Philagathos of Cerami, Procopius of Gaza, and the Rhetoric of Appropriation

Mircea G. Duluş

THE BYZANTINE RHETORICAL CULTURE presupposed a practice of authorship that demanded the imitation and appropriation (μίμησις) of sanctioned literary models. A fine illustration of this cultural attitude is afforded by the surprising array of rhetorical models employed in the *Homilies* of Philagathos of Cerami.[1] He was an influential preacher in the Norman Kingdom of Sicily during the reigns of Roger II (1130–1154) and William I (1154–1166). Setting forth new textual evidence, the present contribution brings to light Philagathos' use of Procopius of Gaza's *Description of the Image*

[1] Philagathos' homiletic corpus is only partly critically edited; most notably, G. Rossi-Taibbi, *Filagato da Cerami, Omelie per i vangeli domenicali e le feste di tutto l'anno* I *Omelie per le feste fisse* (Palermo 1969), edited 35 sermons; other homilies have been edited by S. Caruso, "Le tre omelie inedite 'Per la Domenica delle Palme' di Filagato da Cerami," *EEBS* 41 (1974) 109–132; G. Zaccagni, "Filagato, hom. XLI. Edizione e traduzione," in N. Bianchi (ed.), *La tradizione dei testi greci in Italia meridionale: Filagato da Cerami philosophos e didaskalos* (Bari 2011) 149–163; C. Torre, "Inediti di Filagato Kerameus dall'Ambros. C 100 sup. (Omelie LVI e LVIII Rossi Taibbi)," *Bizantinistica* 14 (2012) 105–151; N. Bianchi, "Frammento omiletico inedito per la Vergine: Filagato da Cerami, hom. LXXXVI," *BollBadGr* 6 (2009) 307–311; nonetheless, a significant number of homilies are still available only in Scorsus' edition (Paris 1644) reprinted in *PG* 132.135–1078. In this essay Philagathos' *Homilies* are cited according to the order established by Rossi-Taibbi, followed by paragraph, editor's name, and page number; for the homilies available in *PG* alone, we first indicate the number of the homily according to Rossi-Taibbi's numeration (hereafter RT), then the editor (i.e. Scorsus), the number of the homily in *PG*, and the column(s) and section(s).

Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 60 (2020) 472–497

(Ἔκφρασις εἰκόνος) and discusses other possible textual allusions to Procopius' *Monody* 1 (*Op.* 14 Amato).[2] I shall start by introducing the Byzantine reception of Procopius' rhetorical writings and then offer an overview of Philagathos' florilegic technique and use of sources for better contextualizing his appropriations of Procopian material. Next, I briefly describe his documented interest in the Procopian corpus, and then seek to present the new evidence on his engagement with Procopius' *oeuvre*.

Procopius of Gaza's (ca. 470–ca. 530) rhetorical corpus, despite its extremely limited manuscript tradition, was admired, imitated, and excerpted throughout the Byzantine period.[3] Citations from Procopius were incorporated in various lexica and florilegia, as in the *Lexicon Seguerianum* (7th cent.), *Florilegium Marcianum* (9th cent.), *Florilegium Georgideum* (end of 10th cent.), and the *Loci communes* of Ps.-Maximus Confessor (10th/11th cent.). Photius in the ninth century praised Procopius' polymorphous corpus, which he qualified as "worthy of admiration and a source of imitation" (ἄξιον ζήλου καὶ μιμήσεως χρῆμα).[4] In

[2] On Procopius of Gaza see E. Amato (ed.), *Rose di Gaza: gli scritti retorico-sofistici e le Epistole di Procopio di Gaza* (Alessandria 2010); see also the thorough discussion in *Procope de Gaza: Discours et fragments*, texte établi, introduit et commenté par E. Amato, avec la collaboration de A. Corcella et G. Ventrella, traduit par P. Maréchaux (Paris 2014) XI–LXXXV; R. B. ter Haar Romeny, "Procopius of Gaza and his Library," in H. Amirav et al. (eds.), *From Rome to Constantinople: Studies in Honour of Averil Cameron* (Leuven 2007) 174–190. On the School of Gaza see B. Bitton-Ashkelony et al. (eds.), *Christian Gaza in Late Antiquity* (Leiden 2004); E. Amato et al. (eds.), *L'École de Gaza: espace littéraire et identité culturelle dans l'Antiquité tardive* (Leuven 2017).

[3] On the manuscript tradition and transmission see Amato, in *Procope de Gaza* LII–LXXIII; A. Corcella, "Tre nuovi testi di Procopio di Gaza: una dialexis inedita e due monodie già attribuite a Coricio," *RET* 1 (2011/2) 1–14; "Una ripresa di Procopio di Gaza in Giovanni Eugenico," *RET* 4 (2014/5) 55–71; "La nuova διάλεξις di Procopio di Gaza: un commento," *Eikasmós* 25 (2014) 199–239; "Escerpti di Procopio e Coricio di Gaza (e nuovi frammenti procopiani?) in un manoscritto laurenziano," *RET* 5 (2015/6) 293–306.

[4] *Bibl.* cod. 160, 103a (II 123 Henry).

the eleventh and twelfth centuries Procopius' works were read and imitated by Michael Psellos (1018–1078), John Tzetzes (1110–1180), Nikephoros Basilakes (late 11th cent.), and Anna Komnene (1083–1153). A significant interest in Procopius' corpus is attested during the cultural renaissance of the Palaiologan era (1259–1453), when were produced most of the surviving non-apograph copies of his works (*Vat.gr.* 1898, *Marc.gr.* 428, *Par.gr.* 1038, and *Laur.plut.* 60. 6).[5] Moreover, E. Amato and A. Corcella, who in addition to making momentous contributions to the study of Procopius of Gaza, have offered indisputable evidence on Philagathos of Cerami's reliance on the Procopian corpus. This essay builds on their findings.[6]

Philagathos, a monk in the monastery of Theotokos Hodegetria in Rossano in Calabria, is one of the best-known homilists of the Byzantine world.[7] His substantial corpus of homilies (88 altogether), the so-called Italo-Greek homiliary, marks the codification of the Byzantine exegetic tradition in Southern Italy. It reflects similar processes of systematization of Orthodox religious knowledge in Southern Italy as illustrated by the literary activity of Neilos Doxapatres. Neilos composed an ecclesiological treatise in 1143/4, addressed to Roger II, on the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the Byzantine church, and wrote, most probably in the San Salvatore monastery in Messina, a monumental theological anthology, *De oeconomia Dei*, which for the larger part amasses quotations from a striking variety of

[5] Amato, in *Procope de Gaza* LXX.

[6] E. Amato, "Procopio di Gaza modello dell'Ekphrasis di Filagato da Cerami sulla Cappella Palatina di Palermo," *Byzantion* 82 (2012) 1–16; A. Corcella, "Echi del romanzo e di Procopio di Gaza in Filagato Cerameo," *BZ* 103 (2010) 25–38, and "Riuso e reimpiego dell'antico in Filagato," in *La tradizione dei testi* 11–21.

[7] For Philagathos and his *oeuvre* see now M. Duluş, *Rhetoric, Exegesis and Florilegic Structure in Philagathos of Cerami: An Investigation of the Homilies and of the Allegorical Exegesis of Heliodorus' Aethiopika* (diss. Central European Univ., Budapest, 2018).

authors.[8] Similarly, the compositional technique of Philagathos' homiliary reflects the same Byzantine florilegic habit, characterized by quotation (most often unacknowledged) of sanctioned authorities.[9] Alongside a vast deployment of Christian writers, among whom prominently feature Gregory of Nyssa, Maximus the Confessor, Cyril of Alexandria, Gregory the Theologian, Michael Psellos, the *Monogenes* of Makarios Magnes, Philagathos was steeped in the Byzantine rhetorical culture. Manifestly, he typified the Byzantine practice of authorship that prescribed the imitation of the literary models advocated in the various handbooks on style (Hermogenes, Aphthonios, and Dionysios of Halikarnassos among the most influential). A wide repertoire of rhetorical devices such as *ekphrasis*, *synkrisis*, *antithesis*, *diegesis*, *ethopoiia*, and *threnos* are embedded in his *Homilies*.

What immediately deserves to be highlighted are the adaptations and quotations from the ancient novelists Achilles Tatius (2nd cent.) and Heliodorus (4th cent.), Lucian of Samosata (120–192), Alciphron (2nd cent.), and Procopius of Gaza.[10] It is

[8] On Neilos' ecclesiological treatise (*Τάξις τῶν πατριαρχικῶν θρόνων*) see J. Morton, "A Byzantine Canon Law Scholar in Norman Sicily: Revisiting Neilos Doxapatres's *Order of the Patriarchal Thrones*," *Speculum* 92 (2017) 724–754; on Neilos' theological anthology see S. Neirynck, "The *De Oeconomia Dei* by Nilus Doxapatres – A Tentative Definition," in P. van Deun et al. (eds.), *Encyclopedic Trends in Byzantium?* (Leuven 2011) 257–269.

