1992), *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity* (London)
- Brown, P. (2002), *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire* (London)

- Brown, P. (2013), ‘From Civic Euergetism to Christian Giving’, in P. Eich and E. Faber (eds.) *Religiöser Alltag in der Spätantike* (Stuttgart), pp. 23-30
- Browning, R. (1975), *The Emperor Julian* (London)
- Brunt, P.A. (1994), ‘The Bubble of the Second Sophistic’, *BICS*, vol.39, pp. 25-52
- Burckhardt, J. (1998), *The Greeks and Greek Civilization* (translated by S. Stern) (London)
- Burkert, W. (1994), “Griechische Hymnoi”, in W. Burkert and F. Stolz (eds.) *Hymnen der Alten Welt im Kulturvergleich* (Goettingen), pp. 9-17
- Burrus, V. (2000), *“Begotten not Made”: Conceiving Manhood in Late Antiquity* (Stanford)
- Burrus, V. (2006), ‘Life after death: The martyrdom of Gorgonia and the birth of female hagiography’, in J. Børtnes and T. Hägg (eds.) *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (Copenhagen), pp.153-170
- Cain, A. (2009), *The Letters of Jerome: Asceticism, Biblical Exegesis, and the Construction of Christian Authority in Late Antiquity* (Oxford)
- Cameron, Al. (1965), ‘Wandering Poets: A Literary Movement in Byzantine Egypt’, in *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, vol.14, pp.470-509
- Cameron, Al. (1971) ‘PAP. ANT. III. 115 and the Iambic Prologue in Late Greek Poetry’, in *The Classical Quarterly*, vol. 20, pp. 119-129
- Cameron, Al. (2006), “Poetry and Literary Culture in Late Antiquity” in Swain, S. and Edwards, M. (eds.) *Approaching Late Antiquity* (Oxford), pp. 327-354
- Cameron, Al. (2007), ‘Poets and Pagans in Byzantine Egypt’, in R.S. Bagnall (ed.), *Egypt in the Byzantine World, 300-700* (Cambridge), pp. 21-46
- Cameron, Av. (1970) *Agathias* (Oxford)
- Cameron, Av. (1997), “Education and Literary Culture” in Cameron, A. and Garnsey, P. (Eds.) *The Cambridge Ancient Histories*, Vol. 13, pp. 665-707
- Cameron, Av. (1980), 'Neither Male nor Female', in *Greece & Rome*, vol. 27, pp. 60-7
- Cameron, Av. (2014), *Dialoguing in Late Antiquity* (London)
- Cameron, Av. (2015), ‘Christian Conversion in Late Antiquity: Some Issues’, in A. Papaconstantinou, N. McLynn, and D.L. Schwartz (eds.) *Conversion in Late Antiquity: Christianity, Islam, and Beyond* (Farnham), pp. 3-21
- Campbell, J.M. (1922), *The Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Style of the Sermons of St. Basil the Great* (Washington)
- Caner, D. (2002), *Wandering, Begging Monks: Spiritual Authority and the Promotion of Monasticism in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley)
- Castagno, A.M. (1995), ‘La demonologia cristiana fra secondo e terzo secolo’, in S.Pricoco (ed.) *Il Demonio e I suoi Complici* (Salveria Mannelli), pp. 111-150

- Castelli, C. (2005), 'Gregorio di Nazianzo nell'Epitafio per Basilio il Grande' in I Gualandri, F. Conca, R. Passarella (eds.) *Nuovo e Antico nella Cultura Greco-Latina di IV-VI Secolo* (Milan), pp. 371-389
- Cazeaux, J. (1980), *Les Échos de la Sophistique Autour de Libanios* (Paris)
- Cavero, L.M. (2008) *Poems in Context: Greek Poetry in the Egyptian Thebaid 200–600 AD* (Berlin)
- Cavero, L.M. (2018), "Christian Poetry", in S. McGill and E. Watts (eds.), *Blackwell's Companion to Late Antique Literature* (Hoboken), pp. 259-80
- Chadwick, H. (1966) *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition* (Oxford)
- Chapman, S. (2003), 'How the Biblical Canon Began: Working Models and Open Questions', in M. Finkelberg and G.G. Stroumsa (eds.) *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond* (Leiden), pp. 29-52
- Clark, G. (1993) *Women in Late Antiquity* (Oxford)
- Clark, G. (1999), 'Translate into Greek: Porphyry of Tyre on the New Barbarians', in R. Miles (ed.) *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity* (London), pp. 112-132
- Clark, G. (2011), *Body and Gender, Soul and Reason in Late Antiquity* (Farnham)
- Clarke, M.L. (1971), *Higher Education in the Ancient World* (London)
- Clay, J.S. (1989), *The Politics of Olympus* (Princeton)
- Clay, J.S. (2011), 'The Homeric Hymns', in I. Morris and B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden), pp. 489-507
- Clements, R. (2000), 'Origen's *Hexapla* and Christian-Jewish Encounter in the Second and Third Centuries', in T.L. Donaldson (ed.) *Religious Rivalries and the Struggle for Success in Caesarea Maritima* (Waterloo), pp. 303-329
- Cohick, L.H. and Hughes, A.B. (2017), *Christian Women in the Patristic World* (Grand Rapids)
- Coleman, K.M. (2019), 'Epigram, Society, and Political Power', in C. Henriksén (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epigram* (Hoboken), pp. 59-76
- Consolino, F.E. (1987), 'Σοφίης ἀμφοτέρης πρύτανιν: gli epigrammi funerari di Gregorio di Nazianzo (AP VIII)', in *Athenaeum*, vol. 65, pp. 407-25
- Cooper, K. (1996) *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity* (London)
- Corsano, M. (1991), 'Tymborychia e leggi in alcuni epigrammi di Gregorio Nazianzeno', in *Vetera Christianorum*, vol. 28, pp. 169-180
- Crawford, M.R. (2019), *The Eusebian Canon Tables: Ordering Textual Knowledge in Late Antiquity* (Oxford)
- Cribiore, R. (1996), *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Atlanta)
- Cribiore, R. (2013), *Libanius the Sophist: Rhetoric, Reality, and Religion in the Fourth Century* (Ithaca)

- Cribiore, R. (2017), ‘Why did Christians Compete with Pagans for Greek Paideia?’, in K.M. Hogan, M. Goff, and E. Wasserman (ed.) *Pedagogy in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Atlanta), pp. 359-374
- Cross, R. (2006), 'Divine Monarchy in Gregory of Nazianzus’, in *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, vol. 14, pp. 105-116
- Daley, B.E. (2008), ‘Walking through the Word of God: Gregory of Nazianzus as Biblical Interpreter’, in J.R. Wagner, A.K. Grieb, and C.K. Rowe (eds.) *The Word Leaps the Gap* (Cambridge), pp. 514-531
- Daley, B.E. (2012), ‘Systematic Theology in Homeric Dress’, in C.A. Beeley (ed.) *Re-reading Gregory of Nazianzus* (Washington), pp. 3-12
- Daley, B.E. (2018), *God Visible: Patristic Christology Reconsidered* (Oxford)
- Daniélou, J. (1964), *Primitive Christian Symbols*, trans. by D.Attwater (London)
- Daniélou, J. (1968), *La Vie de Moïse* (Paris)
- Davies, J.C. (1977), ‘The Philosopher and the Cave’, in *Greece & Rome*, vol. 24, pp. 23-28
- Debidour V.-H. and Musurillo, H. (1963), *Méthode d’Olympe: Le Banquet* (Paris)
- De Brauw, M. (2007), ‘The Parts of Speech’ in I Worthington (ed.) *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric* (Oxford), pp.187-202
- De Carvalho, M.M. (2017) ‘Politique et Culture dans l'Antiquité Tardive: l'Empereur Julien et le Contre Julien de Grégoire de Nazianze’, in M.T. Schettino and C. Urlacher-Becht (ed.) *Ipse Dixit: L’Autorité Intellectuelle des Anciens: Affirmation, Approproiations,Détournements* (Toulouse), pp. 63-82
- DeForest, D. (2011) ‘Between Mysteries and Factions: Initiation Rituals, Student Groups, and Violence in the Schools of Late Antique Athens’, in *Journal of Late Antiquity*, vol. 4, pp. 315-342
- De Jong, I.J.F. (2012a), ‘Introduction: Narratological Theory on Space’, in De Jong (ed.), *Space in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden), pp. 1-18
- De Jong, I.J.F. (2012b), ‘The Homeric Hymns’, in De Jong (ed.), *Space in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden), pp. 39-53
- Demoen, Kristoffel (1993), ‘The attitude towards Greek poetry in the verse of Gregory Nazianzen’, in J. Den Boeft and A. Hilhorst (eds.), *Early Christian poetry: A Collection of Essays* (Leiden), pp. 235-252.
- Demoen, K. (1996), *Pagan and biblical exempla in Gregory Nazianzen: a study of rhetoric and hermeneutics*, (Brepols)
- Demoen, K. (1997a), ‘Gifts of friendship that will remain for ever. Personae, addressed characters and intended audience of Gregory Nazianzen's epistolary poems’, in *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, vol. 47, pp.1-11
- Demoen, K. (1997b), ‘Some Remarks on the Life and Poems of Gregory Nazianzen’, in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, vol. 63, pp. 171-179

