

# Honouring the Bridegroom like God: Theodore Prodromos *Carm. Hist.* 6.46

*Christos Simelidis*

IN THIS PAPER I examine the phrase θεὸν ὡς γερέθουσιν, used by Theodore Prodromos (ca. 1100–1170) in the context of nuptial praise; it is suggested that the idea of a bridegroom honoured like God may be indebted to Sappho, and that the phrase θεὸν ὡς γερέθουσιν is not simply taken over from Gregory of Nazianzos but is almost certainly the result of a misunderstanding or misreading of his text by Theodore. The paper considers Theodore’s knowledge of Gregory’s poetry, as well as his striking comments about the “pillage” of Gregory’s words of praise by later poets and hymnographers. It is further argued that Gregory himself is very likely to have been influenced in this particular case by Euphorion and Homer, and a striking example is adduced of Gregory’s inspired use of allusion, which has never been explored in detail.

At *Carm.hist.* 6 Theodore Prodromos narrates the triumphal entry of John II Komnenos into Kastamon, Paphlagonia. John fought against the Danişmendids, a Turkoman dynasty which had occupied this territory before 1101, and restored Byzantine rule after the death of Emir Ghāzī, eldest son of Danişmend, in 1134. At one point Prodromos describes the delight of the citizens who gather to greet the emperor, using the following simile (40–49):<sup>1</sup>

ὡς δ' ὅτε κουριδίη ἀρτίγαμος εἶδος ἀρίστη	40
παστάσι νυμφιδίοισιν ἐνέζεται, αὐτὰρ ἀκοίτην	
μίμνει, ὅς οἱ λεχέων ἀντιάσοι· ὡς δὲ σελήνη	
χρυσείοισι πέπλοισι φαίνεται, ὄμματα δ' ἀνδρῶν	
πάντα περιτροπάδην ἐπισύρεται, οἱ δέ μιν αἰὲν	
εἰσορόωντες ἄλαστον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θάμβος ἔχουσι	45

<sup>1</sup> Ed. W. Hörandner, *Theodoros Prodromos, Historische Gedichte* (Wien. Byzant.Stud. 11 [Vienna 1974]).

καὶ θεὸν ὡς γερέθουσιν, ὅς οἱ ἀνὰ δέμνια βαίη·  
 ὡς ἄρα καὶ σύμπασα πόλις τότε λαμπρὰ φάάνθη  
 κοιράνου Αὐσονίων ποτιδεγμένη εἴσοδον ἄβράν,  
 ἔργον ἅπαν δ' ἀπέληγε, τέχνη δ' ἀπεπαύετο πᾶσα.

And just as when a fairest newly wedded wife sits in the bridal chamber, waiting for her husband, who will share the bed with her; and she shines in golden garments like the moon, while all men's eyes are drawn towards her from all around; and as they look on and on at her they experience an unending amazement in their hearts and they honour like God the man who goes up to her bed. So then the whole city shone brightly as it was awaiting the glorious entrance of the Ausonian lord; all work stopped and all craft ceased.

Prodromos copies words or phrases from Homer, Hesiod, and other poets; Hörandner offers only Apoc 21:2 for this passage, and a few more examples of borrowings, echoes, or mere similarities with other texts found in this simile will throw some light on the way in which this poetry was composed, and serve as an introduction to my discussion of the phrase θεὸν ὡς γερέθουσιν:

**41** ἐνέζομαι is a very rare verb, found only twice in classical texts: Aesch. *Pers.* 140–141 τόδ' ἐνεζόμενοι στέγος ἀρχαίου and [Arist.] *Pr.* 5.11 (881b36) ἐγκατακλιθῆναι καὶ ἐνέζεσθαι. But in our case it clearly recalls its third and last use in Greek literature before Theodore: in an amatory epigram Paul Silentiarios (*Anth.Pal.* 5.268.5) describes how Love takes up his residence in his heart, ἀστεμφής, ἀδόνητος ἐνέζεται οὐδὲ μετέστη (with the same metrical *sedes* of ἐνέζεται). | ἀκοίτης is only found at this *sedes* of the hexameter in earlier poetry.

**42** cf. Hom. *Il.* 1.31 ἐμὸν λέχος ἀντιόωσαν.

**42–44** cf. Xen. *Symp.* 1.9 ὡςπερ ὅταν φέγγος τι ἐν νυκτὶ φανῆ, πάντων προσάγεται τὰ ὄμματα, οὕτω καὶ τότε τοῦ Αὐτολύκου τὸ κάλλος πάντων εἶλκε τὰς ὄψεις πρὸς αὐτόν (cf. Ath. 188A and *Epit.* [II.1 p.65 Peppink]).

**44** περιτροπάδην is *hapax legomenon* in Ap. Rhod. 2.143. | Cf. Hom. *Od.* 11.570, 23.46 οἱ δέ μιν; at the same metrical *sedes* at Ap. Rhod. 1.390, 1.509, 3.1296.

**45** cf. Hom. *Il.* 3.342 (= 4.79; cf. 24.482) θάμβος δ' ἔχεν εισορόωντας. | Hom. *Od.* 24.423 ἄλαστον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πένθος ἔκειτο.

46 cf. Hes. *Op.* 328 ὅς τε κασιγνήτοιο ἐοῦ ἀνὰ δέμνια βαίνῃ.<sup>2</sup>

47–48 cf. Hom. *Il.* 7.415 πάντες ὀμηγερέες, ποτιδέγμενοι ὀππότε ἄρ' ἔλθοι.