[9] On the Byzantine notion of authorship see A. Pizzone (ed.), *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature: Modes, Functions, and Identities* (Berlin 2014); on the practice of literary imitation see I. Nilsson, "The Same Story but Another: A Reappraisal of Literary Imitation in Byzantium," in E. Schiffer et al. (eds.), *Imitatio – aemulatio – variatio* (Vienna 2010) 195–208; P. Odorico, "Cadre d'exposition / cadre de pensée – la culture du recueil," in *Encyclopedic Trends* 89–108. On Philagathos' florilegic technique see Duluş, *Rhetoric, Exegesis and Florilegic Structure* 196–244.

[10] For Philagathos' use of rhetorical models see N. Bianchi, "Filagato da Cerami lettore di Eliodoro (e di Luciano e Alcifrone)," in *Romanzi greci ritrovati: tradizione e riscoperta dalla tarda antichità al Cinquecento* (Bari 2011) 29–46; Corcella, *BZ* 103 (2010) 25–38, and "Note a Filipo il Filosofo (Filagato da Cerami), *Commentatio in Charicleam*," *MEG* 9 (2009) 45–52; G. Zaccagni,

suggestive that the authors cherished by Philagathos were prominent literary models recommended in near-contemporary handbooks on style like the anonymous *On the Four Parts of the Perfect Speech* (*Περὶ τῶν τεσσάρων μερῶν τοῦ τελείου λόγου*) recently ascribed to the thirteenth century.[11]

The evidence hitherto uncovered for Philagathos' use of Procopius concerns the lost *Monody for Antioch*, *Monody* 1, *The Ekphrasis of the Water-Clock*, *The Ethopoiia of Phoenix*, and the *Epistles*. Thus, unacknowledged citations from the *Monody for Antioch* have been uncovered in Philagathos' homily *For the Holy Innocents* (*Hom.* 24 RT).[12] Snippets from *Monody* 1 surface in the homilies *On the Widow's Son* (*Hom.* 6 RT) and *On the Book of Generation of Jesus Christ and about Thamar* (*Hom.* 22 RT).[13] Citations *ad verbum* from the *Ekphrasis of the Water-Clock* (*Ἔκφρασις ὡρολογίου*) have been revealed in Philagathos' celebrated *ek-*

"La πάρεργος ἀφήγησις in Filagato da Cerami: una particolare tecnica narrativa," *RSBN* 35 (1998) 47–65; Duluş, *Rhetoric, Exegesis and Florilegic Structure* 93–195.

[11] W. Hörandner, "Pseudo-Gregorios Korinthios Über die vier Teile der perfekten Rede," *MEG* 12 (2012) 87–131, here 105: ἀνάγνωθι Λευκίππην, Χαρίκλειαν, Λουκιανόν, Συνέσιον, Ἀλκίφρονος ἐπιστολάς, "Read *Leucippe*, *Charicleia*, Lucian, Synesios, letters of Alciphron." In the same treatise Procopius is listed among the models for the panegyric genre; Ps.-Greg. Corinth. Π, τ. τεσσ. μερ. 74–77: Ἐν τοῖς πανηγυρικοῖς κείσθω σοι πρὸ πάντων εἰς ἀρχέτυπον ὁ μέγας Γρηγόριος ὁ θεολόγος, ὁ Νύσσης, ὁ Βασίλειος, ἐν οἷς ὀλίγοις τοιούτοις ἔγραψεν, ὁ Παναθηναϊκὸς λόγος τοῦ Ἀριστείδου, ὁ Θεμίστιος, ὁ Προκόπιος Γάζης, ὁ Χορίκιος, ὁ Ψελλὸς τὰ μάλιστα, καὶ εἴ τις τοιοῦτος ἔν τε τοῖς παλαιοῖς καὶ νεωτέροις ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς. For the references to Procopius in this rhetorical treatise see A. Corcella, "Una testimonianza sulle προλαλιαί di Procopio e Coricio di Gaza nel Περὶ λογογραφίας," *S&T* 8 (2010) 247–264.

[12] Corcella, *BZ* 103 (2010) 31–35.

[13] Corcella, *RET* 1 (2011/2) 3–4, and *BZ* 103 (2010) 33–37; e.g. *Hom.* 22.6 (RT 143): Οὕτως ἡ Θάμαρ ὑποπεσοῦσα χηρείᾳ διπλῇ καὶ ὡς ὀνείροις τοῖς γάμοις πελάσασα, καὶ οὐδὲ παιδὸς εὐμοιρήσασα, εἰς τὸν τρίτον παῖδα Σηλώμ = Proc. *Op.* 14.7 (*Or.* 4: 462.21 Amato): ὡς ἐν ὀνείρῳ τῷ γάμῳ πελάσασα. In this essay the Procopian citations are from Amato, *Procope de Gaza*, and include paragraph, page number(s), and line(s).

phrasis of the Cappella Palatina (*Hom.* 27 RT).[14] In addition, as Amato convincingly argued, the *incipit* of Philagathos' *ekphrasis* imitates the *incipit* of Procopius' *Ethopoiia of Phoenix* (*Ἠθοποιία Φοίνικος*).[15] He further pointed out that in addition to verbatim quotations there are other passages in Philagathos' *Homilies* that bespeak the imprint of Procopius' works.[16]

The parallels identified reveal that Philagathos relied on Procopius' *Epistles* for describing the emotions experienced in his pastoral endeavor. This type of source use reproduces a rhetorical pattern of self-representation that required the imitation of established stylistic models for speaking about oneself or for describing one's relationship with the audience. In fact, Philagathos often relied on the literary tradition for describing the affectionate relation with his audience.[17]

[14] Amato, *Byzantion* 82 (2012) 5–8. *Hom.* 27.2 (RT 175): Τὸ δὲ τῆς ἀρρήτου τελετῆς χωρίον μαρμάρων θώραξ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι περικλείει τὸν χῶρον […] Κώλυμα δὲ τοῦτο τῶν, εἴ τις προπετὴς καὶ ἀνίερος εἴσω τῶν ἀδύτων ὑπερβῆναι φιλονεικείη = Proc. *Op.* 8.4 (206.12–14 Amato): ὁ μαρμάρων πτυχὶς τῶν κιόνων τὰ μέσα συνέ[χει, ὀξέων] σκολόπων αὐτοῖς ἐμπεπηγότων σιδήρου, κώλυμα τοῦτο τῶν εἴ τις προπετὴς καὶ ὑπερβῆναι φιλονεικεῖ.

[15] *Hom.* 27.1 (RT 174): Συνήδομαί σοι, πόλις, καὶ σοί, θεῖε τῶν ἀνακτόρων ναέ = Proc. *Op.* 7.1 (200.4 Amato): Συνήδομαι μὲν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. On this textual parallel Amato, *Byzantion* 82 (2012) 14, aptly commented: "La coincidenza è davvero fin troppo sospetta per escludere che Filagato, quasi strizzando l'occhio al suo publico, non abbia inteso effettivamente imitare il non citato oratore cristiano di Gaza, tanto più se si considera che nel manoscritto, da cui sono tramandati gli scritti 'profani' di Procopio (e, dunque, presumibilmente anche nell'antigrafo di partenza), l'*Etopea di Fenice* precede la *Descrizione dell'orologio*, modello, abbiamo visto, per la descrizione della recinzione del presbiterio della Cappella palermitana."

[16] *Byzantion* 82 (2012) 12–14.

[17] See for instance *Hom.* 9.1 (RT 61), an appropriation from Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* hitherto unnoticed in the scholarship: Ἐπέχει μου τὴν γλῶτταν ἡ νόσος τοῦ σώματος, λύει δὲ ταύτην ὁ πόθος τοῦ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας πληρώματος. Οἱ πόνοι σιγᾶν ἀναγκάζουσι, τὸ φίλτρον λαλεῖν ἀναπείθει με, καί μοι παρηγορία τῆς νόσου ἡ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁμιλία καθίσταται. Τοιοῦτον ἡ ἀκραιφνὴς ἀγάπη· τῶν μὲν ἔξωθεν προσπιπτόντων ὑπερφρονεῖ, πρὸς δὲ τὸ φιλούμενον ἀφορῶσα ἡδύνεται, "The disease of my body restrains my tongue, but the desire for the

These findings have established that Philagathos' appropriations are based on first-hand knowledge of Procopius' writings. At the same time, it has become manifest that the manuscript circulating in twelfth-century Southern Italy transmitted a larger collection of Procopius' writings, including his now lost *Monody for Antioch* written about the devastating earthquake of 526.[18]

A hitherto unnoticed use of Procopius' *oeuvre* occurs in Philagathos' homily "The lamp of the body is the eye" (on Mt 6:22–23). It is applied in a rare description of an interaction with the audience. The homilist portrays a deacon who is sleeping during his exposition of the Gospel:[19]

> Ἀλλ' ὁρῶ τὸν βέλτιστον ἐκεῖνον διάκονον ὕπνῳ βαρούμενον· ἐφ' ἱκανὰς γὰρ ὥρας ἐπιτηρήσας εἶδον ὡς κάτοχον περικραδαινόμενον,[20] καὶ τὸ βλέμμα χαῦνον, καὶ τὸ σῶμα στηριγμάτων ἐπιδεόμενον, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὥσπερ ἀφιπταμένην, καὶ ζῶντος ἔτι τοῦ σώματος· θάτερον δὲ πῆχυν τῷ ὕπνῳ λυόμενον καὶ μόλις ἄκροις δακτύλοις τῆς παρειᾶς ἐπιψαύοντα. Ἀλλὰ τί πάσχεις,[21]

perfection of the Church unloosens it. The pain forces me to keep silence, the love persuades me to speak, and the speech before you is to me a consolation for my sickness. Such is the perfect love: on the one hand it overlooks whatever happens from without, on the other it delights in looking at the beloved object" = *Aeth.* 1.2 (ed. Colonna 58–60): Οὕτως ἄρα πόθος ἀκριβὴς καὶ ἔρως ἀκραιφνὴς τῶν μὲν ἔξωθεν προσπιπτόντων ἀλγεινῶν τε καὶ ἡδέων πάντων ὑπερφρονεῖ, πρὸς ἓν δὲ τὸ φιλούμενον καὶ ὁρᾶν καὶ συννεύειν τὸ φρόνημα καταναγκάζει, "So it is that genuine affection and wholehearted love disregard all external pains and pleasures and compel the mind to concentrate thought and vision on one object: the beloved" (transl. J. R. Morgan, in B. P. Reardon [ed.], *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* [Berkeley 1989] 355).