- Demoen, K. (1997c), 'The Paradigmatic Prayer in Gregory Nazianzen', in E. Livingstone (ed.) *Studia Patristica*, vol. 32, pp. 96-101
- Demoen, Kristoffel. (1997d). 'Acteurs de pantomimes, trafiquants du Christ, flatteurs de femmes. Les évêques dans les poèmes autobiographiques de Grégoire de Nazianze',in *Vescovi e pastori in epoca Teodosiana. Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum*, vol. 58. pp. 287–298
- Demoen, K. (2006), ''I am a Skilful Poet': Persuasion and Demonstration in Gregory Nazianzen's Ad Vitalianum', in E. Amato (ed.), *Approches de la Troisième Sophistique : hommages à Jacques Schamp* (Brussels) pp. 431-440
- Demoen, K. (2009), 'Poétique et rhétorique dans la poésie de Grégoire de Nazianze', *Dossiers Byzantins*, vol. 9, pp. 47–66
- Depew, M. (2007), 'Springs, Nymphs, and Rivers. Models of Origination in Third-Century Alexandrian Poetry', in Bierl, A. Lämmel, R. and Wesselmann, K. (eds.) in *Literatur und Religion*, vol.2 (Berlin), pp.141-172
- Desmond, W.D. (2006), *The Greek Praise of Poverty* (Notre Dame)
- De Stefani, C. and Magnelli, E. (2011), 'Callimachus and Later Greek Poetry', in B. Acosta Hughes, L. Lehnus, and S. Stephens (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, pp. 534-565 (Leiden)
- Dihle, A. (1989), *Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire* (London)
- Dillon, J. (1977), *The Middle Platonists* (London)
- Dines, J.M. (2004), *The Septuagint* (London)
- Dubischar, M. (2010), 'Survival of the Most Condensed? Auxiliary Texts, Communications Theory, and Condensation of Knowledge', in M. Horster and C. Reitz (ed.) *Condensing Texts – Condensed Texts* (Stuttgart), pp. 39-67
- Dunkle, B. (2012), *Poems on Scripture* (New York)
- Egan, J.P (1993), 'Primal Cause and Trinitarian Perichoresis in Gregory Nazianzen's *Oration* 31.14', in *Studia Patristica*, Vol. 27, pp. 21-28
- Egan, J.P (1997), '*Aitios*/Author, *Aitia*/Cause and *Arche*/Origin: Synonyms in Selected Texts of Gregory Nazianzen', in *Studia Patristica*, Vol. 32, pp. 102-107
- Elm, S. (1994), *Virgins of God: the making of asceticism in late antiquity* (Oxford)
- Elm, S. (1999), 'Inventing the Father of the Church: Gregory of Nazianzus' "Farewell to the Bishops" (Or. 42) in its Historical Context', in F. Felten and N. Jaspert (eds.), *Vita Religiosa im Mittelalter* (Berlin), pp. 3-20
- Elm, S. (2000), 'A Programmatic Life: Gregory of Nazianzus' Orations 42 and 43 and the Constantinopolitan Elites', in *Arethusa*, vol. 33, pp. 411-427
- Elm, S. (2005), 'Hellenism and Hagiography: Gregory of Nazianzus and Julian in Dialogue', in D.B. Martin, P.C. Miller (eds.), *The Cultural Turn in Late Ancient Studies* (London), pp. 258-277

- Elm, S. (2006), 'Gregory's women: Creating a philosopher's family', in J. Børtnes and T. Hägg (eds.) *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (Copenhagen), pp.171-191
- Elm, S. (2012), *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church* (London)
- Elm, S. (2012b), 'Julian the Writer and His Audience', in N. Baker-Brian and S. Tougher (eds.) *Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate* (Oxford), pp.1-18
- Elm, S. (2018), 'Dressing Moses: Reading Gregory of Nyssa's *Life of Moses* Literally', in A. Marmadoro and N. McLynn (eds.) *Exploring Gregory of Nyssa: Philosophical, Theological, and Historical Studies* (Oxford), pp. 49-73
- Engels, D. and Van Nuffelen, P. (2014), 'Religion and Competition in Antiquity. An Introduction', in D. Engels and P. Van Nuffelen (eds.) *Religion and Competition in Antiquity* (Brussels), pp. 9-44
- Eshleman, K. (2007). Affection and Affiliation: Social Networks and Conversion to Philosophy. The Classical Journal, 103(2), pp. 129-140
- Eshleman, K. (2012), *The social world of intellectuals in the Roman Empire: sophists, philosophers, and Christians* (Cambridge)
- Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. (2004), *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge)
- Farrar, T.J. (2018), 'The Intimate and Ultimate Adversary: Satanology in Early Second-Century Christian Literature', in the *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, vol.26.4, pp.517-546
- Faulkner, A. (2010), 'St Gregory of Nazianzus and the Classical Tradition the Poemata Arcana Qua Hymns', in *Philologus*, vol. 154, pp. 78-87
- Fayant, M.C. (2014), *Hymnes Orphiques* (Paris)
- Fedwick, P.J. (ed.) (1981), *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic*, in two volumes (Toronto)
- Ferrari, G. (2003), 'What Kind of Rite of Passage was the Ancient Greek Wedding?', in D.B. Dodd and C.A. Faraone (eds.) *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives* (London), pp. 27-42
- Festugière, A.J. (1959), *Antioche païenne et chrétienne: Libanius, Chrysostome et les moines de Syrie* (Paris)
- Finn, R (2009), *Asceticism in the Graeco-Roman World* (Cambridge)
- Fitzpatrick, G. (1988), *Christian Education and the Three Hierarchs: St Basil the Great, St Gregory the Theologian and St John Chrysostom*, PhD thesis (Durham)
- Floridi, L. (2013), 'The Epigrams of Gregory of Nazianzus Against Tomb Desecrators and Their Epigraphic Background', in *Mnemosyne*, vol. 66, pp. 55-81
- Fortin, E.L. (1981), 'Hellenism and Christianity in Basil the Great's Address *Ad Adulescentes*', in H.J. Blumenthal and R.A. Markus (eds.) *Neoplatonism and Christian Thought* (London), pp. 189-203