The beauty of the bride draws the glances of the men and causes them “unending amazement.” And they honour like God the man who is going to sleep with her. This last phrase (46) seems to be mainly parenthetical in the middle of the comparison between the shining bride and the shining city, which, highly adorned, is waiting for the emperor’s triumphal entry. However, the emperor also is implicitly compared to the bridegroom (cf. esp. 41–42 ἀκοίτην ἰμίμνει ~ 48 κοιράνου Αὐσονίων ποτιδεγμένη εἴσοδον ἀβράν), and thus indirectly to God; indeed images of Constantinople as a bride and the emperor as a bridegroom are common in twelfth-century court poetry.<sup>3</sup> But apart from its indirect connection with the emperor, the phrase θεὸν ὧς γερέθουσιν presents particular interest from the point of view of its literary and linguistic sources.

Although there has been much discussion about the form γερέθουσιν and its origins (see below, 92–93), scholars have not paid attention to the fact that θεὸν ὧς γερέθουσιν explicitly expresses the idea that a bridegroom is to be honoured like God, which is not necessarily implied in nuptial praises with the words μάκαρ or ὄλβιος. Even if metaphorical, this specific comparison is perhaps difficult in a Christian context; if, however, there is intertextuality, the text is not to be taken at face value, but understood in a different way. Indeed, the idea expressed here is similar to that conveyed by Sappho fr. 31.1–5 Voigt:

φαίνεται μοι κῆνος ἴσος θεοῖσιν  
ἔμμεν' ὄνηρ, ὅττις ἐνάντιός τοι  
ἰσδάνει καὶ πλάσιον ἄδῦ φωνεί-  
σας ὑπακούει  
καὶ γελαίσας ἱμέροεν ...

<sup>2</sup> Noticed by E. Trapp, “Bemerkungen zu den Prodromea,” *JÖB* 36 (1986) 67–71, at 67.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. “Manganeios Prodromos” *Carm.* 1.11–20 (ed. E. Miller, “Poèmes historiques de Théodore Prodrome,” *RevArch* N.S. 25 [1873] 251–255); Thdr. Prod. *Carm.hist.* 19.112–121.

He seems to me equal to the gods, the man who sits opposite you and listens close to your sweet voice and lovely laughter ...

The context in Sappho is different<sup>4</sup> and the echo is not a close verbal imitation. But in both cases the similar expressions could be seen as praise from the narrator for a girl; the man is treated as God because he is so fortunate to be near to or sleep with the woman.<sup>5</sup> It is true that the celebrated fragment 31 is now transmitted only by Ps.-Longinus' treatise *On the Sublime* (10.2), which seems to have been a rare text in Byzantium.<sup>6</sup> However, the use of Sapphic verses in various contexts (including nuptial praises) was fashionable in twelfth-century Byzantium.<sup>7</sup> It is also worth mentioning that "Manganeios Prodromos," the conventional name for the twelfth-century author of some court poems transmitted under the name of Theodore Prodromos, wonders how many quotations or allusions to Sappho would be sufficient for praising Manuel I Komnenos' achievements (*Carm.* 6.191–194):<sup>8</sup>

πόση Μουσῶν ἐπίπνοια, πόση ῥητόρων γλῶσσα,  
 πόση Σαπφῶ σαλπίζουσα καὶ πόση Καλλιόπη  
 καὶ ποῖος λόγων ἔφορος καὶ τίς Ἑρμῆς ἀρκέσει  
 ὑμνῆσαι τὰ παράδοξα μεγαλουργήματά σου [...];

How much inspiration of the Muses, how much rhetoric, how many quotations or allusions to Sappho sounding the trumpet and how great a Kalliope, and what kind of master of words and

<sup>4</sup> Only a fragment of the poem survives, but perhaps not much is missing; for details see G. O. Hutchinson, *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces* (Oxford 2001) 168–177.

<sup>5</sup> For Sappho's and parallel cases cf. J. C. B. Petropoulos, *Eroticism in Ancient and Medieval Greek Poetry* (London 2003) 40; Petropoulos also discusses types of nuptial *makarismos* (21–22), but does not mention Thdr. Prod. *Carm. hist.* 6.46.

<sup>6</sup> The treatise depends almost entirely on *Parisinus gr.* 2036 (s. X), from which most of the other extant manuscripts (s. XV–XVI) descended. Cf. N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium*<sup>2</sup> (London 1996) 139 and 150.

<sup>7</sup> See *ODB* III 1840–41 s.v. "Sappho," with examples and bibliography; D. A. Christidis, "Σαπφικά," *Hellenica* 36 (1985) 3–11.

<sup>8</sup> Ed. S. Bernardinello, *Theodori Prodromi, De Manganis* (Studi Bizantini e Neogreci 4 [Padua 1972]) 55.

what Hermes, will suffice to honour your extraordinary achievements?

The naming of Sappho in this context is striking, as is the use of *σαλπίζω* with reference to her poetry. But at the same time the mention may suggest something more than a mere acquaintance with the image of Sappho as the tenth Muse in *Anth. Pal.* 9.506 (“Plato”) and 9.66 (Antip. Sid.), or with earlier references to Sappho in similar contexts.<sup>9</sup> Indeed, “Manganeios Prodromos” begins one of his poem-hymns to Manuel:<sup>10</sup>

ἄγε μοι χέλυς παλαιὰ ῥητορικῶν χειλέων  
ἀπολαβοῦσα σήμερον τὴν παλαιότητά σου  
ἄδε Ῥωμαίων ἀνακτι νικοποιῶ σωτῆρι  
ῦμνον Ὀρφέως ῥήτορος προφήτου ψαλμογράφου.