[18] Amato, *Byzantion* 82 (2012) 8–9, and *Procope de Gaza* LXVIII; Corcella, *RET* 1 (2011/2) 4.

[19] *Hom.* 63 (Scorsus, *Hom.* 42; *PG* 132.813D–816A). The text presented here is based on *Matrit.gr.* 4554, f. 81v (**M**); on the manuscript see Gregorio de Andres, *Catálogo de los códices griegos de la Real Biblioteca de El Escorial* I (Madrid 1965) 15–20; G. Rossi-Taibbi, *Sulla tradizione manoscritta dell'omiliario di Filagato di Cerami* (Palermo 1965) 51–58.

[20] περικραδαινόμενον supplevi ex **M**] κραδαινόμενον Scorsus.

[21] Ἀλλὰ τί πάσχεις **M**] Ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ τί πάσχεις Scorsus.

ὦ οὗτος, ἀκαίρῳ νυσταγμῷ βαρυνόμενος; Τί δὲ σαυτὸν αἰσχύνεις ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς ἀκροάσεως ὕπνῳ δουλαγωγούμενος; Εἰ δὲ ποδοστρόφον[22] μαινάδα[23] ὀρχουμένην ἑώρας, ἢ κασσωρίδα[24] μαχλῶσαν[25] ἀσελγείας ἄδουσαν ῥήματα, ἄγρυπνον ἂν ἐτήρεις καὶ ὄψιν καὶ ἀκοήν. Νῦν δὲ τῶν θείων ἑρμηνευομένων φωνῶν ἡ τῆς ἀκηδίας σοι μολυβδὶς ἐπιβαρύνει τὰ βλέφαρα.

But I see that honourable deacon oppressed by sleep; as I kept an eye on him for a long time, I saw him quivering just as though suffering from catalepsy, *his eye* foggy, his body *lacking support*, his soul as if flying away, *though his body is still alive*; with the other forearm *slackened* by sleep *and only just lightly touching the cheek with the end of his fingers*. *But,* you there, *what's the matter with you* for being weighed down by untimely slumber? *Why do you shame yourself* being enslaved to sleep at the time of instruction? For if you had seen a frenzied woman dancing or a lewd harlot chanting words of wantonness, you would have kept yourself awake, both your sight and your sense of hearing. But now when the divine words are explained, the leaden weight of your torpor presses hard upon your eyelids.

Bitter irony and humour permeate the description of the deacon.[26] What is perhaps most fascinating about Philagathos' account is his appropriation of Procopius' *Description of the Image placed in the City of Gaza* (*Ἔκφρασις εἰκόνος ἐν τῇ πόλει τῶν Γα-*

[22] Εἰ δὲ ποδοστρόφον **M**] Εἰ δὲ καὶ ποδοστρόφον Scorsus.

[23] μενάδα **M**.

[24] Cf. Philagath. *Hom.* 35.7 (RT 241): Ὑποχαυνωθεὶς οὖν τοῖς λόγοις τῆς κασσωρίδος ὁ δείλαιος; 22.3 (RT 142): Ῥαὰβ δὲ κασσωρὶς ἦν καὶ μαχλῶσα ἐν Ἰεριχώ.

[25] The verb μαχλάω is recurrent in Cyril of Alexandria; a congruent usage occurs in his *Commentarius in xii prophetas minores* 1.17.10 (ed. Pusey, Oxford 1868): καὶ τοῦτο μαχλῶσαν καὶ πεπορνευμένην.

[26] On irony and humor in Byzantine literature see e.g. F. Bernard, "Humor in Byzantine Letters of the Tenth to Twelfth Century: Some Preliminary Remarks," *DOP* 69 (2015) 179–196; J. Ljubarskij, "Byzantine Irony: The Case of Michael Psellos," in E. Chrysos et al. (eds.), *Βυζάντιο· κράτος και κοινωνία* (Athens 2003) 349–361; M. Alexiou et al. (eds.), *Greek Laughter and Tears*: *Antiquity and After* (Edinburgh 2017).

ζαίων κειμένης), a source not so far recognized in the homiletic corpus. Procopius' renowned *ekphrasis* illustrates scenes of the myth of Phaedra and Hippolytus, as well as scenes from *Iliad* Book 3.[27] Philagathos imitates and tailors to his own ends Procopius' description of Phaedra:[28]

> Ἀλλὰ τί τοῦτο πέπονθα; τῇ τοῦ ζωγράφου τέχνῃ πεπλάνημαι καὶ ζῆν ταῦτα νενόμικα καὶ λανθάνειν τὴν θέαν, ὅτι πέφυκε γράμματα. οὐκοῦν περὶ τῆς Φαίδρας, μὴ πρὸς ἐκείνην φθεγγώμεθα. τὸ γὰρ σχῆμα ταύτης ἐλέγχει τὸν ἔρωτα. ὁρᾷς ὑγρὸν τὸ βλέμμα καὶ νοῦν τῷ πάθει μετέωρον καὶ σῶμα στηριγμάτων ἐπιδεόμενον, ψυχὴν ὥσπερ ἀποδημοῦσαν καὶ ζῶντος ἔτι τοῦ σώματος. δίφρος ὁ μὲν αὐτῇ πρὸς ἕδραν ὑπέστρωται, ὁ δὲ πρὸς τῇ κλίνῃ, ὡς εἰκός, ὑποκείμενος ἀνέχει τὸν νῶτον καὶ πέμπει τῷ σκίμποδι. ὁρᾷς δὲ πῆχυν καὶ πάθει λυόμενον καὶ μόλις ἄκρῳ δακτύλῳ τῆς παρειᾶς ἐπιψαύοντα.
>
> But what is this I experience? I am deceived by the art of the painter and think all this is alive, and my sight forgets that this is a painting. Let me speak about Phaedra, not to her. Her form proves her love. You can see her moist *eye*, her mind unsettled by passion, *her body lacking support, her soul* wandering, *though her body is still alive*. A couch laid under her for sitting yet lying close to the [king's] bed, as was fitting, sustains her back and leads to the small bed. Behold the *forearm slackened by passion and only just lightly touching the cheek with the end of the finger*.

Philagathos' appropriation echoes the scene taking place in

[27] On Procopius' *ekphrasis* see Amato, in *Procope de Gaza* 159–187. On Procopius' appropriation and modulation of the literary tradition see L. Thénevet, "L'*Ekphrasis eikonos* de Procope de Gaza: visite guidée d'une tragédie," in E. Amato et al. (eds.), *L'École de Gaza: espace littéraire et identité culturelle dans l'Antiquité tardive* (Leuven 2017) 225–265. On the late-antique cultural context see V. Drbal, "*L'Ekphrasis Eikonos* de Procope de Gaza en tant que reflet de la société de l'Antiquité tardive," in V. Vavřínek et al. (eds.), *Ekphrasis: la représentation des monuments dans les littératures byzantine et byzantino-slaves* (Prague 2011) 106–122; R. Talgam, "The *Ekphrasis Eikonos* of Procopius of Gaza: The Depiction of Mythological Themes in Palestine and Arabia during the Fifth and Sixth Centuries," in *Christian Gaza* 209–234.

[28] Procop. *Op.* 9.17 (197.26–198.7). A part of this *ekphrasis* is translated by G. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors* (Princeton 1983) 173–174.

the palace.[29] At the center of a hypostyle hall, Theseus, king of Athens, is shown lying on his bed, attended by Hypnos leaning on his bed and three boy servants. Close to the king's bed sits his wife, Phaedra, accompanied by an old nursemaid, reading the thoughts of her mistress and persuading her to write a letter to Hippolytus expressing her love. Procopius' account portrays Phaedra restless and tormented by her forlorn and tragic love for her stepson. What sparked Philagathos' adaptation of Procopius *ekphrasis* for portraying the sleeping deacon is the analogy provided by the painting, which depicts Theseus asleep in the palace a few lines above. The homilist retrieved this literary context and combined it with the image of Phaedra's uncontrollable desire and lack of self-restraint. In fact, the association between untimely sleep and passion reflects a well-established monastic mindset. Basil the Great in the *Great Asketikon* reports the question: "Why does untimely sleep come upon us and how can we thrust it out?"[30] The Cappadocian explains that untimely sleep occurs when oblivion to God's judgments overcomes the soul. It appears that the homilist connects the monastic theme of untimely sleep with wantonness and lack of self restraint.