- Fowler, R.C. and Quiroga, A.J. (2014), 'A Prolegomena to the Third Sophistic', in R.C. Fowler (ed.) *Plato in the Third Sophistic* (Berlin), pp. 1-30
- Freise, R. (1983), 'Zur Metaphorik der Seefahrt in den Gedichten Gregors von Nazianz', in J. Mossay (ed.), *Symposium Nazianzenum*, vol. 2 (Paderborn), pp. 159-163
- Fuhrer, T. (2013), 'Hypertexts and Auxiliary Texts: New Genres in Late Antiquity?', in T. Papanghelis, S.J. Harrison, and S. Frangoulidis (eds.) *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature* (Berlin)
- Fulford, B. (2012), 'Gregory of Nazianzus and Biblical Interpretation', in C.A. Beeley (ed.) *Re-reading Gregory of Nazianzus* (Washington), pp. 31-48
- Furley, W.D. (1993), 'Types of Greek Hymns', in *Eos*, vol. 81, pp. 21-41
- Furley, W.D. (1995), 'Praise and Persuasion in Greek Hymns', in *JHS*, vol. 115, pp. 29-46
- Gager, J.G. (1972), *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism* (New York)
- Gain, B. (2016), 'Les Épitaphes de Grégoire de Nazianze sur son Ami Basile de Césarée: Aperçu sur leur Transmission et leur Tonalité Chrétienne', in G. H. de La Portbarré-Viard and A. Stoehr-Monjou (eds.), *Studium in libris: mélanges en l'honneur de Jean-Louis Charlet* (Paris), pp. 209-224
- Gallay, P. (1943) *La Vie de Saint Grégoire de Nazianze* (Paris)
- Gallay, P. (1964), *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze: Lettres,* Vol.1 (Paris)
- Gane, J.H. (2012), *Fourth Century Christian Education: An Analysis of Basil's Ad Adolescentes* (PhD thesis, Newcastle)
- Gamble, H.Y. (1995), *Book and Readers in the Early Church* (London)
- Geljon, A.C. (2002), *Philonic Exegesis in Gregory of Nyssa's "De Vita Moysis"* (Providence)
- Gemeindhardt, P. (2012), 'In Search of Christian Paideia: Education and Conversion in Early Christian Biography', in *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum*, vol. 16, pp. 88-98
- Gemeindhardt, P. (2018), 'Translating *Paideia*; Education in the Greek and Latin Versions of the *Life of Antony*', in L.I. Larsen and S. Rubenson (eds.), *Monastic Education in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge), pp. 33-52
- Genette, G. (1997a), *Palimpsests* (Trans. C. Newman & Claude Doubinsky) (London)
- Genette, G. (1997b), *Paratexts* (Trans. J.E. Lewin) (Cambridge)
- Georgia, A.T. (2018), 'The Monster at the End of His Book: Monstrosity as Theological Strategy and Cultural Critique in Tatian's *Against the Greeks*', in *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, vol. 26, pp. 191-219
- Gerber, D.E. (1999), 'Pindar, Nemean Six: A Commentary', in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. 99, pp. 33-91
- Gertz, N. (1986), *Die Handschriftliche Überlieferung der Gedichte Gregors von Nazianz: Die Gedichtgruppe I* (Paderborn)

- Giulea, D.A. (2010), 'The Divine Essence, that Inaccessible *Kabod* Enthroned in Heaven: Nazianzen's *Oratio* 28,3 and the Tradition of Apophatic Theology from Symbols to Philosophical Concepts', in *Numen*, Vol. 57, pp. 1-29
- Gleason, M.W. (1995), *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Representation in Ancient Rome* (Princeton)
- Goldhill, S. (2001) (ed.), *Being Greek Under Rome* (Cambridge)
- Golitzin, A. (2001), 'Adam, Eve, and Seth: Pneumatological Reflections on an Unusual Image in Gregory of Nazianzus's', in *Anglican Theological Review*, Vol. 83, pp. 537-547
- Goody, J. (1977), *The Domestication of the Savage Mind* (Cambridge)
- Gow, A.S.F. & Page, D.L. (1965), *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge)
- Grafton, A. and Williams, M. (2006), *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book* (London)
- Graziosi, B. (2001), 'Competition in Wisdom', in F. Budelmann and P. Michelakis (eds.), *Homer, Tragedy and Beyond: Essays in honour of P. E. Easterling* (London), pp. 57-74
- Gregg, R.C. (1975), *Consolation Philosophy: Greek and Christian "paideia" in Basil and the Two Gregories* (Cambridge, MA)
- Grégoire, H. (1909), 'Notes Épigraphiques', in *Revue de l'Instruction Publique en Belgique*, vol. 52, pp. 149-166
- Grig, L. (2004), *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity* (London)
- Gruenwald, I. (1995), 'The "Scripture-Effect"', in J. Assmann and B. Gladigow (eds.) *Text und Kommentar: Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation IV* (Munich), pp. 75-91
- Guignard, C. (2011), *La Lettre de Julius Africanus à Aristide sur la Généalogie du Christ* (Berlin)
- Gullo, A. (forthcoming), 'Nonnian poets (?): the case of Julian the Egyptian', in B. Verhelst, ed. *Nonnus in Context* vol. IV (Leuven), pp. [unknown by time of submission]
- Gullo, A. (forthcoming, b), 'Writing Classicizing Epigrams in sixth-century CE Byzantium: The Funerary Poems of Julian the Egyptian', in F. Hadjitofi and A. Lefteratou (eds.), *Modulations and Transpositions: The Genres of Late Antique Christian Poetry* (De Gruyter), pp. 53-67
- Gutzwiller, K.J. (1998), *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context* (London)
- Gutzwiller, K.J. (2007), *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature* (Oxford)
- Hägg, T. (2006), 'Playing with expectations: Gregory's funeral orations on his brother, sister, and father', in J. Børtnes and T. Hägg (eds.) *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (Copenhagen), pp.133-151
- Haines-Eitzen, K. (2000), *Guardians of Letters* (Oxford)
- Haines-Eitzen, K. (2009), 'Textual Communities in Late Antique Christianity', in P. Rousseau (ed.) *A Companion to Late Antiquity* (Oxford), pp. 246-257

- Håland, E.J. (2009), '"Take, Skamandros, My Virginity": Ideas of Water in Connection with Rites of Passage in Greece, Modern and Ancient', in C. Kosso and A. Scott (eds.), *The Nature and Function of Waters, Baths, Bathing and Hygiene from Antiquity through the Renaissance* (Leiden), pp. 109-148
- Halfwassen, J. (2014), 'The Metaphysics of the One' in P. Remes and S. Slaveva-Griffin (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Neoplatonism* (London), pp.182-199
- Hall, D. (1978), 'The Philosopher and the Cave', in *Greece & Rome*, vol. 25, pp. 169-173
- Harder, M.A. (1998) "Generic Games in Callimachus' Aetia", in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, and G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry* (Groningen), pp. 95-113
- Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C (eds.), *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry* (Groningen)
- Harrison, J.E. (1912), *Themis: A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion* (Cambridge)
- Hartigan, K.V. (1975), 'Julian the Egyptian', in *Eranos*, vol. 73, pp. 43-54
- Hague, M.R. and Pitts, A.W. (eds.) (2016), *Ancient Education and Early Christianity* (London)
- Hauser-Meury, M.-M. (1960), *Prosopographie zu den Schriften Gregors von Nazianz* (Bonn)
- Hawkins, T. (2014), *Iambic Poetics in the Roman Empire* (Cambridge)
- Henderson, I. (2011), 'The Second Sophistic and Non-Elite Speakers', in T. Schmidt and P. Fleury (eds.) *Perceptions of the Second Sophistic and Its Times* (London), pp.23-35
- Hernandez, P.N. (2000), 'Back in the Cave of the Cyclops', in *American Journal of Philology*, vol. 121, pp. 345-366
- Hilda, S. (1996), 'Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Antiochene School with its Prevalent Literal and Historical Method', in M. Sæbø (ed.) *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation* (Göttingen), pp. 543-568
- Hofer, A. (2013), *Christ in the Life and Teaching of Gregory of Nazianzus* (Oxford)
- Höllger, W. (1985), *Die Handschriftliche Überlieferung der Gedichte Gregors von Nazianz: Die Gedichtgruppen XX und XI* (Paderborn)
- Holub, R.C. (1984), *Reception Theory: A Critical Introduction* (London)
- Horn, C.B. (2009), 'Children in Fourth-Century Greek Epistolography: Cappadocian Perspectives from the Pens of Gregory Nazianzen and Basil of Caesarea', in C.B. Horn and R.R. Phenix (eds.) *Children in Late Ancient Christianity* (Tübingen), pp. 103–141
- Horrocks, G. (2010, 2nd edition), *Greek: A History of its Language and its Speakers* (Oxford)
- Hose, M. (2004), *Poesie Aus der Schule: Überlegungen zur spätgriechischen Dichtung* (München)