Come, old lyre of lips skilled in rhetoric, regain your ancient qualities today and sing a hymn of the rhetor, prophet, and psalmist Orpheus for the victorious and saviour ruler of the Romans.

and the first words are a clear reminiscence of Sappho fr. 118:<sup>11</sup>

ἄγι δὴ χέλυ διὰ ἴμοι λέγε†  
φωνάεσσα ἴδὲ γίνεο†

The naming and use of Sappho by “Manganeios” illustrates very well a twelfth-century Byzantine fashion. Examples are Michael Italikos Λόγος βασιλικὸς εἰς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα Ἰωάννην

<sup>9</sup> E.g. Psellos *Or. paneg.* 1.158–160 (ed. G. T. Dennis, *Michaelis Pselli orationes panegyricae* [Stuttgart 1994]) τῆς Πινδαρικήσ ῥῆδῆσ, τῆσ Σαπφικήσ λύρασ, τῆσ Ὀρφικήσ πειθοῦσ, τῆσ Ὀμηρικήσ Καλλιόπησ, τῆσ Ἀνακρέοντοσ γλώττησ, τῆσ ὀργανικήσ μούσῆσ.

<sup>10</sup> *Carm.* 1.1–4. ῥητορικῶν is D. A. Christidis’ correction (*Hellenica* 36 [1985] 5) for the unmetrical ῥητόρων printed by Miller. For a list of Manganeios’ poems and references to the available editions see P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180* (Cambridge 1993) 494–500. For a recent discussion of his poetry see M. Jeffreys, “‘Rhetorical’ Texts,” in E. Jeffreys (ed.), *Rhetoric in Byzantium* (Aldershot 2003) 87–100.

<sup>11</sup> The echo was first noticed by Christidis, *Hellenica* 36 (1985) 3–5. The fragment would have been known to “Manganeios” through Hermog. *Id.* 2.5 (p.334.9–10 Rabe); “Manganeios” even names Hermogenes: *Carm.* 2.42–43 (p.415 Miller) τὴν δημηγόρον ἴσκησα τῶν μουσοθρέπτων γλώτταν, ἢ τὸ μέλοσ παρεζήλωσα τῆσ Ἐρμογένουσ λύρασ.

τὸν Κομνηνόν:<sup>12</sup> “ἄγε τοίνυν, χέλυ διὰ μοι”—λεγέσθω γὰρ ἐπικαίρως τὸ τῆς Σαπφοῦς—φωνητικωτέρα τε γίνου καὶ εὐφωνος καὶ πολύφωνος καὶ τὰ βασιλέως ἐπαίνει καλά; and Anna Komnene *Alex.* 15.9.1: ἡβουλόμην δὲ καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν τῶν Βογομίλων διηγῆσασθαι αἴρεσιν· ἀλλὰ με κωλύει καὶ αἰδώς, ὡς πού φησιν ἡ καλὴ Σαπφώ, ὅτι συγγραφεὺς ἔγωγε γυνή (cf. Sappho fr.137).

Regarding the peculiar form γερέθουσιν in Theodore Prodromos: Hörandner printed the form in *crucis*,<sup>13</sup> but Erich Trapp and, particularly, Athanasios Kambylis later argued persuasively that the transmitted form is sound. Kambylis initially proposed καὶ θεὸν ὡς γε τίουσιν.<sup>14</sup> Trapp replied<sup>15</sup> that σέβουσιν is palaeographically superior to τίουσιν, but, more importantly, he noticed that Prodromos uses γερέθω once again at *Epigrammata in Vetus et Novum Testamentum* 283b3:<sup>16</sup> ῥήματα σεῦ γερέθοντες θεῖους ἢ τε χρησμούς (“honouring your words like

<sup>12</sup> P. Gautier, *Michel Italikos, Lettres et Discours* (Archives de l’Orient chrétien 14 [Paris 1972]) 247.13–16.

<sup>13</sup> Hörandner, *Theodoros* 222, with comment at 227.

<sup>14</sup> A. Kambylis, *Prodromea: Textkritische Beiträge zu den historischen Gedichten des Theodoros Prodromos* (Wien.Byzant.Stud. 11 Suppl. [Vienna 1984]) 23–24. To his arguments against Hörandner’s conjecture γεραροῦσιν, one could add that γεραρῶ is attested elsewhere twice only by grammarians and lexicographers: Theognost. *Can.* 878 (Cramer, *Anecd. Oxon.* II 145.11–12) αἴρω, ἄρω· γεραίρω, γεραρῶ· μαρμαίρω, μαρμαρῶ, and *Etym. Gud.* s.v. γεραίρω (II 305.10–11 de Stefani), where a scholiast on Joh. Damasc. *Canon. iamb.* 3.5 claims to have met the future γεραρῶ: παρὰ τὸ γέρας γεραίρω. ὁ μέλλον γεραρῶ ἀλλαχού ἐστιν. The future was proposed by Dobree and printed by many editors in an oath cited at Apollodorus, *Against Neaira* [Dem. 59] 78, where the codices transmit γεραίρω; but the emendation is not necessary and we should keep the reading of the manuscripts: see K. A. Kapparis, *Apollodorus, “Against Neaira” [D. 59]* (Berlin/New York 1999) 134 and 342. It is odd that both LSJ and the *Diccionario Griego-Espanol* s.v. γεραίρω cite γεραρῶ from *Against Neaira* without indicating that this is an emendation. At Balbilla’s epigram (*Col. Memn.* 29.1), cited by LSJ, γεραρῶ is in fact a grapheme for the adjective γεραροῦ: A. and É. Bernand, *Les inscriptions grecques et latines du Colosse de Memnon* (Cairo 1960) 86–92, at 89.