The exegetic connection is based on Procopius' *ekphrasis* as the recrimination of the deacon (Ἀλλὰ τί πάσχεις, ὦ οὗτος, ἀκαίρῳ νυσταγμῷ βαρυνόμενος; Τί δὲ σαυτὸν αἰσχύνεις ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς ἀκροάσεως ὕπνῳ δουλαγωγούμενος;) is modelled on a passage of Procopius' *ekphrasis* which speaks of Phaedra's unbridled passion (*Op.* 9.16 [197.13–19]):

> Θησεὺς μὲν καθεύδει καὶ τὴν τύχην οἰκέται βιάζονται. Φαίδραν δὲ ἐκείνην οὐ κατέσχε "νήδυμος ὕπνος." ἀνθ' ὕπνου δὲ ταύτῃ τὴν καρδίαν Ἔρως ἐνέμετο. ἀλλὰ τί πάσχεις, ὦ γύναι; ἀνόνητον πονεῖς οὐκ εὐτυχοῦντος τοῦ Ἔρωτος. πῶς γὰρ δὴ καὶ

[29] Thénevet, in *L'École de Gaza* 233–240; Talgam, in *Christian Gaza* 210–216.

[30] Bas. *Reg.brev.* 32 (*PG* 31.1104C).

> πείσεις τὸν καὶ σωφρονεῖν ἐπιστάμενον; τί σαυτὴν αἰσχύνεις ἀνόμῳ κοίτῃ πλησιάζειν ἐθέλουσα;
>
> Theseus is asleep and the members of his household take advantage of the opportunity. But sweet sleep holds not Phaedra. Instead of sleep, Love has taken possession of her heart. *What is happening to you*, woman? You suffer in vain from a love which cannot succeed. How will you persuade him who knows self-restraint? *Why do you shame yourself* by longing to approach a forbidden bed. (transl. Kennedy)

Philagathos' rhetorical interrogations are thus inspired by Procopius' text. Notably, the image of Theseus held by sleep which triggered Philagathos' adaptation is an innovation of Procopius. In Euripides' *Hippolytus* (281, 660) Theseus is said to be away on a state visit when the first events unfold.[31] It may not be just a coincidence that the same recrimination is addressed to Herod in Philagathos' homily *On the Beheading of St. John the Baptist* (*Hom.* 35 [RT 239–244]): Τί σαυτὸν αἰσχύνεις, λέχος ἐνυβρίζων ὁμόγνιον καὶ ἐπιδέμνια βαίνων παράνομα; ("*Why do you disgrace yourself* by mocking thy brotherly bridal-bed and mounting *lawless* couches?"). If the reprimand appears too common to indicate a filiation, the similarity between contexts is striking in that both refer to illegitimate seduction and may in fact be indicative of a Procopian imprint.

But Procopius' *Description of the Image* can in fact be demonstrated in *Hom.* 35. This sermon was pronounced at the liturgical commemoration of the biblical event on 29 August in the Church of St. John of the Hermits (San Giovanni degli Eremiti) in Palermo during one of Philagathos' sojourns in the capital. Stylistically, it showcases his mastery of incorporating various rhetorical models. It contains a pictorial *ekphrasis* of St. John the Baptist based on passages from Basil of Caesarea's *Homily on the Martyr Gordius*, Gregory of Nyssa's *Eulogy of Saint Basil*, and quotations from the Homeric poems (*Il.* 16.235 and *Od.* 9.191).[32]

[31] See on this Thénevet, in *L'École de Gaza* 237.

[32] On Philagathos' embroidery of sources see Duluş, *Rhetoric, Exegesis and Florilegic Structure* 129–133.

Noteworthy is the depiction of the emotions that divided Herod's soul, modeled after an episode in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*.[33] Similarly, the depiction of Herodias' arts of seduction is intertwined with a snippet from Lucian's dialogue *Toxaris*.[34] However, the most arresting aspect of Philagathos' sermon is the *ekphrasis* of the glamorous appearance and lascivious dance of Herodias' daughter (whom Josephus identifies as Salome) (*Hom.* 35.8 [RT 241–242]):

> Θυγάτριον ἦν τῇ Ἡρωδιάδι ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Φιλίππου νομίμων κηδευμάτων τεχθέν, ἀστεῖον μὲν καὶ τὴν ὄψιν οὐκ ἄωρον, ἄλλως δὲ ἰταμὸν[35] καὶ προπετὲς καὶ ἀναίσχυντον, καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς τῆς ἀσπίδος μητρὸς ἀπεικόνισμα. Ταύτην κοσμήσασα ἡ μοιχαλὶς μήτηρ ἀβρότερον καὶ νυμφικῶς περιστείλασα, πρὸς τοὺς εὐωχουμένους ὀρχησομένην ἐξέπεμψεν. Ἡ δέ, ὡς ἐν μέσῳ γένοιτο τῶν δαιτυμόνων, πρὸς τῷ μὴ αἰσχυνθῆναι κορικῶς ἀποξύσασα τῶν προσώπων πᾶσαν αἰδῶ,[36] ὥσπερ κορυβαντιῶσα ἐβάκχευε,

[33] Philagath. *Hom*. 35.5 (RT 240–241): Ὁρῶν γὰρ Ἡρώδης ῥαγδαίως τὸν προφήτην τοῖς ἐλέγχοις τοῦτον μαστίζοντα, ἀνυποστόλῳ τε θάρσει τὸ δυσῶδες τῆς φαύλης πράξεως ἐκπομπεύοντα, πολλοῖς ἐμερίζετο τὴν ψυχήν, αἰσχύνῃ, ἔρωτι καὶ θυμῷ· ἠσχύνετο τοῦ κήρυκος τὸ ἀξίωμα, ὠργίζετο ἐλεγχόμενος, ὁ ἔρως τὴν ὀργὴν ἐπὶ πλέον ἀνέφλεγε, καὶ τέλος ἡ φιληδονία νικᾷ τὸ ἀνδράποδον, "For Herod seeing the prophet violently flogging him with rebukes and parading the filthiness of his foul deeds openly and fearlessly, *had his soul torn apart by many conflicting emotions—shame, love, and anger; he was ashamed* before the herald's standing, *enraged* when chastised; *for love greatly inflamed the anger* and the lust for pleasure prevails *at last* over the one who has been taken captive" = Ach. Tat. 5.24.3: ὡς δὲ προϊοῦσα καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐνέτυχε, πᾶσαν μαθοῦσα τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐμεμέριστο πολλοῖς ἅμα τὴν ψυχήν, αἰδοῖ καὶ ὀργῇ καὶ ἔρωτι καὶ ζηλοτυπίᾳ. ἠσχύνετο τὸν ἄνδρα, ὠργίζετο τοῖς γράμμασιν, ὁ ἔρως ἐμάραινε τὴν ὀργήν, ἐξῆπτε τὸν ἔρωτα ἡ ζηλοτυπία, καὶ τέλος ἐκράτησεν ὁ ἔρως.

[34] On Philagathos' Lucianic allusions see also N. Bianchi, "Filagato da Cerami lettore del *De domo* ovvero Luciano in Italia meridionale," in *La tradizione dei testi* 47.

[35] Cf. Heliod. *Aeth.* 7.10.4: γύναιόν τι ξενικὸν οὐκ ἄωρον μὲν ἄλλως δὲ ἰταμὸν; 1.9.1: ἐπεισάγει γύναιον ἀστεῖον μὲν ἀλλ' ἀρχέκακον, ὄνομα Δημαινέτην.

[36] Cf. Alciphr. *Ep.* 1.12.1: δέον αἰσχύνεσθαι κορικῶς, ἀπέξυσαι τὴν αἰδῶ τοῦ προσώπου.

σοβοῦσα τὴν κόμην, ἀσέμνως λυγιζομένη, ἀνατείνουσα τὴν ὠλένην, παραγυμνοῦσα τὰ στέρνα, θάτερον τοῖν ποδοῖν ἀναστέλλουσα, τῇ ταχείᾳ τοῦ σώματος συστροφῇ παραγυμνουμένη, καὶ τάχα τι καὶ τῶν ἀπορρήτων ὑποδεικνύουσα, ἀναιδεῖ τε προσώπῳ τοὺς τῶν ὁρώντων ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς ἑαυτὴν ἐπιστρέφουσα, καὶ σχήμασι παντοδαποῖς ἔμπληκτα ποιοῦσα τῶν θεατῶν τὰ φρονήματα. Ἦν δὲ ἄρα τότε ὁ κτηνώδης Ἡρώδης σωφρονοῦσιν ἀνθρώποις, ὡς εἰκός, καταγέλαστος, μείρακα παρθένον τό γε δοκεῖν ἐν ὄψεσιν ἀρρένων οὕτω παρασκευάσας ἀναισχυντεῖν. Πρόσθεσις δὲ τοῦ κακοῦ, ὅτι καὶ ἤρεσεν αὐτῷ τῆς μαιναδογενοῦς[37] ποδοστρόφου ἡ ὄρχησις. Τῷ δὲ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς ἔρωτι καὶ τῇ μέθῃ κάτοχος ὤν, καίτοι μηδὲν αἰτησάσης τῆς νεήλυδος, ἄχρι τοῦ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτῇ διελεῖν ἐπηγγείλατο ἀντὶ πορνικῶν λυγισμάτων καὶ ποδῶν ἀτάκτου στροφῆς, καὶ ὅρκον τῇ ἐπαγγελίᾳ ἐπέθηκε τὸ τῆς ἀκολασίας ἀνδράποδον.