- Hose, M. (2006), 'Die Enstehung der Christlichen Poesie', in R. Kussl (ed.) Präsenz der Antike (Speyer), pp. 75-104
- Hunter, D.G. (2007), 'Sexuality, Marriage, and the Family' in A. Casiday and F.W. Norris (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, vol. 2 (Cambridge), pp. 585-600
- Hunter, R. (2009), *Critical Moments in Classical Literature* (Cambridge)
- Jacobs, I. (2014), 'A Time for Prayer and a Time for Pleasure. Christianity's Struggle with the Ancient World', in D. Engels and P. Van Nuffelen (eds.) *Religion and Competition in Antiquity* (Brussels), pp. 192-219
- Jaeger, W. (1939) *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, (G. Highet, trans.) vol. 1 (Oxford)
- Jaeger, W. (1943) *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, (G. Highet, trans.) vol. 2 (Oxford)
- Jaeger, W. (1954) *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge, MA)
- Jaeger, W. (1963), *Das Frühe Christentum und die Griechische Bildung* (Berlin)
- James, W. (1982), *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (New York)
- Janiszewski, P., Stebnicka, K., and Szabat, E. (2015), *Prosopography of Greek Rhetors and Sophists of the Roman Empire* (Oxford)
- Jansen, L. (2014), 'Introduction', in L. Jansen (ed.) *The Roman Paratext: Frame, Texts, Readers* (Cambridge), pp. 1-18
- Jáuregui, M.H. (2010), 'Orphic God(s): Theogonies and Hymns as a Vehicle for Monotheism', in S. Mitchell and P. Van Nuffelen (eds.) *Monotheism Between Pagans and Christians in Late Antiquity* (Leuven), pp. 77-99
- Jáuregui, M.H. (2015), 'The Poet and His Addressees in Orphic Hymns', in A. Faulkner and O. Hodkinson (eds.) *Hymnic Narrative and the Narratology of Greek Hymns* (Leiden), pp. 224-243
- Johnsén, H.R. (2018), 'The Virtue of Being Uneducated: Attitudes towards Classical *Paideia* in Early Monasticism and Ancient Philosophy', L.I. Larsen and S. Rubenson (eds.), *Monastic Education in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge), pp. 219-235
- Jones, A.H.M. (1963), 'The Social Background of the Struggle between Paganism and Christianity', in A. Momigliano (ed.), *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford), pp. 17-37
- Jones, A.H.M, Martindale, J.R. and Morris, J. (1971), *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol.1 (Cambridge)
- Jones, P.J. (2005), *Reading Rivers in Roman Literature and Culture* (Oxford)
- Joyal, M., McDougall, I. and Yardley, J.C. (2009), *Greek and Roman Education: A Sourcebook* (London)
- Kahlos, M. (2007), *Debate and Dialogue: Christian and Pagan Cultures c. 360-430* (Aldershot)
- Kaldellis, A. (2007) *Hellenism in Byzantium: The transformation of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*

- Kambylis, A. (1982), 'Gregor von Nazianz und Kallimachos', in *Hermes*, Vol. 110, pp. 120-122
- Kannengiesser, C. (2004), *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, vol. 2 (Leiden)
- Kantorowicz, E.H. (1960), 'On the Golden Marriage Belt and the Marriage Rings of the Dumbarton Oaks Collection', in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 14, pp. 1-16
- Karavites, P. (1993), 'Gregory Nazianzinos and Byzantine Hymnography', in *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. 133, pp. 81-98
- Kaster, R.A. (1988), *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Los Angeles)
- Kennedy, G.A. (1983), *Greek Rhetoric Under the Christian Emperors* (Princeton)
- Kerferd, G.B. (1981), *The Sophistic Movement* (Cambridge)
- Keydell, R. (1950), 'Die Unechtheit der Gregor von Nazianz zugeschrieben *Exhortatio ad virgines*', in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* Vol. 43, pp. 334-337
- Keydell, R. (1950b), 'Die literarhistorische Stellung der Gedichte Gregors von Nazianz', in *Studi. Biz. E Neoell.*, vol. 7, pp. 134-143
- Keydell, R. (1951), 'Ein Dogmatisches Lehrgedicht Gregors von Nazianz*'*, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* Vol. 44, pp. 315-321
- Khun, T. (2014) *Schweigen in Versen*, Berlin
- König, J. (2007), 'Fragmentation and coherence in Plutarch's *Sympotic Questions*', in J. König and T. Whitmarsh (eds.) *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire* (Cambridge), pp. 43-68
- König, J. (2009), *Greek Literature in the Roman Empire* (London)
- König, J. (2012), *Saints and Symposiasts: The Literature of Food and the Symposium in Greco-Roman and Early Christian Culture* (Cambridge)
- König, J. and Whitmarsh, T. (2007), 'Ordering Knowledge', in J. König and T. Whitmarsh (eds.) *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire* (Cambridge), pp. 3-39
- König, J. and Woolf, G. (2013), 'Introduction', in J. König and G. Woolf (eds.) *Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to Renaissance* (Cambridge), pp. 1-20
- König, J. and Woolf, G. (2013), 'Encyclopaedism in the Roman Empire', in J. König and G. Woolf (eds.) *Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to Renaissance* (Cambridge), pp. 23-63
- Konstan, D. (2000) How to Praise a Friend: St. Gregory of Nazianzus' Funeral Oration on St. Basil the Great, in T. Hägg and P Rousseau (eds.) *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (London), pp.160-179
- Konstan, D. (2011), 'Excerpting as a Reading Practice', in G. Reydams-Schils (ed.) *Thinking Through Excerpts: Studies on Stobaeus* (Turnhout), pp. 9-22
- Kopecek, T.A. (1973), 'The Social Class of the Cappadocian Fathers', in *Church History*, vol. 42, pp. 453-466

- Kopecek, T.A. (1974), 'The Cappadocian Fathers and Civic Patriotism', in *Church History*, vol. 43, pp. 292-303
- Kopecek, T.A. (1979), *A History of Neo Ariansim*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, MA)
- Krolikowski, J. (2010), 'Paideia' in L.F. Mateo-Seco and G. Maspero (eds.) *The Brill Dictionary of Gregory of Nyssa* (Leiden), pp. 568-575
- Krueger, D. (1993), 'Diogenes the Cynic Among the Fourth Century Fathers', in *Vigiliae Christianae*, vol. 47, pp. 29-49
- Krueger, D. (2004), *Writing and Holiness: The Practice of Authorship in the Early Christian East* (Philadelphia)
- Kurmann, A. (1988) *Gregor von Nazianz: Oratio 4 gegen Julian. Ein Kommentar* (Basel)
- Lamarche, J. (1997), 'The Septuagint: Bible of the Earliest Christians' in P.M. Blowers (ed.) *The Bible in Greek Antiquity* (Notre Dame), pp.15-33
- Lamberton, R. (1989), *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical reading and the growth of the epic tradition* (Berkley)
- Lattimore, R. (1942), *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana)
- Leipoldt, J. (1964), *Der Römische Kaiser Julian in der Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin)
- Lewy, H. (1978), *Chaldean Oracles and Theurgy* (Paris)
- Lieu, S.N.C. (1985), *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China* (Manchester)
- Lim, R. (1995), *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity* (London)
- Lim, R. (2008), 'Christians, Dialogues, and Patterns of Sociability in Late Antiquity' in Goldhill, S. (ed.) *The End of Dialogue in Antiquity* (Cambridge), pp. 151-172
- Limberis, V. (2000), '"Religion" as the Cipher for Identity: The Cases of Emperor Julian, Libanius, and Gregory Nazianzus" in *The Harvard Theological Review*, vol. 93, pp. 373-400
- Limberis, V. (2011), *Architects of Piety: The Cappadocian Fathers and the Cult of the Martyrs* (Oxford)
- Lloyd, M. (1992), *The Agon in Euripides* (Oxford)
- Lorenz, B. (1979), 'Zur Seefahrt des Lebens in den Gedichten des Gregor von Nazianz', in *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol.33 pp.234-241
- Losin, P. (1996), 'Education and Plato's Parable of the Cave', vol. 178, pp. 46-65
- Lössl, J. (2014), 'An Inextinguishable Memory: 'Pagan' Past and Presence in Early Christian Writing', in C. Harrison, C. Humfress, and I. Sandwell (eds.), *Being Christian in Late Antiquity: A Festschrift for Gillian Clark* (Oxford), pp. 74-87
- Ludlow, M. (2012), 'Demons, Evil, and Liminality in Cappadocian Theology', in *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, vol. 20, pp. 179-211
- Lyman, R. (2003a), '2002 NAPS Presidential Address: Hellenism and Heresy', in *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, vol. 11, pp. 209-222