<sup>15</sup> Trapp, *JÖB* 36 (1986) 67.

<sup>16</sup> Ed. G. Papagiannis, *Theodoros Prodromos, Jambische und hexametrische Tetra-sticha auf die Haupterzählungen des Alten und des Neuen Testaments* (Meletemata 7.1–2 [Wiesbaden 1997]).

divine oracles”). The meaning here is clearly “honour” or “respect,”<sup>17</sup> and this second case leaves no doubt that Theodore does use an otherwise unattested verb γερέθω. Trapp also cites an interpolation in the *Etymologicum Magnum* (s.v. ἀγειρέθω): νέμω νεμέθω, γέρω γερέθω, ὅθεν καὶ τὸ ἀγειρέθω.<sup>18</sup>

In his second thoughts on *Prodromea*,<sup>19</sup> Kambylis added a parallel from Gregory of Nazianzos, *Carm.* 2.1.1.[991] 280:<sup>20</sup> ἀγγελικοί τε χοροὶ ψαλμοῖς θεὸν οἱ γ’ ἐρέθουσιν. He claimed that Prodromos in all probability borrowed his phrase directly from Gregory, who, however, must have originally written γερέθουσιν and not γ’ ἐρέθουσιν, the result of wrong word division. Kambylis argued that in Gregory’s verse the meaning we need (which is indeed found in a Byzantine scholion already recorded in *PG*) is “honour,” but Gregory uses ἐρέθω at 290 of the same poem with the meaning “irritate”: οἱ μὲ καὶ ἐννυχίοισι κακοῖς ἐρέθουσιν ὀνειροῖς (“they irritate me with bad dreams in the night”). “Es ist unwahrscheinlich, daß Gregor v. Naz. in einem Abstand von nur 10 Versen dasselbe Verb in so unterschiedlicher Bedeutung verwendet haben sollte. So müssen wir davon ausgehen, daß er V. 280 γερέθουσιν geschrieben hat; allerdings wissen wir nicht, woher er es hat, der Ursprung des Wortes bleibt in Dunkel.” Kambylis admits that “das verb ist offenbar in der Zwischenzeit nirgendwo belegt,” and also the possibility that “eine künftige kritische Edition der Gedichte des Theologen das Ergebnis vorlegen sollte, daß es bei Greg. v. Naz. γ’ ἐρέθουσι heißen muß.” The form γερέθω has now entered the *Lexicon zur byzantinischen Gräzität* (*LBG*).

At 279–281 of this long autobiographical poem, Gregory recollects his past spiritual experiences:

<sup>17</sup> The verse corresponds to 283a2 οὐ τοὺς λόγους σέβουσιν ὡς θεοῦ λόγους, as pointed out by A. Kambylis, “Retractationes Prodromeae,” *JÖB* 38 (1988) 291–325, at 298–301.

<sup>18</sup> Transmitted by *Vossianus gr.* Q 20 (= *Magna Grammatica*), s. XIII, and printed in the apparatus for ἀγειρέθω by F. Lasserre and N. Livadaras, *Etymologicum Magnum Genuinum I* (Rome 1976) 30.

<sup>19</sup> Kambylis, *JÖB* 38 (1988) 298–301.

<sup>20</sup> In references to Gregory of Nazianzos’ poems, the number in square brackets indicates the column in Migne, *PG* 37.

εὐχαί τε στοναχαί τε φίλαι καὶ νύκτες ἄπνοι  
 ἀγγελικοί τε χοροὶ ψαλμοὺς **θεὸν οἷ γ' ἐρέθουσιν**  
 ἰστάμενοι ψυχὰς τε Θεῷ πέμποντες ἐν ὕμνοις,

prayers, pleasant groans, and sleepless nights, as well as angelic  
 choirs who stand and stir up God with their psalms and send  
 their souls to God in hymns

The use of ἐρέθω in this context has puzzled both Byzantine and modern scholars. As far as the former are concerned, their activities can be traced in the anonymous Paraphrases of Gregory's poems, transmitted by several manuscripts together with the poems.<sup>21</sup> Paraphrase A (in the version of *Laurentianus* 7.18 [s. XII] fol. 19<sup>r</sup>.ii.28–32) reads for 280: καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις ὅμοιοι χοροὶ ταῖς ψαλμωδίαις τὸν θεὸν οἷτινες χοροὶ ἐρεθίζουσιν διεγείρουσιν; Paraphrase B (version of *Mosquensis* 156 Vlad. [s. XII] fol. 16<sup>r</sup>.ii.12–14) offers ἀγγελικαὶ τε χοροστασίαι ψαλμοὺς θεὸν γεραίρουσαι; while Paraphrase C (version of *Marcianus gr.* 82 [s. XIII] fol. 17<sup>v</sup>.20–21) has καὶ χοροὶ ἄγιοι οἷτινες ἰστάμενοι τὸν θεὸν διὰ ψαλμῶν εἰς οἶκτον ἐγείρουσιν.<sup>22</sup> But Gregory's *Carm.* 2.1.1 has now been twice edited, by R.-M. Bénin in 1988<sup>23</sup> and by A. Tuilier and G. Bady in 2004.<sup>24</sup> Bénin conjectured and printed the unmetrical γεραίρουσιν, adding in his apparatus: “scilicet γεράρουσιν (cf. fut. γεραρῶ in *Jusjur. ap. Demosth.* 59.78) – γεράουσιν prop. Sicherl ex lect. γεραϊόμενα in *Nicandr. Al.* 396, sed dubia lectio.” Nevertheless,