Herodias had a little daughter born from her legitimate marriage with Philip, *charming and not unappealing looking, but of uncommon impudence,* reckless and shameless, truly the representation of her viperish mother. The adulterous mother, *embellishing her daughter more gracefully* and dressing her up in wedding dress, sent her out dancing in front of those *sumptuously feasting*. And she stepped out among the guests *instead of being ashamed as a girl should be, and wiping off all modesty from her countenance* danced as if filled with Corybantic frenzy, wildly moving her hair, twisting herself indecently, lifting up her elbows, disclosing her breast, raising up one of her two feet, laying herself bare by the swift bending of her body, *and forthwith revealing something of those parts, which are unfit to be spoken*; with unabashed expression she turned the eyes of the beholders toward herself, and by gestures of every kind she stupefied the spectators' minds. At that moment, Herod truly seemed more beastlike than human, probably [he was] an object of derision, since he provided a young girl, a virgin, as it seems, to behave so shamelessly in the sight of men. Then, there was a further increase of evil, for the dance of the Maenad-born dancer pleased him. Being possessed by an ardent passion for her mother and overcome by drunkenness, and although it was nothing that the newcomer had asked, [Herod] promised her

[37] μαιναδογενής ("maenad-bred" or "maenad-descended") is a *hapax*.

> that he would even divide the kingdom for the sake of her obscene twistings and wild leaping of her feet, and the slave of licentiousness added to the promise a vow.

This is one of the most extensive accounts of her performance in the Byzantine homiletic literature.[38] For this amplified description of Salome's performance, Philagathos amassed a mosaic of vignettes on impudence plucked from Alciphron's letters, Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, and Procopius' *Description of the Image*. For the characterization of Salome's performance as exposing the hidden parts of her body (καὶ τάχα τι καὶ τῶν ἀπορρήτων ὑποδεικνύουσα) recalls Procopius' description of Phaedra, who "by wearing a transparent tunic reveals something of those parts, which are unfit to be spoken" (λεπτῷ δὲ χιτωνίσκῳ [σχεδόν τ]ι καὶ τῶν ἀπορρήτων ὑπέδειξεν).[39] That Philagathos relied on Procopius' text is reinforced by the fact that the same section about Phaedra's passion is used in *Hom.* 63 in portraying the sleeping deacon, as noted above.

Philagathos' description of Salome's lecherous dance is surprising given the anxieties aroused by the image of the dancer in patristic literature and the rhetorical conception of language as a force that can affect the conscience through the power of words. For evocative descriptions were thought to have the same efficacy in stirring the imagination of the audience as the sight itself. This is, for instance, a recurrent theme in St. John Chrysostom:[40] the great preacher argued that one should avoid the mere sight of a prostitute, since such sights creep into the viewer's mind and it is impossible not to be affected by them.[41] In the twelfth century, Zonaras, commenting on the council of

[38] Closest to Philagathos' *ekphrasis* of the dance in terms of vividness is Basil of Seleucia's *Oratio XVIII in Herodiadem*, *PG* 85.226D–236C. On the theme of dance in this sermon see R. Webb, "Salome's Sisters: The Rhetoric and Realities of Dance in Late Antiquity and Byzantium," in L. James (ed.), *Women, Men and Eunuchs: Gender in Byzantium* (London 1997) 135–141.

[39] Procop. *Op.* 9.17 (198.12–13).

[40] See on this Webb, in *Women, Men and Eunuchs* 131–134.

[41] *C. ludos et theat.*, *PG* 56.266.

Trullo (A.D. 691/2), which outlawed public spectacle and dancing, explained that such sights were bound to arouse wantonness in the audience.[42]

In the case of Philagathos, the assiduous imitation of rhetorical models elucidates the purpose of descriptive detail. The goal is to achieve vividness and emotional evocation. Indeed, behind Philagathos' indulgence in conveying erotic details may stand the stylistic influence of Procopius' *Description of the Image*. Besides the description of Phaedra's transparent garments and seductive body, the *ekphrasis* includes other scenes suffused with dramatic and erotic appeal that may have affected Philagathos' description of Salome's performance. Thus, the image of Salome as "disclosing her breast" (παραγυμνοῦσα τὰ στέρνα) recalls the licentious peasant woman nearly exposing her breasts (Procop. *Op.* 9.33 [206.7–8]: παραγυμνοῖ τὸ μέρος καὶ τὸ μασθὸν ἂν ὑπέδειξεν) while she watched the brutal spectacle of the servant beating the old nursemaid in the second episode of the myth. Furthermore, the exposed breast of the old nursemaid when struck down by the servant (*Op.* 9.25 [202.20–21]: γυμνοῖς δὲ τοῖς στέρνοις ἐπιβαλοῦσα τὴν χεῖρα) provides another possible analogy for Philagathos' imagery. Finally, in light of Philagathos' acquaintance with Procopius' *Monody* 1 (*Op.* 14), the depiction of Salome's movements as "obscene twistings and wild leaping of her feet" (πορνικῶν λυγισμάτων καὶ ποδῶν ἀτάκτου στροφῆς) seems to reflect Procopius' description of the excellence of the youth who "passed beyond wild leapings despite being very young" (*Op.* 14.3 [459.23–24]: νεώτατος ὑπερβὰς ἀτακτοῦντα πηδήματα).

It is opportune to note here that the account of the old nursemaid's sufferings in Procopius' *Description of the Image* recalls the extreme gestures of bereavement in Philagathos' homily *On the Widow's Son*. The mother's desolation at the loss of her beloved son is vividly rendered as "burning up her entrails, withering

[42] S. Taugher, "Having Fun in Byzantium," in L. James (ed.), *A Companion to Byzantium* (Oxford 2010) 143.

her lips, tearing her hair, baring her chest, unveiling her head … and almost breathing out her life along with him" (*Hom.* 6.8 [RT 40]: ἀπηνθρακωμένη τὰ σπλάγχνα, πεφρυγμένη τὰ χείλη, κεκαρμένη τὴν κόμην, γυμνὴ τὰ στέρνα, ἀπαρακάλυπτος τὴν κεφαλήν). In another passage Philagathos writes that upon "smiting her chest and head with stones she revealed the breasts with which she had nursed" (6.10 [RT 41]: λίθοις παίουσα καὶ στέρνα καὶ κεφαλήν, μαστοὺς ὑπεδείκνυ τοὺς θρέψαντας). This homiletic context is congruent with Procopius' description of the old nursemaid whose nakedness is similarly provoked by bereavement and self-inflicted pain: "smiting her chest, she probably wails her own fate" (*Op.* 9.25 [202.24–25]: πλήττουσα δὲ τὰ στέρνα, ὡς εἰκὸς, τὴν τύχην ἑαυτῆς ἀποδύρεται). Undoubtedly, these displays of grief represent a literary convention in laments and may point to other rhetorical models. In the *Aethiopica*, for instance, Theagenes is described as mourning his beloved Charikleia by "striking his head and tearing his hair" (Heliod. *Aeth.* 2.1.2: παίων τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ τίλλων τὰς τρίχας). Nonetheless, it is important to stress that Philagathos in fact retrieved several snippets from Procopius' *Monody* 1 in this sermon (more on this below), which would seem to add to the suggested imprint of Procopius' *ekphrasis* on *Hom.* 6.