- Lyman R. (2003b), 'The Politics of Passing: Justin Martyr's Conversion as a Problem of "Hellenization"', in K. Mills and A. Grafton (eds.) *Conversion in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Seeing and Believing* (Rochester), pp. 36-60
- Maas, P. (1962) *Greek Metre*, trans. by H. Lloyd-Jones (Oxford)
- MacCoull, L.S.B. (1988), *Dioscourus of Aphrodito: His Works and his World* (London)
- Malosse, P.-L. and Schouler, B. (2008), 'Qu'est-ce que la Troisième Sophistique?', in *Lalies*, vol.29, pp. 161-224
- Marcone, A. (2012), 'The Forging of a Hellenic Orthodoxy: Julian's Speeches Against the Cynics', in N. Baker-Brian and S. Tougher (eds.), *Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate* (Swansea), pp. 239-250
- Markschies, Ch. (2003), 'The Canon of the New Testament in Antiquity', in M. Finkelberg and G.G. Stroumsa (eds.) *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond* (Leiden), pp. 175-194
- Markus, R. (1990), *The End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge)
- Marrou, H. (1982), *A History of Education in Antiquity* (Madison)
- Maas, P. (1962) *Greek Metre* (Trans. H. Lloyd-Jones) (Oxford)
- Mastronarde, D.J. (2002), *Euripides: Medea* (Cambridge)
- MacDonald, D.R. (2000), *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark* (London)
- Matz, B.J. (2012), 'Deciphering a Recipe for Biblical Preaching in *Oration* 14', in C.A. Beeley (ed.) *Re-reading Gregory of Nazianzus* (Washington), pp.49-66
- McDonald, L.M. (2006), 'Canon', in J.W. Rogerson and J.M. Lieu (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies* (Oxford), pp. 777-809
- McDonald, L.M. and Sanders, J.A. (eds.) (2002), *The Canon Debate* (Peabody)
- McGuckin, J. (2001), *Saint Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography* (New York)
- McGuckin J. (2006), 'Gregory: The rhetorician as poet', in Børtnes, J. and Hägg T. (eds.) *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (Copenhagen), pp. 193-212
- McGuckin, J.A. (1994), 'Perceiving Light from Light: the Trinitarian Theology of Gregory Nazianzen', in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. 39, pp. 7-32
- McGuckin, J.A. (1997), 'The Vision of God in Gregory Nazianzen', in *Studia Patrisitca*, Vol. 32. pp. 145-152
- McGuckin, J.A. (2011), 'Gregory of Nazianzus: The Rhetorician as Poet, in *Studia Universitatis Septentrionis*, vol.3, pp. 49-69
- McLynn, N. (1998), 'A Self-Made Holy Man: The Case of Gregory Nazianzen', in *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, vol. 6. pp. 463-483
- McLynn, N. (2001), 'Gregory Nazianzen's Basil: The Literary Construction of a Christian Friendship', in *Studia Patristica*, vol. 37 (2001), pp. 178-193
- McLynn, N. (2006), 'Among the Hellenists: Gregory and the Sophists', in Børtnes, J. and Haegg T. (eds.) *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (Copenhagen), pp. 213-238

- McLynn, N. (2006B), 'Curiales into Churchmen: The Case of Gregory Nazianzen', in R.L. Testa (ed.) *L'Erma di Bretschneider* (Rome), pp.277-295
- McLynn, N. (2010), 'The Manna from Uncle: Basil of Caesarea's *Address to Young Men*', in C. Kelly, R. Flower, and M.S. Williams (eds.) *Unclassical Traditions*, vol. 1 (Cambridge), pp. 106-118
- McLynn, N. (2012), 'The Tax Man and the Theologian: Gregory, Hellenius, and the Monks of Nazianzus, in C.A. Beeley (ed.) *Re-reading Gregory of Nazianzus* (Washington), pp. 178-198
- McLynn, N. (2014), "Julian and the Xtian Professors" in Harrison, C., Humfress, C. and Sandwell, S. (eds.) *Being Xtian in Late Antiquity* (Oxford), pp. 120-134
- McLynn (2018), 'The Two Gregories: Toward Nyssen from Nazianzen', in A. Marmadoro and N. McLynn (eds.) *Exploring Gregory of Nyssa: Philosophical, Theological, and Historical Studies* (Oxford), pp. 29-48
- Meesters, A.C. (2012), 'The Cappadocians and their Trinitarian conceptions of God', in *Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie*, Vol. 54, pp. 396-413
- Meijering, E.P. (1975), *God Being History: Studies in Patristic Philosophy* (New York)
- Meinel, F. (2009) 'Gregory of Nazianzus' Poemata Arcana: ἄρρητα and Christian persuasion', *Cambridge Classical Journal*, vol.55, pp.71–96
- Meyer, D. (2007), 'The Act of Reading and the Act of Writing in Hellenistic Epigram', in P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram* (Leiden), pp. 187-210
- Meyer, D. (2019), 'Tears and Emotions in Greek Literary Epitaphs', in M. Kanellou, I. Petrovic, and C. Carey (eds.) *Greek Epigram from the Hellenistic to the Early Byzantine Era* (Oxford), pp. 176-191
- Millard, A. (2000), *Reading and Writing in the Time of Jesus* (Sheffield)
- Millard, A. (2006), 'Authors, Books, and Readers in the Ancient World' in J.W. Rogerdson and J.M. Lied (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies* (Oxford), pp. 544-564
- Milovanovic-Barham, C. (1997), 'Gregory of Nazianzus: *Ars Poetica*', in *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, vol. 5, pp. 497-510
- Milovanović, C. (2005) 'Sailing to Sophistopolis: Gregory of Nazianzus and Greek *Declamation', Journal of Early Christian Studies*, vol.13, pp.187-232
- Mitchell, S. (1999), 'The Cult of Theos Hypsistos between Pagans, Jews, and Christians', in P. Athanassiadi and M. Frede (eds.), *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford), pp. 81-148
- Moles, J. (1978), 'The Career and Conversion of Dio Chrysostom', *The Journal of Hellenic*
- *Studies*, Vol. 98, pp. 79-100