<sup>21</sup> N. Gertz, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Gedichte Gregors von Nazianz II* (Paderborn 1986) 18, 181–183; Fr. Lefherz, *Studien zur Gregor von Nazianz: Mythologie, Überlieferung, Scholiasten* (Bonn 1958) 169–177. For published paraphrases see L. Bacci, *Gregorio Nazianzeno, Ad Olimpiade* (Pisa 1996) 141–152, and D. M. Scarby, “A Paraphrase of Gregory of Nazianz, *Carmen de virtute* 2.9, in an Uppsala Ms.,” *OrChrP* 69 (2003) 341–353.

<sup>22</sup> The Paraphrases' renderings for γ' ἐρέθουσι may also be found as interlinear glosses in other manuscripts, but the case of *Coislinianus* 56 (s. XIV–XV) is worth mentioning here; this codex transmits Paraphrase B as a second column and Paraphrase A as interlinear glosses, but in this case (fol. 8<sup>r</sup>) apart from ἐρεθίζουσιν διεγείρουσιν, we also get τιμῶσιν written above γ' ἐρέθουσιν.

<sup>23</sup> R.-M. Bénin, *Une autobiographie romantique au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle: le poème II 1.1 de Grégoire de Nazianze* (diss. Paul Valéry-Montpellier III 1988).

<sup>24</sup> *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze: Œuvres poétiques I* (Paris 2004) 20. Cf. my review in *AntTard* 12 (2004) 445–450.



Tuilier and Bady rightly kept the reading of almost all manuscripts.<sup>25</sup> The verb ἐρέθω is more often used in a bad sense, as Gregory himself uses it at 290 of the same poem (cited above), but it is also found in a good sense, as at 2 Cor 9:2, καὶ τὸ ὑμῶν ζήλος ἠρέθισεν τοὺς πλείονας (“your zeal has stirred most of them to action”).<sup>26</sup> For the idea of bothering and pressing God through prayers and demands cf. the parable of the widow and the judge at Luke 18:1–8 (esp. ὁ δὲ θεὸς οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν βοῶντων αὐτῷ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, καὶ μακροθυμῆι ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς;).<sup>27</sup> Paraphrases A and C got it right.

But still ἐρέθω is not the word most expected to be used in Gregory’s context, and there may indeed be a special reason for this slightly strained expression. Gregory enjoys drawing phrases from earlier poetry and using them in his own verses transformed within a new, Christian, context. The result is often impressive, when one meets the classical expression used in a way or having a meaning that would be impossible in a

<sup>25</sup> I copy their apparatus: “γ’ ἐρέθουσιν codd. Ma<sup>pc</sup> : γεραίουσιν Lc<sup>corr</sup> σ’ ἐρέθουσι B γ’ ἐραίουσιν Ma<sup>ac</sup>.” Bernardi translates “pressent Dieu avec des psaumes,” but there is no comment on this phrase. For the use of γ’ to avoid hiatus cf. e.g. *Carm.* 1.1.2.[408] 83 (ed. Moerschini) ἦν, σοί γ’ εὐμένεων; 1.2.29.[888] 55 (ed. Knecht) πῶς δὲ σύ γ’ εἶδος ἔχουσα, [890] 85 εἰ δὲ σὺ γ’ ἄλλων; 2.1.11.[1162] 1886 (ed. Tuilier-Bady) ἦ σοί γ’, ἄριστε; *Anth.Pal.* 8.200.3 νεκρῶν καὶ τάδε γ’ ἐστὶ σοφίσματα.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. *Lib. Or.* 11.145 συμπαρακαλοῦσι καὶ προτρέπουσι καὶ προάγονται θαρρεῖν, ὥσπερ ἀετοὶ νεοττοὺς εἰς πτῆσιν ἐρεθίζοντες; *Psellos Or.* 30.48–50 (ed. Littlewood) οὗτος (sc. ὁ οἶνος) εὐφραίνει καρδίαν, οὗτος διεγείρει πρὸς εὐχαριστίαν καὶ πρὸς ὕμνους ἐρεθίζει καὶ κατάνυξιν ἐμποιεῖ καὶ δάκρυον ἐκκαλεῖται τὸ θεῖον ἐξιλεούμενον; Symeon of Thessalonike Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Λαυριώτας (B9).382–383 (“Ἔργα Θεολογικά p.183 Balfour) ὡς ἀλλήλους πρὸς τὸ καλὸν ἀεὶ ἐρεθίζετε, καὶ ἀδελφὸς τῷ ἀδελφῷ βοηθεῖτω. Also Heb 10:24 καὶ κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους εἰς παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης καὶ καλῶν ἔργων; *Xen. Mem.* 3.3.13 παροξύνει πρὸς τὰ καλὰ καὶ ἔντιμα.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. also Eus. on Ps 82:6–9 (*PG* 23.996A) ὥσπερ διεγείρων καὶ παροξύνων τὸν θεὸν ὁ προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἱκετηρίᾳ τῇ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ φάσκει τὸ “κατὰ σοῦ” (but cf. Num 15:30 τὸν θεὸν οὗτος παροξύνει and Mal 2:17 οἱ παροξύνοντες τὸν θεὸν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ὑμῶν). In addition, Eustathius *De capita Thessalonica* is worth citing here (p.114.14–15 Kyriakidis): εἰστρέχοντες γὰρ καὶ εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐκάστους (sc. τοὺς ναοὺς) οἱ βάρβαροι ἐποίουν πάνδεινα καὶ οἷα θεὸν ἐρεθίζειν εἰς ἄμυναν.