Besides *Hom.* 63 and 35, Philagathos can be seen to have employed Procopius' *Description of the Image* in the homily *For the Holy Innocents* (*Hom.* 24 RT). The originality of Philagathos' account consists in adding an *ekphrasis* of a painting featuring the Massacre of the Innocents to his detailed account of the event, as an *ekphrasis* within an *ekphrasis*. The first *ekphrasis*, as A. Corcella has pointed out, encloses snippets derived in all likelihood from Procopius' lost *Monody for Antioch*. This section is worth retrieving here to emphasize Philagathos' reliance on the Procopian corpus and to better contextualize his (possible) use of Procopius' *Description of the Image* as discussed below (*Hom.* 24.6–7 [RT 158–159]):

Ἐθρήνουν πατέρες, προσέπιπτον τοῖς στρατιώταις, ἱκέτευον, καὶ

μήτηρ περιεκέχυτο παῖδα,[43] πατὴρ δὲ ἀνεκαλεῖτο γονήν. Ὥρμα γυνὴ πρὸς φυγήν, φόρτον τοῖς ὤμοις τὸ παιδίον ἐπάγουσα· ἀλλ' ἦν τῶν ὑπηρετῶν ὁ δρόμος ὀξύτερος. Ἀλλήλοις δὲ συνεκρούοντο, καὶ φωναὶ συμμιγεῖς ἀνηγείροντο· ἠπείλουν οἱ στρατιῶται δεινόν τι καὶ δρακοντῶδες, ἠγριωμένοις δεδορκότες τοῖς ὄμμασιν.[44] Ὠλόλυζον μητέρες αἵμασι πεφυρμέναι καὶ δάκρυσιν· ὠλοφύροντο νήπια ἐλεεινῶς συγκοπτόμενα. Τὰ γὰρ ξίφη, ὡς ἔτυχεν, ἐπ' αὐτὰ φερόμενα ἀθλίως ἠκρωτηρίαζε· καὶ τὸ μὲν χειρῶν ἀπεστέρητο, τὸ δὲ τὼ πόδε συντριβὲν ἐξ ἡμισείας ἀπώλετο· ἄλλο κατεάγη τὴν κεφαλήν, τοῦ σώματος τὰ καίρια παρασπώμενον,[45] τὸ δὲ ὅλον ἐτέμνετο, ὡς ὁ θυμὸς ἐδίδου αὐτοματίζων ἑκάστῳ τὸν θάνατον. Ὦ πόσοι παῖδες, μέσον τμηθέντες, ἡμίθνητοι μεμενήκασι, μηδὲ τελευτὴν ὀξυτέραν κερδαίνοντες,[46] ἀλλὰ κατὰ βραχὺ δαπανώμενοι. Παῖς παρέθεε τῇ μητρὶ καὶ ψελλιζούσῃ φωνῇ τὴν τεκοῦσαν ἀνεκαλεῖτο.[47] Ἀλλὰ στρατιώτης ἐξάπινα εἰσδραμών, ἀφηρεῖτο τῷ ξίφει τὴν κεφαλήν· φθεγγομένου δ' ἄρα τοῦδε, ἡ κάρα κατεμίχθη τῇ κόνει.[48]

[43] Proc. fr. incert. sedis 26 Amato = Bekker 169.4–5: Περιχεόμαι· αἰτιατικῇ. Προκόπιος· "καὶ μήτηρ περιεκέχυτο παῖδα."

[44] Gr. Nyss. *Beat.*, *PG* 44.1285: ὀφθαλμοὶ μὲν ὑπὸ τὴν τῶν βλεφάρων περιγραφὴν ἐξωθοῦνται, ὕφαιμόν τι καὶ δρακοντῶδες πρὸς τὸ λυποῦν ἀτενίζοντες. The allusion to Gregory's text consisting in just one word is certified by Philagathos' extensive reliance on Nyssen's homily in *Hom.* 9.13 (RT 65): Ὀφθαλμοὶ μὲν γὰρ ὑπὲρ τὴν τῶν βλεφάρων περιγραφὴν ἐξωθοῦντο, ὕφαιμόν τι καὶ δρακοντῶδες δεδορκότες πρὸς τὸν λυπήσαντα, "The eyes wrenched out beyond the limit of the eye-lids, were flashing forth something bloody and gazing snake-like to the one tormented by this [viz. demonic possession]."

[45] Proc. *Monodia per Antiochia*, fr. certae sedis I 2 Amato = Bekker 153.21–23: Κατεάγη: γενικῇ· Προκόπιος ἐκ τῆς Μονῳδίας Ἀντιοχείας· "ἄλλος κατεάγη τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ σώματος τὰ καίρια παρασπώμενος."

[46] Proc. fr. incertae sedis 22 Amato = Bekker 153.24–26: Κερδαίνω· αἰτιατικῇ. Προκόπιος· "ὦ πόσοι μέσοι ξύλων ἀλληλοις ἀντερειδόντων ἐγίνοντο, μηδὲ τελευτὴν ὀξυτέραν κερδαινόντες."

[47] Gr. Nyss. *Nativ.*, *PG* 46.1145: ἀλλ' ἀκροᾶται τοῦ ἄλλου ἤδη φθεγγομένου καὶ ψελλιζομένῃ τῇ φωνῇ τὴν μητέρα μετὰ δακρύων ἀνακαλοῦντος. τί πάθῃ; τίς γένηται; τῇ τίνος ἀντιβοήσει φωνῇ; τῇ τίνος οἰμωγῇ ἀντοδύρηται;

[48] *Il.* 10.455–457; the narrative context in the *Iliad* is Dolon, who although a swift runner was hopelessly hunted down by Diomedes and

> The fathers wailed, they fell down before the soldiers kneeling, beseeching them; *a mother embraced her child* and a father called to his offspring. A woman rushed out fleeing, carrying the child as a burden upon her shoulders, but the henchmen's running was faster. They collided with each other and mingled voices arose. The soldiers *blustered terrible threats, flashing forth like snakes with savage eyes*. The mothers wept bitterly, drenched by blood and tears; the babes sobbed when pitiably cleft asunder. For the swords, randomly raining down upon them, inflicted horrendous mutilations. One was deprived of hands, while one died with legs cut in half. *Another had his head cut off, having detached the body's most important part*; another one was entirely cut, since wrath acting spontaneously brought death to every single one. *Oh, how many children cut in half lay half-dead, not even having the benefit of a swifter death,* but they expired only slowly. *A child ran to his mother, and called her with faltering voice.* But a soldier rushing towards him with the sword immediately severed his head; and "*while he was yet speaking his head was mingled with the dust*" (for the speech leads me to utter poetic words).

This extensive and bloody narrative of the Massacre is in a sanctioned pattern in Byzantine homiletics for describing this episode. As Henry Maguire has pointed out, the delight in cruel detail was absorbed into religious literature from descriptions of war and calamities.[49] Thus, Philagathos intertwines snippets from Procopius of Gaza and Gregory of Nyssa, sparing no gruesome detail that might bring the scene before the eye. The attribution of these snippets to Procopius' lost work is based on the indication given in the *Lexicon Seguerianum*: ἐκ τῆς Μονῳδίας Ἀντιοχείας. As Corcella has insightfully argued, the Procopian snippets incorporated by Philagathos are best explained by direct access to Procopius' full corpus.[50]

Odysseus. By this poetical allusion, Philagathos evokes the hopelessness of the children's flight and their inescapable death.

[49] H. Maguire, *Art and Eloquence in Byzantium* (Princeton 1981) 24–27.

[50] Corcella, *BZ* 103 (2010) 31–34, here 34: "Filagato ha evidentemente riadattato nella sua omelia questi brani, con alcune ovvie variazioni. Si potrebbe, a rigore, supporre che li abbia ripresi da questo o da analogo

That Philagathos used Procopius' *Description of the Image* can be suggested for the next section of the sermon, which sets forth a description of a painting of the *Massacre of the Innocents*, which Philagathos claimed to have seen with his own eyes:[51]

> Εἶδον ἐγὼ τοῦτο τὸ πάθος χρώμασι γεγραμμένον ἐν πίνακι, καὶ πρὸς οἶκτον ἐκινήθην καὶ δάκρυα. Ἐγέγραπτο γὰρ ὁ μὲν τύραννος ἐκεῖνος Ἡρώδης ἐφ' ὑψηλοῦ τινος θρόνου σοβαρῶς ἐφεζόμενος, δριμύ τι καὶ θηριῶδες ὁρῶν κεχηνότι τῷ βλέμματι. Ὀρθὸν δὲ στήσας ἐν κολεῷ τὸ ξίφος, τὴν λαιὰν ἐπ' αὐτῷ διανέπαυε, τὴν <δὲ> δεξιὰν προτείνων ἐπιτάττειν ἐῴκει τοῖς στρατιώταις ἀνηλεῶς θερίσαι τῶν νηπίων τὴν ἄρουραν. Οἱ δὲ θηριοπρεπῶς ἐπιθρώσκοντες,[52] ἀφειδῶς τὰ δείλαια κατεμελιζον.[53]
>
> I saw this [scene of] suffering painted in colors on a panel, and I was moved to pity and tears. For that tyrant Herod was depicted sitting on a high throne haughtily, looking with wide-open eyes, fierce and savage. *While he rested* his left hand *upon the upraised* and sheathed *sword, he stretched forth his right hand* [and] he seemed to

lessico; ma non pare che altri frammenti, procopiani o non procopiani, presenti nel *περὶ συντάξεως* siano stati utilizzati da Filagato ed è senz'altro più naturale pensare che egli avesse accesso al testo stesso di Procopio."

[51] *Hom.* 24.9–11 (RT 159–160). It remains uncertain whether Philagathos described a real painting or based his account on the literary tradition; e.g. a similar emotion prefacing an *ekphrasis* of a painting of the Sacrifice of Isaac is expressed by Greg. Nyss. *Deit.*, *PG* 46.572C: Εἶδον πολλάκις ἐπὶ γραφῆς εἰκόνα τοῦ πάθους, καὶ οὐκ ἀδακρυτὶ τὴν θέαν παρῆλθον, ἐναργῶς τῆς τέχνης ὑπ' ὄψιν ἀγούσης τὴν ἱστορίαν, "I often saw the representation of this suffering in painting, and I could not pass by this spectacle without tears, so vividly the art brought the story before my eyes."