- Moreschini, C. (1995), 'Il demone nella cultura pagana dell'età imperial, in S. Pricoco (ed.) *Il Demone e I suoi Complici* (Soveria Mannelli), pp. 75-110
- Moreschini, C. (2006), *Introduzione a Gregorio Nazianzeno* (Brescia)
- Moreschini and Sykes (1997), *Gregory of Nazianzus: Poemata Arcana* (Oxford)
- Morgan, T. (1998) *Literate education in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds* (Cambridge)
- Moroni, M.G. (2006), *Gregorio Nazianzeno: Nicobulo jr. al Padre, Nicobulo sen. Al Figlio, Una Discussione in Famiglia* (Florence)
- Mosshammer, A.A. (1997), 'Gregory of Nyssa and Christian Hellenism', in *Studia Patristica*, vol. 32, pp. 170-195
- Mountford, R. (2005), 'Gregory of Nazianzus' in M. Ballif and M.G. Moran (eds.) *Classical Rhetorics and Rhetoricians* (Westport), pp.176-181
- Musurillo, H. (1958), *St. Methodius: The Symposium, A Treatise on Chastity* (London)
- Musurillo, H. (1963), *Méthode D'Olympe: Le Banquet* (Paris)
- Narbonne, J-M. (2014), 'Matter and Evil in the Neoplatonic Tradition', in P. Remes and S Slaveva-Griffin (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Neoplatonism* (London), pp.231-244
- Negri, G. (1905), *Julian the Apostate*, vols. 1-2 (trans. L.V. Arese) (London)
- Nesselrath, H.-G. (2015), *Iulianus Augustus: Opera* (Berlin)
- Nimmo Smith, J. (2016), 'Pillars and Monuments (στῆλαι) in the Works of Gregory Nazianzus', in V. Somers and P. Yannopoulos (eds.) *Philokappadox: In Memoriam Justin Mossay* (Leuven), pp. 3-18
- Nimmo Smith, J. (2016b), 'Some Observations on "Being All Things to All Men to Save All" and Apparent Inconsistency in the Works of Gregory of Nazianzus, the Emperor Julian and the Apostle Paul', in *Studia Patristica*, vol. 74, pp. 169-180
- Noble, T.A. (1993), 'Paradox in Gregory Nazianzen's Doctrine of the Trinity', in *Studia Patristica*, Vol. 27, pp. 94-99
- Nock, A.D. (1933), *Conversion* (Oxford)
- Norris, F.W. (1984), 'Of Thorns and Roses: The Logic of Belief in Gregory Nazianzen', in *Church History*, Vol. 53, pp. 455-464
- Norris, F.W. (1991), *Faith Gives Fullness to Reasoning* (Leiden)
- Norris, F.W. (1997), 'Gregory Nazianzen: Constructing and Constructed by Scripture', in P. Blowers (ed.) *The Bible in Greek Christian Antiquity*, (Notre Dame), pp. 149-162
- Norris, F.W. (2000) 'Your Honour, My Reputation: St. Gregory of Nazianzus' Funeral Oration on St. Basil the Great', in T. Hägg and P Rousseau (eds.) *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (London), pp.140-159
- Norris, FW. (2012), 'Gregory Nazianzus' Poemata Arcana: A Poetic, Musical Catechism?' in *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, vol.63, pp.62-75
- Oberhaus, M. (1991), *Gregor von Nazianz: Gegen den Zorn* (Paderborn)

- O'Connell, P.A. (2019), 'Homer and His Legacy in Gregory of Nazianzus' "On His Own Affairs"', in *Journal of Hellenistic Studies*, vol. 139, pp. 1-25
- Otten, W. and Pollmann, K. (2007), *Poetry and Exegesis in Pre-Modern Latin Christianity* (Leiden)
- Paget, J.N.B.C. (1996), 'The Christian Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Alexandrian Tradition', in M. Sæbø (ed.) *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation* (Göttingen), pp. 478-542
- Palla, R. (1989), 'Ordinamento e polimetria delle poesie bibliche di Gregorio Nazianzeno' in *Wiener Studien*, vol. 102, pp. 169-185
- Parrot, A. (1939) *Malédictions et Violations de Tombes* (Paris)
- Patterson, L.G. (1997), *Methodius of Olympus* (Washington)
- Pelikan, J. (1993), *Christianity and Classical Culture: The Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism* (London)
- Penella, R. (2005), 'From the Muses to Eros: Choricius' Epithalamia for Student Bridegrooms', in C. Saliou (ed.) *Gaza dans l'Antiquité Tardive: Archéologie, rhétorique et histoire*, (Helios, Salerno) pp. 135-148
- Penniman, J.D. (2015), 'Fed to Perfection: Mother's Milk, Roman Family Values, and the Transformation of the Soul in Gregory of Nyssa', in *Chruch History*, vol. 84, pp. 495–530
- Perkins, J. (2009), *Roman Imperial Identities in the Early Christian Era* (London)
- Pollmann, K. (2017), *The Baptized Muse: Early Christian Poetry as Cultural Authority* (Oxford)
- Poulos, M.A.T. (2017), 'Gregory of Nazianzus and the Epigrammatic Tradition', paper given at the Fifth Hellenistic Studies Seminar held at the Universidade de São Paulo, (can be found at: https://www.academia.edu/36367376/Gregory_of_Nazianzus_and_the_Epigrammatic_Tradition)
- Poulos, M.A.T. (2019), *Callimachus and Callimacheanism in the Poetry of Gregory of Nazianzus* (PhD Dissertation, Catholic University of America, Washington D.C.)
- Prudhomme, J. (2006). *L'oeuvre poétique de Grégoire de Nazianze* (PhD Dissertation, Lyon)
- Puech, B. (2002), *Orateurs et sophistes grec dans les inscriptions d'époque impériale* (Paris)
- Quiroga, A. (2007), 'From Sophistopolis to Episcopolis. The Case for a Third Sophistic', *JLARC*, vol.1, pp. 31-42
- Race, W.H. (1982), 'Aspects of Rhetoric and Form in Greek Hymns', in *Roman and Byzantine Studies*, vol. 23, pp. 5-13
- Rapp, C. (2005), *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley)

- Rapp, C. (2007), 'Holy Texts, Holy Men and Holy Scribes: Aspects of Scriptural Holiness in Late Antiquity', in W.E. Klingshirn and L. Safran (eds.) *The Early Christian Book* (Washington), pp. 194-224
- Rappe, S. (2001), 'The New Math: How to Add and to Subtract Pagan Elements in Christian Education', in Too, Y.L. (ed.) *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Leiden), pp. 405-432
- Rebillard, E. (2009), *The Care of the Dead in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca)
- Rebillard, E. (2012), *Christians and their Many Identities in Late Antiquity, North Africa, 200-450 CE* (London)
- Rebillard, E. (2017) (ed.), *Greek and Latin Narratives about the Ancient Martyrs* (Oxford)
- Rebillard, S.A. (2012) 'Historigraphy as Devotion', in C.A. Beeley (ed.) *Re-reading Gregory of Nazianzus* (Washington), pp. 125-142
- Rehm, R. (1994), *Marriage to Death: The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton)
- Richter, D.S. and Johnson, W.A. (eds.) (2011), *The Oxford Handbooks of the Second Sophistic* (Oxford)
- Riggsby, A. (2019), *Mosaics of Knowledge: Representing Information in the Roman World* (Oxford)
- Rist, J. (1996), 'Plotinus and Christian Philosophy', in L.P. Gerson (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Plotinus* (Cambridge), pp.386-413
- Roberts, M. (1985), *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity* (Liverpool)
- Roberts, M. (1989), 'The Use of Myth in Latin Epithalamia from Statius to Venantius Fortunatus', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, vol.119, pp.321-348
- Rosenmeyer, T.G. (2006), 'Ancient Literary Genres: A Mirage?', in A. Laird (ed.) *Ancient Literary Criticism* (Oxford), pp. 421-439
- Rossen, R.M. (2004), 'Aristophanes' *Frogs* and the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*', in *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, vol. 134, pp. 295-322
- Rousseau, P. (1990), 'Basil of Caesarea: Choosing a Past', in G. Clarke et al. (eds.), *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity* (Ruschcutters Bay), pp. 37-58
- Rousseau, P. (1994), *Basil of Caesarea* (Oxford)
- Rousseau, P. (2000), 'Antony as Teacher in the Greek *Life*' in T. Hägg and P Rousseau (eds.) *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (London), pp. 89-109
- Rousselle, A. (1988), *Porneia* (Oxford)
- Rubesnon, S. (2000), 'Philosophy and Simplicity: The Problem of Classical Education in Early Christian Biography' in T. Hägg and P Rousseau (eds.) *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (London), pp. 110-139
- Rubenson, S. (2007), 'Asceticism and Monasticism, I: Eastern', in A. Casiday and F.W. Norris (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Christanity*, vol. 2 (Cambridge), pp. 637-668