classical context.<sup>28</sup> In our case the verb ἐρέθω is used in Homer with particular gods who quarrel, e.g. *Il.* 3.414 (Aphrodite speaking to Helen) μή μ' ἔρεθε σχετλίη; 4.5 αὐτίκ' ἐπειρᾶτο Κρονίδης ἐρεθίζεμεν Ἥρην; 5.418–419 Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη | κερτομίους ἐπέεσσι Δία Κρονίδην ἐρέθιζον. These cases alone might have inspired the use of ἐρέθω in Gregory's context, but it is more likely that his use of ἐρέθω was inspired by some verses of Euphorion, who in his curse poem Θρᾶξ speaks of his enemies as people who irritate the gods (*Suppl.Hell.* 415.ii.8–11):

οἷ ῥα θεοὺς ἐρέθωσι, παρὰ ρήτρας τ' ἀγάγοντ[αι,]  
[ἡ]πεδανούς ἢ ο[ἶ] κεν ἀγνηορέωσι τοκῆας  
στύξαντες ζῶων τε παρα<ι>φασίας τε καμών[των,]  
ἢ οἱ ξείνια δόρπα Διός τ' ἀλίτωσι τραπέζας.

those who enrage the gods and conduct themselves contrary to the laws or those who are insolent towards their weak parents disregarding the advice of those alive and dead, or those who sin against the hospitable banquets and the tables of Zeus.

Gregory knew the poetry of Euphorion, and his most interesting echo of Euphorion's extant verses is worth citing here,<sup>29</sup> as it will support my argument for the case cited above and also illustrate to some extent the feature of Gregory's poetry I have already mentioned. In fr.98 Powell, transmitted by John Tzetzes in his Scholia on Lycophron's *Alexandra* 440,<sup>30</sup> Euphorion refers to the myth of Mopsus and Amphilocheus (cf. Strab. 14.5.16), who killed each other over control of Mallus, near the river Pyramus:

Πύραμον ἠχῆντα, πόλιν δ' ἐκτίσσατο Μαλλόν,  
ἦς πέρι δῆριν ἔθεντο κακοφράδες ἀλλήλοισι  
Μόψος τ' Ἀμφίλοχός τε, καὶ ἄκριτα δηρινθέντες

<sup>28</sup> This feature of Gregory's poetry is discussed in more detail in the Introduction of my D.Phil. thesis "Selected Poems of Gregory of Nazianzus: a Critical Edition with Introduction and Commentary," which I am currently completing at the University of Oxford.

<sup>29</sup> The case is cited without discussion by E. Magnelli, *Studi su Euforione* (Rome 2002) 115–116; he also cites fr.75 χθιζόν μοι κνώσσοντι παρ' Ἀργα-νώθιον αἶπος ~ Greg. Naz. *Carm.* 2.1.45.[1369] 229 καὶ ποτέ μοι κνώσσοντι παρίστατο τοῖος ὄνειρος.

<sup>30</sup> E. Scheer, *Lycophronis Alexandra* II (Berlin 1908) 162.19–22.

μουνάξ ἀλλίστοιο πύλας ἔβαν Ἀϊδονῆος.<sup>31</sup>

(Amphilochus arrived at) the resounding Pyramus and founded the city of Mallus, over which Mopsus and Amphilochus began a fight with mutual dislike; after they contended indecisively, they arrived separately at the gates of inexorable Hades.

In a short prayer, Gregory refers to Christ's crucifixion and resurrection (*Carm.* 1.1.33.[514] 7–9):<sup>32</sup>

ὅστις ἐπὶ σταυροῖο μόρον τέτληκας ἐπισπεῖν,  
οἷα βροτός· τριτάτη δὲ πύλας λίπες ἀϊδονῆος,  
οἷα Θεός· θανάτου γὰρ ἔλυσας δεσμὸν ἀναστάς

(you) who endured to face death on the cross as a mortal man;  
but on the third day you left the gates of Hades as God; for you  
loosed the bond of death with your resurrection

λίπες would be inconceivable to a non-Christian world,<sup>33</sup> but at the same time very satisfactory to Christians, whether they were able to notice the allusion to Euphorion or not; but the adoption of a unique expression<sup>34</sup> at the same metrical *sedes* is intended to stress Christ's triumph over death and only those

<sup>31</sup> For the last phrase cf. Tzetzes' schol. on Lycophron *Alex.* 440 (162.16–18 Scheer): οὓς θάψαντες οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες πύργον μεταξὺ τῶν τάφων κατεσκεύασαν, ὅπως μηδὲ μετὰ θάνατον ἀλλήλων κοινωνήσωσιν.