[52] Cf. Cyril. *Comm. xii* I 640 Pusey: κατεστάλαξε δὲ καὶ εἰς νοῦν αὐτοῖς καὶ καρδίαν, τὴν διὰ πλανήσεως μέθην, ἐφ' ᾗ δικαίως καὶ ἀπολώλασι, θηριοπρεπῶς ἐπιθρώσκοντες, παντί τε θράσει καὶ δυσφημίᾳ χρώμενοι, "He distilled into their mind and heart an intoxication through error in which they rightly perish in a frenzy befitting wild animals employing utter audacity and abuse" (transl. R. Hill, *Cyril of Alexandria, Commentary on the Twelve Prophets* II (Washington 2008] 209).

[53] Cf. Cyril. *Comm. xii* I 645 Pusey: καταμελίζοντας ἀφειδῶς, "chopping it unmercifully."

be ordering the soldiers to cut off without pity the mothers. And *springing like beasts they slaughtered mercilessly* the wretched [lads].

Philagathos' statement of being "moved to pity and tears" evokes the standard emotional response aroused by the work of art. This is a constituent element in the *ekphraseis* of paintings from Late Antiquity onwards.[54] Given Philagathos' practice of literary *mimesis*, the imprint of Procopius' *Description of the Image* can be suggested for his description of Herod:

Procop. *Op*. 9.13 (196.2–5): ὅπως δὲ μὴ λάθῃ παραρρυέν, ὀρθὸν τοῦτο στήσας τὸ σῶμα ἀνέκλινε, λαιῷ συνέχων τῷ πήχει καὶ πρὸς ἀσφάλειαν τῇ χειρὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐρειδόμενος.[55]
9.10 (194.9–12): τὸ δὲ παρὸν πρὸς τὸ τῆς ἡμέρας μῆκος ἀποκαμὼν ἐπὶ κλίνην ἐτράπη καὶ διαναπαύει τὸ σῶμα, τῆς μεσημβρίας τὸ πνῖγος ἀποπεμπόμενος ὕπνῳ.[56]
9.39 (208.3–10): ὀρθὴν γὰρ στήσας τῇ λαβῇ τοῦ ξίφους ἐπαναπαύει τὴν χεῖρα. […] πάρεστιν Αἴας αὐτῷ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα καὶ τὸν Τυδέως εἰ βούλει τῇ χειρὶ μιμησάμενος, ἐκ νώτων Ἀγαμέμνονος προτείνων τὴν δεξιὰν Πριάμῳ καὶ στῆναι λέγων μηδέν τι τῶν βασιλέως ἁπτόμενον.[57]

Several contexts in Procopius' text can have inspired Philagathos. First, the description of Herod has a parallel in Procopius' description of the boy bearing the fan in the main scene of the painting, which features Theseus asleep surrounded by servants and his wife Phaedra. Second, Procopius' similar use of διανα-

[54] L. James and R. Webb, "'To Understand Ultimate Things and Enter Secret Places': *Ekphrasis* and Art in Byzantium," *Art History* 14 (1991) 9–11.

[55] "In order that he does not fall without being aware, he had placed it [the fan] upright to serve as support for his body, holding it tightly with his left arm and resting his head on his hand, out of caution."

[56] "But at present, having grown weary at the height of the day he [Theseus] has turned to his bed and rests his body, sent off to sleep by the stifling heat of noon."

[57] "Holding it [his left hand] straight by leaning on the handle of his sword, he [Agamemnon] lets his hand rest; near him is Ajax who imitates, if you want, Odysseus and Tydeus' son by stretching forth to Priam his right hand over the shoulders of Agamemnon and saying to stay still without even touching a hair of the king."

παύω in picturing Theseus who "rests his body" (διαναπαύει τὸ σῶμα) while lying on his bed at noon at the center of a hypostyle hall: this appears to represent another pertinent context for Philagathos' τὴν λαιὰν ἐπ' αὐτῷ διανέπαυε. Third, the homily's image of Herod "resting his left hand upon the upraised and sheathed sword while stretching forth his right hand" (Ὀρθὸν δὲ στήσας ἐν κολεῷ τὸ ξίφος, τὴν λαιὰν ἐπ' αὐτῷ διανέπαυε, τὴν <δὲ> δεξιὰν προτείνων) seems to recall the passage of Procopius' *Description of the Image* featuring Agamemnon receiving Priam.[58] Admittedly, these are tiny allusions for locating Philagathos' source of inspiration. Nonetheless, since corroborated by Philagathos' extensive use of Procopius' *ekphrasis* for the deacon sleeping during the liturgy (*Hom.* 63), the hypothesis that Philagathos' description of Herod is based on Procopius' *Description of the Image* seems warranted.

Finally, I suggest that further allusions to Procopius' corpus can be found in the homily *On the Widow's Son*. The sermon showcases Philagathos' propensity for emotional evocation achieved through a consummate florilegic technique.[59] The same ekphrastic emphasis on conjuring the absent sight in the sermon on the Massacre of the Holy Innocents by a twofold account of the slaughter (i.e. Philagathos first described the Massacre itself and then repeated it in the *ekphrasis* of the painting) is found again here in the compositional structure of the homily. For its first part contains a lengthy citation from Gregory of Nyssa's *On the Making of Man*, which incorporates almost all of Nyssen's account of Christ raising Lazarus, while in the second part Philagathos introduces his own description made up of a mosaic of vignettes, so that he is able to present the

[58] The passage refers to Procopius' description of the panels in the upper part of the painting, which depict Priam accompanied by Antenor on a mission to Agamemnon, based on *Il.* 3.259–263; on the Iliadic allusions in Procopius' *ekphrasis* see Amato, *Procope de Gaza* 176–177 n.65.

[59] For a detailed mapping of sources in this sermon see Duluş, *Rhetoric, Exegesis and Florilegic Structure* 93–107.

episode twice over.[60] He wove into his account passages consonant with the theme of his sermon from Gregory's *On the Making of Man*, *Sermons on the Beatitudes*, and *Life of Saint Macrina*, Basil of Caesarea's *Homily on Psalm 44*, Gregory of Nazianzus' *In Praise of the Maccabees* (*Or.* 15), the *Life and Miracles of St. Nicholas of Myra*, Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*, Nilus of Ancyra's *Epistles*, and Procopius of Gaza's *Monody* 1 (*Op*. 14). Without a doubt, Philagathos resorted to Procopius' *Monody* 1 because it dovetailed with the subject of the sermon. Therein Procopius offered consolation for the death of a recently espoused young man of aristocratic descent.

To begin with, an unambiguous appropriation is embedded in the *ethopoiia* of the Widow:

Hom. 6.11–12 (RT 41–42)	Proc. *Op.* 14 (*Or*. 4) 463.16–18:
ὡς ζῶντι τῷ νεκρῷ διελέγετο· "Τίνα ταύτην, υἱέ μου, τίνα ταύτην βαδίζεις ὁδὸν τὴν μακράν τε καὶ ἀνεπίστροφον; […] Πρὸς τῷ σῷ τάφῳ πήξομαι τὴν καλύβην, καὶ τάχα μοι φανήσῃ καὶ λαλοῦντος ἀκούσομαι, μᾶλλον δὲ συνταφήσομαί σοι, ποθούμενε, καὶ τοῖς σοῖς νεαροῖς ὀστέοις σάρκες γηραιαὶ συντακήσονται."	ἀλλὰ πρὶν ἴδειν ἀπέπτης καὶ πρὶν ἡσθῆναι διήμαρτες, καὶ γέγονας ἐξαίφνης ὠμότερος, ὁδὸν βαδίζων ξένην καὶ τὴν ἐμὴν φιλίαν ἀρνούμενος, οὐδὲ προσβλέπειν ἐθέλας παιδάριον, ἐλπίδος ἔσχατον λείψανον, ἀλλ' ὃ ὁρῶν εὐφραίνου νῦν ἀπεστράφης οἰχόμενος. πρὸς τῷ σῷ τάφῳ πήξομαι τὴν παστάδα, καὶ τάχα μοι φανήσῃ καὶ λαλοῦντος ἀκούσομαι.
She spoke with the deceased as if he were living: "What is this, my child, what is this long *road, with no way back*, that you *walk*? […] *On your grave I shall fix a hut, and perhaps you would come forth to me and I shall hear you talking*, or rather I shall bury myself with you, my darling, and the aged flesh will be consumed along with your youthful bones."	But before looking you flew away, before rejoicing you disappeared, and on a sudden you became more cruel, *walking* a strange *road* and refusing my love, and you do not wish to behold your little boy, the last remnant of hope, but you who rejoiced in seeing him now have turned away by *leaving*. *On your grave I shall fix the bridal chamber, and perhaps you would come forth to me and I shall hear you talking*.

[60] Philagath. *Hom*. 6.5–6 (38–39 RT) = Greg. Nys. *De opificio hominis*, *PG* 44.217D–220B.