- Rubenson, S. (2018), 'Early Monasticism and the Concept of "School"', in L.I. Larsen and S. Rubenson (eds.), *Monastic Education in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge), pp. 13-32
- Rudhardt, J. (1991), 'Quelques Réflexions sur les Hymnes Orphiques', in P. Borgeaud (ed.), *Orphisme et Orphée en l'honneur de Jean Rudhardt* (Geneva), pp. 262-283
- Rudhardt, J. (2008), *Opera Inedita: Essai sur la religion grecque; Recherches sur les Hymnes orphiques* (Liège)
- Ruether, R.R. (1969), *Gregory Nazianzus: Rhetor and Philosopher* (Oxford)
- Russell, D.A. (1981), *Criticism in Antiquity* (London)
- Salzman, M.R. (2017), 'From a classical to a Christian city: civic euergetism and charity in late antique Rome', in *Studies in Late Antiquity,* vol. 1, pp. 65-85
- Sandy, G.N. (1982), *Heliodorus* (Boston)
- Schäublin, C. (1974), *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der antiochenischen Exegese* (Leipzig)
- Schmitz, T. (1997), *Bildung und Macht* (Munich)
- Schmitz, T. (2011), 'The Second Sophistic', in M. Peachin (ed.) The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World (Oxford), pp. 304-316
- Schmitz, T. (2017), 'Professionals of *Paideia*? The Sophists as Performers', in D.S. Richter and W.A. Johnson (eds.) *The Oxford Handbooks of the Second Sophistic* (Oxford), pp. 169-180
- Seaford, R. (1987), 'The Tragic Wedding', in *The Journal of Hellenistic Studies,* Vol. 107, pp. 106-130
- Segal, C. (1994), *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the Odyssey* (London)
- Ševčenko, I. (1980), 'A Shadow Outline of Virtue: The Classical Heritage of Greek Christian Literature (Second to Seventh Century), in K. Weitzmann (ed.) *Age of Spirituality: A Symposium* (New York), pp. 53-73
- Shorrock, R. (2011), *The Myth of Paganism (London)*
- Shumate, N. (1988), 'The Augustinian Pursuit of False Values as a Conversion Motif in Apuleius' Metamorphoses', *Phoenix,* Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 35-60
- Shumate, N. (1996), *Crisis and Conversion in Apuleius' "Metamorphoses"* (Michigan)
- Sicherl, M. (2002),'Verschmolzene Gedichte Gregors Von Nazianz', in W. Blümer, R. Henke, and M Mülke (eds.) *Alvarium Festschrift für Christian Gnilka*, pp. 313-323
- Sicherl, M. (2011), *Die Handschriftliche Überlieferung der Gedichte Gregors von Nazianz: Die Epischen und Elegischen Gruppen* (Paderborn)
- Simelidis, C. (2009), *Selected Poems of Gregory Nazianzus* (Goettingen)
- Simelidis, C. (2011), 'Callimachus, Epigram 9.6 G.-P. and Gregory of Nazianzus Carmen I 2.14.101, in *Zeitschrift fuer Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, vol. 176, pp. 60-62
- Simelidis, C. (2019), 'Gregory of Nazianzus and the Christian Epigram in the East', in C. Henriksén (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epigram* (Hoboken), pp. 633-648

- Simmons, M.B. (2017),'Julian the Apostate' in P.F. Esler (ed.) *The Early Christian World* (London), pp. 1169-1187
- Sissa, G. (1990), *Greek Virginity*, A. Goldhammer (trans.) (London)
- Sluiter, I. (2000), 'The Dialectics of Genre: Some Aspects of Secondary Literature and Genre in Antiquity', in M. Depew and D. Obbink (eds.) *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society* (London), pp. 183-203
- Smith, A. (2004), *Philosophy in Late Antiquity* (London)
- Smith, R.B.E. (1995), *Julian's gods: religion and philosophy in the thought and action of Julian the Apostate* (London)
- Spatharas, D. (2011), 'Self-Praise and Envy: From Rhetoric to the Athenian Courts', *Arethusa,* vol. 44, pp. 199-219
- Steel, C. (2009), 'Divisions of Speech' in E. Gunderson (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric* (Cambridge), pp.77-91
- Steinschneider, M. (1908), *Rangstreit-Literatur: Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenenden Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte* (Wien)
- Stenger, J. (2009), *Hellenisch Identiät in der Spätantike* (Berlin)
- Stenger, J. (2016), 'Athens and/or Jerusalem? Basil's and Chrysostom's Views on the Didactic Use of Literature and Stories', in P. Gemeindhardt, L. Van Hoof, and P. Van Nuffelen (eds.) *Education and Religion in Late Antique Christianity* (London), pp. 86-100
- Stenger, J. (2020), 'Learning City: The Athenian Experience in Late Antiquity', in I. Tanaseanu-Döbler and L. von Alvensleben (eds.) *Athens II: Athens in Late Antiquity* (Tübingen), pp. 155-182
- Sterk, A. (1998), 'On Basil, Moses, and the Model Bishop: The Cappadocian Legacy of Leadership', in *Church History*, vol. 67, pp. 227-253
- Sterk, A. (2004) *Renouncing the World Yet Leading the Church: The Monk-Bishop in Late Antiquity* (London)
- Stevens, E.B. (1948), 'Envy and Pity in Greek Philosophy', *AJPh,* vol.69, pp. 171-189
- Storin, B.K. (2011), 'In a Silent Way: Asceticism and Literature in the Rehabilitation of Gregory of Nazianzus', in *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, vol. 19, pp. 225-257
- Strøm-Olsen, R. (2018), 'The Propylaic Function of the Eusebian Canon Tables in Late Antiquity', in *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, vol. 26, pp. 403-431
- Stroumsa, G.G. (2012), 'Reading Practices in Early Christianity and the Individualisation Process', in J. Rüpke and W. Spickermann (eds.) *Reflections on Religious Individuality* (Berlin), pp. 175-192
- Sundermann, K. (1991), *Der Rangstreit zwischen Ehe und Jungfräulichkeit* (Paderborn)
- Swain, S. (1996) *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD. 50-250* (Oxford)

- Sykes, D.A. (1970), 'The *Poemata Arcana* of St. Gregory Nazianzen', in *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. 21, pp. 32-42
- Sykes, D.A. (1979), 'The *Poemata Arcana* of St. Gregory Nazianzen: Some Literary Questions', in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, Vol. 72, pp. 6-15
- Sykes, D.A. (1982), 'The Bible and Greek Classics in Gregory Nazianzen's Verse', in *Studia Patristica* vol. 17.3, pp. 1127-1130
- Szabat, E. (2015), 'Late Antiquity and the Transmission of Educational Ideals and Methods: The Greek World' in W.M. Bloomer (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Education*, pp. 252-263 (Oxford)
- Szymusiak, J.M. (1963), *Elements de Theologie de l'Homme selon Saint Gregoire de Nazianze* (Rome)
- Szymusiak-Affholder, C.M. (1971), 'Psychologie et histoire dans le reve initial de Gregoire le Theologien', in *Philologus*, vol. 155, pp. 302-310
- Talbert, C.H. (2003), *Reading Luke-Acts in its Mediterranean Milieu* (Leiden)
- Tanaseanu-Döbler (2012), 'Religious Education in Late Antique Paganism', in I. Tanaseanu-Döbler and M. Döbler (eds.) *Religious Education in Pre-Modern Europe* (Leiden), pp. 97-146
- Tarán, L. (1975), *Academica: Plato, Philip of Opus, and the Pseudo-Platonic "Epinomis"* (Philadelphia)
- Teitler, H.C. (2017), *The Last Pagan Emperor* (Oxford)
- Thielmann, F. (1998), 'The Place of the Apocalypse in the Canon of St. Gregory Nazianzen", *Tyndale Bulletin*, vol. 49, pp. 155-157
- Thomas, G. (2016), 'Gregory Nazianzen on the Devil and the Image of God: "Worship me!"', in *Studia Patristica*, vol. 74, pp. 181-190
- Thomas, G. (2017), *Divine, Yet Vulnerable: Gregory Nazianzen's Human Eikon* (PhD thesis, University of Nottingham)
- Trenchard-Smith (2016), 'Sea-Sickness, Shipwreck and the Heretical Storm: Saint Basil of Caesarea on Dissent, the Passions and Madness', in H. Perdicoyianni-Paléologou (ed.) *The Concept of Madness from Homer to Byzantium,Manifestations and Aspects of Mental Illnes and Disorder* (Amsterdam), pp. 321-348
- Trisoglio, F. (1990),'Il Demonio in Gregorio di Nazianzo', in E. Corsini and E. Costa (eds.) *L'Autunno del Diavolo*, vol.1 (Milan), pp.249-263
- Trypanis, C.A. (1981), *Greek Poetry from Homer to Seferis* (London)
- Turcan, R. (2003) 'Les Demons et la Crise du Paganisme Gréco-Romain', in *Revue de Philosophie Ancienne*, Vol. 21, pp. 33-54
- Urbano, A.P. (2013), *The Philosophical Life: Biography and the Crafting of Intellectual Identity in Late Antiquity* (Washington)
- Vaggione, R. (2000), *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution* (Oxford)