<sup>32</sup> H. M. Werhahn, "Dubia and Spuria bei Gregor von Nazianz," in *Studia Patristica* 7 (Texte u. Untersuch. 92 [Berlin 1966]) 337–347, at 342–343, has questioned the authenticity of this poem, because it is transmitted (together with 1.1.31, 34–35) only by *Vindobon. Theol. gr.* 43 (s. XVI). But scribes sometimes copied out very old exemplars (cf. Tuilier [n.24] cxxxii on this case) and the poem is actually transmitted also by *Vat. Borg. gr.* 22 (s. XV) (unknown to Tuilier); see M. Sicherl, "Zwei Autographen Marsilio Ficinos: Borg. Gr. 22 und Paris. Gr. 1256," in G. C. Garfagnini (ed.), *Marsilio Ficino e il ritorno di Platone* I (Florence 1986) 221–228. The words and the meanings are Gregorian (see C. Crimi, "Nazianzenica. VIII," *GIF* 47 [1995] 141–146, at 141–142) and the allusion to Euphorion argues further in favour of the poem's authenticity (cf. Magnelli, *Studi* 115 n.57). In addition, Gregory seems to have in mind line 3 of the Euphorion fragment when he writes *Carm.* 2.1.17[1268] 92 χηνῶν ἢ γεράνων ἄκριτα μαρναμένων.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. e.g. Philetas fr.6 Powell ἀτραπὸν εἰς Ἀίδαο | ἦνυσα, τὴν οὐπὼ τις ἐναντίον ἦλθεν ὀδίτης, and the other parallels cited by A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus* II (Cambridge 1952) 225, on Theoc. *Id.* 12.19 ἀνέξοδον εἰς Ἀχέροντα.

<sup>34</sup> For the rare form Ἀϊδονεύς, which occurs only in Euphorion, Quintus of Smyrna, Gregory, and Nonnus, see *DGE* s.v. Ἀϊδονεύς and Ἀϊδωνεύς.

aware of the allusion to the pagan poem can fully understand and appreciate Gregory's verse. Such a use of allusion is undoubtedly a very clever and inspired way of writing Christian poetry within the tradition of classical literature. In a similar way to that suggested for *πύλας ... ἄϊδονῆος*, we should understand the use of the phrase *θεὸν ἐρέθω* by Gregory. What could only have a negative meaning in the past can now be understood in a different, even opposite way, as happens in this case: the Christians may *ἐρέθουσιν* their *μακρόθυμον* god (cf. Luke 18:7, cited above) with prayers and psalms in order to achieve their demands: the irritable pagan gods are implicitly contrasted with the forbearing Christian god.

Let us now return to Theodore Prodromos. How well did he know the poems of Gregory of Nazianzos? In his recent edition of Prodromos' tetrasticha on the Old and New Testaments, Papagiannis refers more than one hundred times to Gregory's *Carmina*; in most of these cases Prodromos copies or echoes words or phrases. Several other echoes have been noticed<sup>35</sup> and there are certainly more to be found. There should then be no doubt about the origins of Theodore's *θεὸν ὡς γερέθουσιν*. His phrase could be paralleled with Hom. *Il.* 9.297 *θεὸν ὡς τιμήσουσι* or 302–303 *οἱ σε θεὸν ὡς | τίσουσ'* (cf. Thdr. Prod. *Carm.hist.* 8.5 *καὶ θεὸν ὡς σε τίσωσι μετήλυδες Ἴαρεος υἱοί*), but Gregory's *θεὸν οἱ γ' ἐρέθουσιν* was definitely his source. How else can we explain the expression *θεὸν ὡς γερέθουσιν*, and especially the form *γερέθουσιν* in Prodromos? The most likely scenario is that Theodore Prodromos failed to understand the reading *γ' ἐρέθουσιν*; the context led him to the sense "honour" and, possibly misled by a paraphrase which interpreted *γ' ἐρέθουσιν* as *γεραίρουσιν* (as does the extant Paraphrase B), he

<sup>35</sup> E.g. Thdr. Prod. *Carm.hist.* 8.92 *καὶ κύνες ἀργοὶ | ἀμφυλάοντες ἔπονται* ~ Greg. Naz. *Carm.* 1.1.19.[1272] 20 (edited by me [n.28]) *πάντοθεν ἀμφυλάουσι κακοὶ κύνες* (those being the only occurrences of the verb *ἀμφυλάω*; cf. *LBG* s.v. *ἀμφυλάω*); Thdr. Prod. *Carm.hist.* 59.167 *ὅ τις σεβασθῆ ταῦτα, καὶ σωθήσεται* ~ Greg. Naz. *Carm.* 1.2.30.[910] 24 *ὅ τις φυλάξει ταῦτα, καὶ σωθήσεται* (noticed by Hörandner, *Theodoros* 479); see also the cases recorded by J. Sajdak in his edition of Prodromos' epigrams on Gregory: *Historia critica scholiastarum et commentatorum Gregorii Nazianzeni* (Meletemata Patristica I [Cracow 1914]) 259–265.

thought that Gregory's word was γερέθουσιν. We should not exclude the possibility that Theodore's manuscript of Gregory read γερέθουσιν, but it is worth mentioning that such a reading is not found in any of the seventeen manuscripts (s. X–XVI) collated by the recent editors. Even the manuscripts of Paraphrase B read γ' ἐρέθουσιν. γερέθουσι is found only in the *Lexicon ordine versuum* 278, where it is glossed γεαίρουσι;<sup>36</sup> but in this case the corruption could be part of the transmission of the lexicon itself.<sup>37</sup> However, Prodromos could easily have made this mistake, even if his manuscript contained the apostrophe. Reading γερέθουσιν for γ' ἐρέθουσιν could also have been the result of an oversight by Prodromos or of minor damage to the manuscript, which made the apostrophe invisible.