As suggested by this homiletic passage, the imprint of Procopius' *Monody* extends beyond the verbatim citation identified by Corcella (πρὸς τῷ σῷ τάφῳ … ἀκούσομαι).[61] For Philagathos' formulation (βαδίζεις ὁδὸν τὴν μακράν τε καὶ ἀνεπίστροφον) appears to be inspired by Procopius' parallel imagery (ὁδὸν βαδίζων ξένην … ἀπεστράφης). Once again, this idea is reinforced by Philagathos' certified use of *Monody* 1.

Furthermore, there are other passages in Philagathos' sermon which could have been inspired by Procopius' *Monody*; thus the simile of the young man lying dead like an uprooted tree (*Hom.* 6.9 [RT 40]):

> Ὁ δὲ νέος ἔκειτο ἐκταθεὶς ἐπὶ τοῦ σκίμποδος ὕπτιος, οἷα πεύκη τις ὑψίκομος ἢ κυπάρισσος, ἣν ἀνέμων διέσεισε προσβολὴ καὶ αὐταῖς ῥίζαις ἐξήπλωσεν, ἐλεεινὸν θέαμα καὶ δακρύων ὑπόθεσις, ἄρτι μὲν τὸν τῆς παρειᾶς ῥόδον μεταβαλὼν εἰς ὠχρότητα, δεικνὺς δὲ καὶ οὕτω τοῦ κάλλους τὰ λείψανα.
>
> The youth lay stretched out on his back upon the bier, like a towering pine or a cypress tree which the onslaught of winds has violently shaken and torn out by its roots, a pitiable spectacle and occasion for tears, even though the rose of his cheek has become pale, revealing still the remnants of a great beauty.

As has often been remarked, this is an ancient simile for death which goes back to the Homeric tradition.[62] While not excluding other sources, the model for Philagathos' reworking of the image may have been furnished by Procopius' text (*Op.* 14.1 [458.8–16]):

> ὁ δὲ τοῦ κειμένου πατὴρ ἐξαίφνης ἄπαις ὁ πρεσβύτης καὶ ἔρημος, καὶ <u>τὴν ἄγκυραν τοῦ βίου</u> διέρρηξε τὸ δαιμόνιον, καὶ προσβαλοῦσα θύελλα οἴκου τε παντὸς διέσεισε στήριγμα καὶ κεῖται νεῦσαν ἐς ἔδαφος, ὥσπερ τι δένδρον ὑψηλόν τε καὶ μέγα· καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ ἐδάκρυσε φυτουργός, ᾧ ἔπι πολλ' ἐμόγησε, φθόνου τινὸς προσβολῇ κατὰ γῆς ἰδὼν ἐφαπλούμενον.

[61] Corcella, *RET* 1 (20112) 3–4, *BZ* 103 (2010) 33–37.

[62] Cf. *Il.* 4.482, 16.482–484; on this simile see M. Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*[2] (Lanham 2002) 201–202.

> But the father of the deceased became childless on a sudden in his old age, and on top of it, forsaken; Divinity tore apart the anchor of his life and a storm attacked and shook violently the foundation of the entire house; he lies on the sloping ground like a great and lofty tree; because he toiled much for him, the planter wept seeing him spread on the ground by the attack of envy.

At the textual level the similarities are limited to the verb διέσεισε, the compounds of ἁπλόω (ἐξήπλωσεν / ἐφαπλούμενον), and the pair προσβολή / προσβαλοῦσα. However, the same Procopian passage offers a closer textual connection with another passage of Philagathos' sermon. The *ethopoiia* of the Widow's encounter with Jesus contains the metaphor "anchor of my life," common to both texts (*Hom.* 6.9 [RT 40]):

> Εἶπε γὰρ ἴσως δριμύ τι ἀπιδοῦσα καὶ βλοσυρόν· "Ὦ τῆς ἀκαιρίας ἄνθρωπε, ὁρᾷς οἷον κάλλος ὁ θάνατος πρὸ ὥρας ἐμάρανε καὶ ὅτι ἄπειμι τῇ γῇ κατακρύψουσα τὸ ἐμὸν φῶς, τῆς ζωῆς μου τὴν ἄγκυραν."
>
> Perhaps looking at Him, she might have said something stern and grim: "O senseless man, behold what beauty untimely death has withered and that I go to bury my light in the earth, the anchor of my life."

Furthermore, Philagathos' κάλλος ὁ θάνατος πρὸ ὥρας ἐμάρανε seems to reflect Procopius' κάλλος, οἴμοι, μαραίνεται in his description of the moral qualities of the young man (*Op.* 14.3 [459.18–25]):

> κάλλος, οἴμοι, μαραίνεται. μέχρι δὲ ἡμῶν ἐξ οὐρίας ἡ τύχη, καὶ παῖς ἐκεῖνος ἐτύγχανεν ὢν οὐκ ἐξύβρισε χρημάτων περιουσία, οὔτε μὴν ἐκ γένους ἠλαζονεύσατο, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸ κάλλος καθύβρισεν, ἀλλ' αἰδοῖ μειλιχίῃ καὶ σωφροσύνῃ κεκοσμημένος, νεώτατος ὑπερβὰς ἀτακτοῦντα πηδήματα, οὐχ ἵππων δρόμοις, οὐχ ἡδονῇ σκηνῆς, οὐδὲ τῇ πεττείᾳ προσέκειτο.
>
> Beauty, oh, is withering. Chance was favorable to him until he was our student and he turned out to be a boy whom the abundance of money did not lead into insolence and who did not pride himself on account of his lineage; neither did beauty heap insult upon him, but being adorned with gracious reverence and

> temperance, bypassing the wild leapings of youth he was not devoted to horse races or to the pleasure of theatre or to gaming.

In addition to supplying a plausible connection to Philagathos' formulation, this extended quotation is meant to introduce our final suggestion: that Philagathos' description of Jesus' journey towards the Galilean village of Nain echoes several details from Procopius' *Monody* 1 (*Hom.* 6.13 [RT 42]):

> Ἴετο δὲ ὁ Σωτὴρ ἐκ τῆς Καπερναούμ, ἄρτι τὸν τοῦ ἑκατοντάρχου παῖδα τεθεραπευκὼς ἐν δυσμαῖς τοῦ βίου γενόμενον· ἴετο δὲ πεζῇ βαδίζων, ὡς ἔθος αὐτῷ, καὶ βάδην τὴν ὁδοιπορίαν ποιούμενος, ἅμα μὲν παιδεύων ἡμᾶς μὴ ἐνυβρίζειν τὸ σεμνὸν τῆς κατάστασεως ἀτάκτῳ βαδίσματι, ἅμα δὲ καὶ θαρρῶν ὡς, εἰ καὶ τάφῳ κατάκρύψαιεν τὸν νεκρόν, ἀναστήσει τοῦτον ὥσπερ τὸν Λάζαρον.
>
> But the Saviour hastened from Capernaum, having just cured the centurion's boy, who was at the setting of life; He hastened on foot, as was His habit, making the journey with measured step, at once teaching us not to disparage the seriousness of the [soul's] condition with a disorderly walk, yet at the same time inspiring confidence that even if the dead were shut in the grave, He will raise him, as He did Lazarus.

Thus, Philagathos' μὴ ἐνυβρίζειν recalls the ὑβρίζω compound in Procopius (οὐκ ἐξύβρισε and οὐδὲ καθύβρισεν). Next, the imagery evoked by ἀτάκτῳ βαδίσματι corresponds to Procopius' ἀτακτοῦντα πηδήματα. Then, a few lines later (469.3–4), Procopius' description of the youth's supreme rhetorical training by which "he was leading the herd with a lighter walk" (παρῄει τὴν ἀγέλην κουφοτέρῳ βαδίσματι) dovetails with the imagery and wording of Philagathos.

To summarize, I have argued that Philagathos' acquaintance with Procopius' corpus is more extensive than hitherto realized. I have illustrated the adaptation of Procopius' *Description of the Image* in Philagathos' *Hom.* 63 and 35 and identified other possible imitations in *Hom.* 6 and 24. I have added further evidence on Philagathos' appropriations from Procopius' *Monody* 1 in *Hom.* 6. Overall, these impromptu retrievals of Procopian material indicate a profound rumination and assimilation of this rhetorical model. At the same time, they hint at a process

of memorization and systematization of knowledge, a feature often presumed for the practice of literary *mimesis*. This is emphasized by Quintilian's appraisal of imitation, which remained pertinent to generations of rhetoricians from antiquity through the Byzantine period: "we shall do well to keep a number of different excellences before our eyes, so that different qualities from different authors may impress themselves on our minds, to be adopted for use in the place that becomes them best."[63] Clearly, Philagathos' citation and adaptation of Procopian material confirms this recommendation.[64]

April, 2020

Research Institute of the
University of Bucharest (ICUB)
1 Dimitrie Brandza St.
Bucharest, 060102, Romania
mircea.dulus@icub.unibuc.ro

[63] Quint. *Inst.* 10.2.1, transl. H. E. Butler.

[64] I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to István Perczel for having set up and supervised a research grant at the Central European University (Budapest) for completing this research. I am also grateful to Liviu Matei, Provost of Central European University, for having endorsed it. Moreover, I am thankful to the anonymous reviewer for his/her valuable comments and suggestions.