- Vaggione, R.P. (1993) 'Of Monks and Lounge Lizards: Arians, Polemics and Asceticism in the Roman East', in M.R. Barnes and D.H. Williams (ed.) *Arianism After Arius* (Edinburgh), pp. 181-214
- Van Dam, R. (1995), 'Self-Representation in the Will of Gregory of Nazianzus', in *The Journal of Theological Studies,* vol. 46, pp. 118-148
- Van Dam, R. (2002), *Kingdom of Snow* (Philadelphia)
- Van Dam, R. (2003), *Becoming Christian* (Philadelphia)
- Van Dam, R. (2003b), *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia* (Philadelphia)
- Van Hoof. L. (2010), 'Greek Rhetoric and the Later Roman Empire: The Bubble of the "Third Sophistic"', in *Antiquité Tardive,* vol. 18, pp. 211-224
- Van Hoof, L. (2013), 'Performing *Paideia*: Greek Culture as an Instrument for Social Promotion in the Fourth Century A.D.', in *The Classical Quarterly,* vol. 63, pp. 387-406
- Van Hoof, L. (2016), 'Falsification as a Protreptic to Truth: The Force of the Forged Epistolary Exchange Between Basil and Libanius', in P. Gemeindhardt, L. Van Hoof, and P. Van Nuffelen (eds.) *Education and Religion in Late Antique Christianity* (London), pp. 116-130
- Van Hoof, L. and Van Nuffelen, P. (2015), 'The Social Role and Place of Literature in the Fourth Century AD', in L. van Hoof and P. van Nuffelen (eds.) *Literature and Society in the Fourth Century AD: Performing Paideia, Constructing the Present, Presenting the Self* (Leiden), pp.1-15
- Van Nijf, O. (2004), 'Athletics and *paideia*: Festivals and physical education in the world of the Second Sophistic', in B.E. Borg (ed.) *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic* (Berlin), pp. 203-228
- Van Noorden, H. (2018), 'Hesiod Transformed, Parodied, and Assaulted: Hesiod in the Second Sophistic and Early Christian Thought', in A.C. Loney and S. Scully (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Hesiod* (Oxford), pp. 395-410
- Van Nuffelen, P. (2014), 'Religious Disputation in Late Antiquity', in D. Engels and P. Van Nuffelen (eds.) *Religion and Competition in Antiquity* (Brussels), pp. 149-172
- Versnel, H.S. (2011), *Coping with the Gods: Wayward Readings in Greek Theology* (Leiden)
- Vertoudakis, V.P. (2011), Το όγδοο βιβλίο της Παλατινής Ανθολογίας: Μια μελέτη των επιγραμμάτων του Γρηγορίου του Ναζιανζηνού (Athens)
- Vestrheim, G. (2010), 'Voice in Sepulchral Epigrams', in M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic, and I. Petrovic (eds.) *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* (Cambridge), pp. 61-78
- Von Ehrenkrook, J. (2017), 'Christians, Pagans, and the Politics of *Paideia* in Late Antiquity', in J.M Zurawski and G. Boccaccini (eds.) *Second Temple Jewish "Paideia" in Context* (Berlin), pp. 255-265

- Vuolanto, V. (2002), 'Male and female euergetism in late antiquity: a study on Italian and Adriatic church floor mosaics', in P. Setälä, R. Berg, and R. Hälikkä (eds.), *Women, wealth and power in the Roman Empire* (Rome), pp. 245-302
- Vuolanto, V. (2013), 'Elite Children, Socialization, and Agency in the Late Roman World', in J. E. Grubbs and T. Parkin (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Childhood and Education in the Classical World* (Oxford), pp. 580-596
- Walsh, G.B. (1990) 'Surprised by Self-Audible Thought in Hellenistic Poetry', in *Classical Philology*, vol. 85, pp. 1-21
- Waltz, P. (1931), 'L'Inspiration Païenne et le Sentiment Chrétien dans les Épigrammes Funéraires du VI^{e} Siècle', in *L'Acropole*, vol. 6, pp. 3-21
- Waltz, P. (1944), *Anthologie Grecque, Tome VI* (Paris)
- Watson, L. (1991) *Arae: The Curse Poetry of Antiquity* (Leeds)
- Watts, E.J. (2006), *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria* (London)
- Webb, R. (2017), 'Schools and *Paideia*', in D.S. Richter and W.A. Johnson (eds.) The Oxford Handbooks of the Second Sophistic (Oxford), pp. 139-153
- Wenzel, A. (2010) 'Libanius, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Ideal of Athens in Late Antiquity', in *Journal of Late Antiquity*, vol. 3.2, pp. 264-285
- Werhahn (1953), *Gregorii Nazianzeni Σύγκρισις βίων* (Wiesbaden)
- West, M.L. (1967), 'The Contest of Homer and Hesiod', in *The Classical Quarterly*, vol. 17, pp. 433-450
- West, M.L. (1982), *Greek Metre* (Oxford)
- West, M.L. (1983), *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford)
- West, M.L. (1987), *Introduction to Greek Metre* (Oxford)
- West, M.L. (2011), 'Homer's Meter' in Morris, I. and Powell, B. (eds.) *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden), pp. 218-237
- Whitby, M. (2008) '"Sugaring the Pill": Gregory of Nazianzus' Advice to Olympias (Carm. 2.2.6)', *Ramus*, vol. 37, pp. 79–98.
- White, C. (1992), *Christian Friendship in the Fourth Century* (Cambridge)
- White, C. (1996), *Gregory of Nazianzus: Autobiographical Poems* (Cambridge)
- White, D.L. (2017), *Teacher of the Nations: Ancient Educational Traditions and Paul's Argument in 1 Corinthians 1-4* (Berlin)
- Whitmarsh, T. (2001), *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation* (Oxford)
- Whitmarsh, T. (2001b), 'Greece is the World: exile and identity in the Second Sophistic', in S. Goldhill (ed.) *Being Greek Under Rome* (Cambridge), pp.269-305
- Whitmarsh, T. (2004), *Ancient Greek Literature* (Cambridge)
- Williams, R. (1967), *Culture and Society (1780-1950)*, (London)
- Willis, I (2018), *Reception* (London)

- Wilson, N.G. (1983), *Scholars of Byzantium* (London)
- Wyss, B. (1946), 'Zu Gregor Von Nazianz', in B. Wyss, et al. (eds.) *Phyllobolia für Peter von Der Mühll*, pp. 153-185
- Wypustek, A. (2013), *Images of Eternal Beauty in Funerary Verse Inscriptions of the Hellenistic and Greco-Roman Periods* (Leiden)
- Wyss, B. (1949), 'Gregor von Nazianz: Ein griechisch-christlicher Dichter des 4. Jahrhunderts', in *Museum Helveticum*, vol. 6, pp.177-210
- Young, F.M. (1973), 'Insight or Incoherence? The Greek Fathers on God and Evil', in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 24, pp. 113-126
- Young, F.M. (1997), *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge)
- Ypsilanti, M. (2018), 'Epigrammatic *Topoi*, Christian Ideas, and Real Events in Selected Epigrams of Gregory Nazianzus for Nonna, Caesarius and Basil the Great', in *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale*, vol. 60, pp. 435-458
- Zehles,F.E. and Zamora, M.J. (1996), *Gregor von Nazianz: Manhungen an Die Jungfrauen* (Paderborn)
- Zimmermann, C. (2019), 'Faith and Verse: Gregory of Nazianzus and Early Christian Village Poetry', in S. Mitchell and P. Pilhofer (eds.) *Early Christianity in Asia Minor and Cyprus: From the Margins to the Mainstream* (Leiden), pp. 126-147