Theodore Prodromos' decision to use an otherwise unattested word at a place where he could just as well have written τίουσι or σέβουσι is not surprising. The word, he thought, had been blessed by the Theologian, and Prodromos' admiration for him is explicitly expressed in his epigram-hymns on Gregory. But there is an even more relevant confession by Prodromos. The Christmas Canon attributed to Cosmas of Maiouma<sup>38</sup> begins with the first lines of Gregory's *Or.* 38:<sup>39</sup>

Χριστὸς γεννᾶται· δοξάσατε·  
 Χριστὸς ἐξ οὐρανῶν· ἀπαντήσατε·  
 Χριστὸς ἐπὶ γῆς· ὑψώθητε·

<sup>36</sup> Ed. D. Kalamakis, *Λεξικά τῶν ἐπῶν Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου* (Athens 1992) 129. Kalamakis corrected to γ' ἐρέθουσι, but γερέθουσι is transmitted by all eight codices (s. XIII–XV). This is a Paraphrase-Lexicon, whose lemmata include, apart from words, short phrases or whole lines, e.g. 67 τὸ δ' ἔμπεδον; 141 ἢ ἀμφαδόν; 209 εἰ γανόνωντος; 266 ἐπ' ἀνέρι.

<sup>37</sup> Similarly, the corrupt lemmata, e.g. 240 ἀφανρός (ἀφανροτάτοισιν 2.1.1.94), 241 †ὑπάλευα (ὑπάλυξα 2.1.1.102), 284 ὀρυμαγδός (-ῶν 2.1.1.289), 322 ἀτρεμέοντα (ἀρτεμ- 2.1.1. 389), and 376 ἄσσα (ῶσσα 2.1.1.570) have not been found in any of the manuscripts collated by Bénin (n.23), and Tuilier and Bady (n.24).

<sup>38</sup> W. Christ and M. Paranikas, *Anthologia graeca carminum christianorum* (Leipzig 1871) 165.

<sup>39</sup> Ed. C. Moreschini (SC 358 [Paris 1990]). Cf. P. Karavites, "Gregory Nazianzinos and Byzantine Hymnography," *JHS* 113 (1993) 81–98, at 83–84.

ἄσατε τῷ Κυρίῳ, πᾶσα ἡ γῆ·

and Prodromos starts his comments on the Canon as follows:<sup>40</sup>

πόθεν δὲ ἄλλοθεν τοὺς εὐφρονούντας ἄρτον ζητητέον, χρείας καλούσης, ἢ παρὰ ἄρτοπράτου λαβεῖν; πόθεν δὲ οἶνον ἢ παρὰ οἰνοπώλου; πόθεν δὲ χρυσοῦν ἢ ἀργυροῦν χάραγμα ἢ δηλονότι παρὰ ἀργυραμοιβοῦ· ἀκολούθως δὴ τούτοις, πόθεν καὶ λόγους χορευτικούς καὶ πανηγυριστικούς ζητητέον τοὺς χορεύειν ἢ πανηγυρίζειν ἐθέλοντας, ἢ παρὰ τοῦ χορευτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πανηγυριστοῦ, τοῦ ἐν θεολογίᾳ μεγάλου φημί Γρηγορίου, τοῦ μὴ μόνον τὰς θείας καὶ δεσποτικὰς ἐορτὰς τοῖς οἰκείοις ἐγκοσμησαμένου λόγοις καὶ ὕμνοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλοις ἀνέντος τὰ ἐκείνου συλαγωγείσθαι ῥήματα καὶ νοήματα, συλίαν ταύτην μακαριστὴν καὶ ἀξιοθαύμαστον, καὶ ἦν ὁ κλέπτων οὐχ ὅπως αἰδεσθήσεται, ἀλλὰ τούναντίον ἅπαν καὶ ἐγκαλλωπισθήσεται;

Where else should the sensible people ask for bread, when there is need, other than from the baker? Where for wine, other than from the wine-merchant? Where for gold or silver carved coins other than from the money-changer? Following on from these examples, where should those who want to dance or celebrate ask for dancing and festive words, other than the dancer and the panegyrist? I mean Gregory, great in theology, who did not only adorn the holy and dominical festivals with his own words and hymns, but also allowed others to plunder his words and ideas—a pillage worthy of blessing and admiration; the thief should not at all feel ashamed, but the complete opposite, he should take pride in his action.<sup>41</sup>

July, 2005

Somerville College  
Oxford, OX2 6HD, UK  
christos.simelidis@some.ox.ac.uk

<sup>40</sup> H. M. Stevenson, *Theodori Prodromi commentarios in carmina sacra melodorum Cosmae Hierosolymitani et Ioannis Damasceni* (Rome 1888) 33.23–32. Cf. A. Kazdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature (650–850)* (Athens 1999) 119.

<sup>41</sup> I am grateful to Mr Nigel G. Wilson, Professor Elizabeth M. Jeffreys, and Dr Mary Whitby for their comments and encouragement.